

International Commission for



the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries

Serial No. 3500
(B.u.75)

ICNAF Summ.Doc. 75/9

ANNUAL MEETING - JUNE 1975

REPORT

OF

JOINT ICNAF/NEAFC MEETING ON JOINT INTERNATIONAL ENFORCEMENT

Leningrad, 4-7 March 1975

The Report of Meetings, together with Appendices, are listed below. The page numbers referred to are those given at the bottom of the pages.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Report of Joint Sessions of ICNAF and NEAFC Committees on International Enforcement.....	2
Appendix I. Agenda.....	5
Appendix II. Report of Meetings of Standing Committee on International Control (STACTIC) of the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries (ICNAF).....	6
ANNEX A. List of Participants.....	16
ANNEX B. Agenda.....	18
ANNEX C. (1) Resolution Relating to Safe Boarding of Vessels at Sea by Inspectors under the ICNAF Scheme of Joint International Enforcement.....	19
ANNEX D. Fishing Vessels' Guide to ICNAF Regulations (except quotas).....	20
ANNEX E. (1) Recommendation Relating to the Adoption of Permits for Fisheries Research in the Convention Area.....	22
ANNEX F. US proposal for a scheme of registration for vessels engaged in the fisheries or fishing support operations in the Convention Area or Statistical Area 6.....	24
ANNEX G. (2) Resolution Relating to the Enforcement of the Commission's Fishery Regulations (Implementation of an International Observer Program)....	25
Appendix III. Report of Meeting of the Enforcement Committee of the North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission (NEAFC).....	27
ANNEX A. List of Delegates.....	31
ANNEX B. Agenda.....	33
ANNEX C. Permit form for fisheries research in the Convention Area.....	34
ANNEX D. Procedure of research fishing in the Convention Area.....	35
Appendix IV. Report of Meetings of the Joint ICNAF/NEAFC Working Group on Logbooks and Joint Enforcement.....	37
Attachment 1. Record of Accumulative Catch form.....	39
Attachment 2. Entries Required in all Logbooks.....	40
Attachment 3. International Fisheries Inspection Questionnaire.....	41
Attachment 4. ICNAF/NEAFC - Scheme of Joint Enforcement - Report of Inspection form	43

JOINT ICNAF/NEAFC MEETING ON JOINT INTERNATIONAL ENFORCEMENT

Leningrad, 4-7 March 1974

Report of Joint Sessions of ICNAF and NEAFC Committees on International Enforcement

Tuesday, 4 March, 1015 hrs
Thursday, 6 March, 1000 hrs
Thursday, 6 March, 1745 hrs
Friday, 7 March, 0900 hrs

1. Opening. The Joint Meeting was called to order in Teachers House, Leningrad, USSR, by the Chairman of ICNAF, Mr E. Gillett (UK). Participants were present from Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany, the German Democratic Republic, Ireland, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America. Lists of delegates from ICNAF and NEAFC are at Appendix II, Annex A, and Appendix III, Annex A, respectively.
2. Chairman. Mr A. Volkov (USSR) was elected Chairman of the Joint Sessions.
3. Rapporteur. Mr A.W. Beers (USA) was appointed Rapporteur.
4. Welcome. The Chairman introduced Dr S. Studenetsky, Deputy Minister of Fisheries for the USSR, who addressed the Joint Sessions as follows:

"Mr Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, Distinguished Guests, Comrades:

"I am very much pleased to welcome you, representatives of Member Countries of the International Commissions on Fisheries in the North Atlantic, NEAFC and ICNAF, to the Soviet Union to participate at the present meeting.

"You are all well aware of the fact that the main objective of both Commissions is to secure conservation and management of fish stocks in the North Atlantic and adjacent waters to the interests of all peoples. Fishermen of our countries pay great attention to the progress of the Commissions and at the same time feel concern for the status of certain stocks of fish in the Convention Areas. And, for good reason, since the welfare of the people from maritime areas is dependent primarily upon achievements of fishermen and, in their turn, the latter are dependent upon the status of fish stocks.

"I am happy to note that the efforts and good will of Member Countries of ICNAF and NEAFC have led to adoption of a number of important decisions, especially on fixing quotas to catches of the main commercial species of fish, which will make a great contribution to conservation and increase in the fish stocks. The adoption of such decisions has supported the evidence in favour of international commissions for their high efficiency in solving fish management problems and conservation of living resources from the World Ocean. It is important, however, not only to make decisions, but also to realize unconditional and efficient observance of the decisions on the part of fishermen of all Contracting States.

"In this respect, the role and significance of national and international control for observance of accepted fishing regulations, have increased in recent years.

"The Soviet Union considers the international control as an important and efficient mechanism used for solving problems of stock restoration and achievement of the maximum sustained yield. Thus, great attention is paid to the schemes of national and international control enforcement.

"The accumulated experience of practical implementation of international control in the North Atlantic justifies the decision taken by the Commission in designing the Scheme of Joint International Enforcement.

"At the same time, the accumulated experience of international control indicates that we, Member Countries of ICNAF and NEAFC, are able to do much more to improve and unify the methods of control and to increase their efficiency.

"Methods of controlling the quota regulations, standardization of fishing logs, limitation of research fishing in the Convention Areas and elaboration of systems for issuing licences or registration of fishing vessels are not a comprehensive list of problems to be considered at the present meeting. They will be extremely important for further development of international control. Of utmost importance is the discussion of unification of methods and documentation used in the implementation of control in the Northwest and Northeast Atlantic.

"The conclusions of the meetings will be significant not only for the North Atlantic areas, but also for the Convention Area of the Southeast Atlantic where the International Control Scheme will be

in force on 1 July 1975.

"Allow me to wish all the participants success at the meeting and please enjoy yourselves in Leningrad.

"Thank you."

5. Agenda. The Chairman called for adoption of the provisional agenda. A proposal by the delegate of Portugal that a new item, "Comparison of the NEAFC and ICNAF Schemes of Joint Enforcement" be added was agreed. The agenda as revised was adopted (Appendix I).

6. Recess. Following a few administrative announcements, the meeting was recessed at 1045 hrs, Tuesday, 4 March 1975.

7. The second session of the Joint Meeting reconvened at 1000 hrs, Thursday, 6 March 1975. The Chairman requested progress reports from the Chairmen of STACTIC and the NEAFC Enforcement Committee. At the Chairman's suggestion it was agreed that a joint report be issued with the STACTIC and the NEAFC Enforcement Committee Reports appended.

8. Consideration of Information Pertaining to Problems in Practical Accomplishment of International Control. The delegate of USSR introduced a paper which contained examples of poorly executed inspections and stressed that the objective of the paper was to improve the reporting of information to Governments by inspection agencies which conduct inspections of Soviet vessels.

The delegate of USA requested that the Report of Inspection form be included in the ICNAF booklet on Translations of the Questionnaire in each of the various languages, and suggested that all entries in the Report of Inspection should be printed in capitalized block letters for better legibility. The delegate of Spain said that Spanish vessels have been boarded for inspections with no Report of Inspection being executed. The delegate of UK stated that inspectors should have the necessary training and expertise to carry out efficient inspections on board fishing vessels and to complete Inspection forms correctly. The delegate of Norway, on being informed that reports of Norwegian inspections of USSR vessels had not reached the USSR, could only provide the assurance that they were sent. The delegate of Canada repeated the regrets expressed at the ICNAF Fifth Special Commission Meeting, November 1974, in Miami, Florida, for any embarrassment to the USSR arising from a premature press release of alleged violations.

9. Report of the ICNAF STACTIC Working Group on Permits for Fisheries Research in the Convention Area (Appendix II). At the Chairman's suggestion it was agreed that the Report of the ICNAF STACTIC Working Group could be considered by the Joint Meeting before STACTIC approval. The delegate of Portugal noted that the applicability to ICNAF of the Report of the STACTIC Working Group on Permits for Fisheries Research was entirely different from that to NEAFC, as the two Conventions were different. The NEAFC Convention exempted fishery research vessels from adherence to that Commission's regulations, while no such authority was included in the ICNAF Convention. Following discussion in which it became apparent that the Convention differences prevented close agreement to the STACTIC procedures or to any joint action, and that the NEAFC Enforcement Committee had already drafted its own procedure, it was agreed that each Committee should proceed on its own to meet its needs.

10. The second session of the Joint Meeting recessed at 1300 hrs, Thursday, 6 March 1975.

11. The third session of the Joint Meeting reconvened at 1745 hrs, Thursday, 6 March 1975. The Chairman noted that the Report of the NEAFC Enforcement Committee (Appendix III) was available and requested a summary review by its Chairman, Capt J.C.E. Cardoso (Portugal). Following a review of the highlights, the Chairman of the Joint Meeting thanked Capt Cardoso and proposed that note be taken of the Report.

12. The delegate of USA thanked the Soviet delegation, on behalf of the other delegations, for the excellent evening at the Kirov Theatre ballet.

13. The Joint Meeting recessed at 1815 hrs, 6 March 1975.

14. The fourth session of the Joint Meeting reconvened at 0900 hrs, Friday, 7 March 1975.

15. The Chairman of the Joint Meeting, Mr A. Volkov (USSR), requested consideration of the Report of Meetings of the Joint ICNAF/NEAFC Working Group on Logbooks and Joint Enforcement (Appendix IV). Following a review of the sections of the Report on Logbooks (Section 2), on the Inspection Questionnaire (Section 3), and the Report of Inspection (Section 4) by the Chairman of the Joint Working Group, Mr J.S. Beckett (Canada), the Joint Meeting

agreed to recommend

- i) that the Report with recommendations (Appendix IV) be drawn to the attention of the ICNAF and NEAFC for consideration at their 1975 Annual Meetings;
- ii) that Member Countries of ICNAF and NEAFC take immediate steps to translate into their language the revised Inspection Questionnaire (Appendix IV, Attachment 3), and the revised form for Report of Inspection (Appendix IV, Attachment 4) and forward the translations to the Secretariats of ICNAF and NEAFC before their 1975 Annual Meetings;
- iii) that the revised Inspection Questionnaire and Report of Inspection be included in the different languages of the Commission Member Countries in the ICNAF International Inspection Scheme Translations handbook for wide distribution.

The Chairman of the Joint Working Group drew attention to the fact that there had been no time for the Group to consider the mesh-size item assigned to it by the NEAFC Enforcement Committee. In this regard, the delegate of Netherlands agreed to provide 6 copies each to the ICNAF and NEAFC Secretariats of two reports on measuring of meshes.

16. The delegate of Portugal, noting that the Agenda Item, "Comparison of the ICNAF and NEAFC Schemes of Joint International Enforcement", had not been dealt with by the Joint Meeting, offered to prepare a paper comparing the two Schemes for consideration by ICNAF and NEAFC at their 1975 Annual Meetings. The Joint Meeting accepted the offer of the delegate of Portugal with thanks.

17. The Chairman of STACTIC reviewed the Report of the Meetings of the ICNAF Standing Committee on International Control (Appendix II) and drew attention to the discussion and action taken relating to research vessel permits, an ICNAF observer program, safe boarding practices during inspections at sea, and registration of fishing vessels and fishery support vessels. The Joint Meeting noted the Report and agreed that it should be appended to the Report of the Joint Meeting.

18. The Joint Meeting adopted written reports of its proceedings on Tuesday, 4 March, and Thursday, 6 March, and instructed the Rapporteur, Mr A.W. Beers (USA), to prepare a report of the proceedings on Friday, 7 March, for distribution and approval.

19. The Chairman of the Joint Meeting thanked the participants and the Secretariats for their good efforts and commended the Chairmen for their leadership and success. The delegate of USA, on behalf of the US delegation and the Joint Meeting participants, thanked the USSR delegation and Government for the excellent meeting arrangements, facilities and entertainment, and noted particularly the warm and helpful response from the citizens of Leningrad. The delegate of Canada thanked Mr Volkov for his chairmanship of the Joint Meeting and the delegate of Portugal requested Mr Volkov to thank Dr Studenetsky, Deputy Minister of Fisheries, for taking time to come from Moscow to welcome the participants and entertain them at a reception.

20. There being no other business, the Joint Meeting was adjourned at 1200 hrs, Friday, 7 March 1975.

JOINT ICNAF/NEAFC MEETING ON JOINT INTERNATIONAL ENFORCEMENT

Leningrad, 4-7 March 1975

Agenda

1. Opening of the Meeting
2. Election of Chairman
3. Appointment of the Rapporteur
4. Address of Welcome
5. Adoption of the Agenda
6. Report of the STACTIC Meeting, ICNAF
7. Report of the NEAFC Meeting
8. Report of Joint ICNAF/NEAFC Working Group on Fishing Logbooks and Joint Enforcement
9. Comparison of NEAFC and ICNAF Schemes of Joint Enforcement
10. Consideration of problems pertaining to practical accomplishment of control (information and proposals of the Parties)
11. Procedure of research fishing in the Convention Areas
12. Unification of methods of measuring the mesh size in fishing gear used in the Convention Areas
13. Unification of the procedure of submitting inspection reports and annual reports on violations
14. Unification of fish log records
15. Other problems
16. Adoption of the solutions of the Meeting
17. Adjourning of the Meeting

JOINT ICNAF/NEAFC MEETING ON JOINT INTERNATIONAL ENFORCEMENTLeningrad, 4-7 March 1975

Report of Meetings
of
Standing Committee on International Control (STACTIC)
of
International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries

Monday, 3 March, 1500 hrs
 Tuesday, 4 March, 1130 hrs
 Tuesday, 4 March, 1500 hrs
 Wednesday, 5 March, 1020 hrs
 Wednesday, 5 March, 1725 hrs
 Thursday, 6 March, 1555 hrs

1. Opening. The meeting of STACTIC was opened by the Chairman, Mr W.G. Gordon (USA). Delegates of all Member Countries, except Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Norway, and Romania, were present (Annex A). The Chairman thanked the delegation of the Soviet Union in advance for its hospitality and the excellent facilities made available for the meeting.

2. Rapporteur. Mr T.R. McHugh (USA) was appointed Rapporteur.

3. Agenda. The agenda (Annex B) was adopted after separating Item 5 of the agenda to read:

- "5 (a) Review of all regulatory measures adopted by the Commission aimed at the conservation of stocks
 (b) Review of current Scheme of Joint International Enforcement and its observance."

Items 4, 6, and 7 were considered to be of interest to both ICNAF and NEAFC, and were scheduled to be discussed in joint sessions.

4. Under STACTIC Agenda Item 5(b), Review of Status of Implementation of the Scheme of Joint International Enforcement, the Chairman invited comments from the delegates of each Member Country present concerning their country's participation in the Scheme of Joint International Enforcement. The delegate of Bulgaria stated that inspections of Bulgarian vessels had been conducted in the vessels' ports, but that, in January 1975, inspectors had been designated and sent to the Convention Area. As vessels move from one area to another, and the regulatory measures change often, they are not always able to instruct the captains in due time; this will be accomplished by radio messages. To ensure that Bulgarian vessels have no infringements, the captains will be instructed about the regulations before they fish in the ICNAF Area and their compliance will be checked when they return to port.

The delegate of Canada reported that three inspection vessels were employed full time on ICNAF duties and that a total of 15 vessels including 12 recently-designated vessels were available to conduct ICNAF inspections. In 1974, Canadian inspectors conducted 251 international inspections under the Scheme. Canadian inspectors also conducted 40 inspections of Canadian vessels at sea, 300 dockside inspections, and 500 herring size-limit inspections. Inspection of Canadian vessels is not mandatory in Statistical Area 6.

The delegate of FRG reported that his country has participated in the Scheme of Joint International Enforcement since 1972 and the Scheme is expected to become mandatory in Statistical Area 6 for the FRG in April. Though most of their national control is carried out when landings are made, the FRG attaches great importance to control at sea, both national and international, and has assigned this task to their fishery protection vessels whose main occupation is assistance to the fishing fleet.

The delegate of GDR reported that they are fully ready to participate in the Joint Scheme of Enforcement and that the inspection officers and vessels have been named in a letter to the ICNAF Secretariat.

The delegate of Poland reported that Poland is using fishing vessels for inspections. During 1973 Polish inspectors conducted 15 inspections at sea and 9 in port, and during 1974 they conducted 24 inspections at sea and 20 in port. Also, 25 net inspections were made in 1973, and 73 in 1974. For 1975 two fishing vessels were designated to carry out inspections in the ICNAF Area, and new administrative orders were issued so that Polish fishing vessels would be aware of all the regulations including those developed at the Fifth Special Commission Meeting in November 1974.

The delegate of Portugal reported that the implementation of the Scheme for Portugal was as it was a year ago. Arrangements would be sought with Canada to have Portuguese inspectors conduct inspections in

cooperation with Canadian inspectors in those areas where Portuguese vessels are fishing. Although some administrative difficulties have occurred, it is hoped that mandatory application of the Scheme would be in effect for Portuguese vessels for Statistical Area 6 within a short period, as long as this area would be included in the Convention Area.

The delegate of USSR noted that his country had been a participant in the Scheme of Joint International Enforcement since 1970 and currently has six inspection vessels and 36 inspectors designated to carry out inspection duties. Over 3,000 inspections were conducted in 1974, 1,295 of these were carried out at sea. The number of violations has decreased since the inspections have increased. The Soviet Union supports the principle of reciprocity in terms of the mandatory application of the Scheme to vessels of other nationalities.

The delegate of Spain offered to send an inspector to participate in cooperative enforcement with the states that maintain inspection vessels. Currently, Spain inspects fishing vessels upon departure for and return from the fishing areas; inspection of Spanish vessels is mandatory in Statistical Area 6.

The delegate of UK reported that his country had sent inspectors to cooperate in cooperative inspections. The Commission's regulations have the force of law in the UK, but the complexity of the regulations makes them difficult to observe as well as enforce. Educating the fishing skippers is important in this regard.

The delegate of USA reported that his country had participated in the Joint Enforcement Scheme on a mandatory basis since 1971, and that the regulations have the force of law for US vessels. In 1974 USA inspected just less than 3,000 of its own vessels in port, and conducted over 300 international inspections at sea. USA also formally invited inspectors from any Member Country to participate in cooperative inspection patrols upon 30 days' notice.

The Chairman noted that Member Governments were to designate authorities who are available to receive notification of infringements. The Executive Secretary reported that Bulgaria, Canada, Italy, Norway, UK, and USA had notified the Commission of the names of such persons, and requested that other countries wishing to do so should be sure to include the individual's name, office, post office address, cable address, telex address and radio call sign (if any). The delegates of Spain, GDR, and USSR said they would provide the information immediately. The delegate of Portugal reported having made a special bilateral notification arrangement with Canada. For the purposes of notification within the Convention, the Portuguese authorities were in the process of appointing a new official. The delegate of FRG will notify the Commission of arrangements as soon as possible.

The delegate of Canada considered that his country and the USA carried too much of the load in enforcing the Commission's regulations and invited inspectors from all the other Member Countries to participate in cooperative enforcement patrols aboard Canadian vessels. As the Scheme is one that calls for international enforcement, its purpose is not to have the members inspect their own vessels but assist the other countries in ensuring that the vessels of all Member Countries are adhering to the regulations. The regulations are not effective if they are not enforced. Participation in the enforcement should be the highest priority of the participants.

The delegate of FRG responded by stating that the regulations were too complex and, in some cases, were difficult to translate, especially into legal language. It may be necessary to see how the regulations could be simplified, by eliminating those that overlap, and making uniform mesh size and exemption regulations throughout the Convention Area.

The Chairman, supported by the delegate of Portugal, proposed that the regulations be considered by a working group for the purpose of simplifying them. The delegate of UK offered to do a draft simplification to be used in considering the problem. One legal problem, raised by the delegate of FRG, concerned whether or not simplified regulations could have the same legal status as the regulations themselves. STACTIC decided that it was not necessary that the guide to the regulations have the same force in law as the regulations themselves but that the goal of the work should be to develop a simplified guide to the regulations for use by the fishermen.

5. The first session of STACTIC recessed at 1635 hrs, 3 March.

6. The second session of STACTIC reconvened at 1130 hrs, 4 March. The Chairman welcomed the delegation from Norway.

7. Under STACTIC Agenda Item 4, Standardization of Records in Fishing Logs, the Chairman noted that five sample logbook sheets had been submitted for consideration.

The delegate of Portugal introduced his country's logbook sheet by noting that it was adaptable to all the Convention Areas including ICNAF, NEAFC, and ICSEAF. Further, important features included entering the date of arrival and departure from the fishing grounds, the coding of the type of gear in use and the species

caught, and the inclusion of the registration number of the vessel on the logsheet. A column recording the disposition of the catch provided for five possible options, including salting, freezing, or making fish meal out of the catch, or discarding the catch, or using the catch for crew consumption.

The delegate of Norway advised that he was prepared to submit a sample logbook for consideration.

The delegate of UK proposed, and was supported by the delegate of Portugal, that a working group might be formed that would consider the differences in the logbooks that had been submitted, and that a draft of some suggested standard logbook entries be provided to the Joint ICNAF/NEAFC Meetings for consideration. Canada, FRG, Portugal, Spain, USSR, UK, and USA provided members for the working group.

8. Under STACTIC Agenda Item 6, Review of National Systems of Registration for Fishing in Certain ICNAF Areas, the delegate of USA reported that recent inspections had noted that, in some cases, the fishing effort applied to a quota caused that quota to be reached very quickly, long before the regulatory authorities from the Member Countries could be made aware of the fact that the quota had been met. The current reporting systems were not effective in meeting this problem. It may be necessary for each State to regulate the number of vessels it sends to an area to fish; a registration system will aid in the attempt to evaluate the effort that will be involved in a fishery. By notification of the vessels so registered to the Commission, those countries conducting international enforcement could obtain information about the status of vessels when they are inspected in the Convention Area.

The delegate of UK responded to this proposal with a number of comments on the principles involved. The US proposal was that registration should be the responsibility of the ICNAF Secretariat. Registration of fishing vessels must, however, be the obligation of the Flag State and not of ICNAF. Secondly, vessels have a right in international law to fish outside fishery limits, and cannot be required to give prior notice to ICNAF. Thirdly, the information an inspector needs to complete his report of inspection is limited by the Scheme of Joint International Enforcement. Fourthly, it is the responsibility of the Flag State to decide whether or not to prescribe the methods of fishing which a vessel may use.

The delegates of Portugal, USSR and Spain agreed that the licensing would be undertaken on a national basis, and any authorization to fish should not rest with an international organization such as ICNAF. The delegate of Norway suggested that the licensing might be undertaken on a national basis, as is the case today, but that Member Countries could supply information concerning the vessels intending to fish in the ICNAF Area to the Secretariat. The delegate of USA emphasized that the US proposal intended that the licence should be granted under a national system, and that the information concerning where the vessel intended to fish should be sent to the ICNAF Secretariat so that both the Flag State of the vessels concerned and the inspectors would know the exact status of each vessel fishing in the Convention Area. This proposal was not meant to suggest any other system than a national registration system, but stressed the necessity to communicate the information to ICNAF so that inspection officers would have it available at sea.

The delegate of Canada supported the US position by stating that a licence should be issued by each country to each of the vessels that would fish in the Convention Area, the information on the licence form would be uniform for all Member Countries to facilitate enforcement, the licence would indicate that the master of the fishing vessel was conversant with the ICNAF regulations, and that the information should be transmitted to the Secretariat.

The delegate of USSR noted, in a general comment on the issuance of licences, that the ICNAF Secretariat could not be given the responsibility for the validation of any registrations, and so the provisions in the proposed licence form concerning the date of validation suggested that the Secretariat and the signature of the official in the Secretariat making the validation should be removed from the proposal.

The delegate of UK suggested that (a) it was essential to ensure that inspectors under the Joint International Enforcement Scheme should have the authority to look at the licence issued by the Flag State; (b) coding of entries was desirable to avoid the language barrier; and (c) it may also be proper to provide a place for the issuing authority to signify the Subarea(s) where the vessel may fish, based on the master's degree of familiarity of the regulations for that Subarea(s). Some deletions from the proposal would include those previously mentioned by the USSR, and the apparently pre-emptive requirement for notifying the Secretariat prior to any changes in fishing activity.

The delegate of FRG expressed the idea that vessels fishing in certain areas, for example, near Greenland, where NEAFC and ICNAF are in close proximity to each other, may find it impossible under such a registration system to notify the Secretariat if they wished to move their fishery even a short distance from one Convention Area to the other. If this is a quota enforcement measure, it could not be implemented as such in FRG as it is impossible for the Government to divide quotas by vessels, only by companies. At the same time, the vessels would like to fish on all available quotas, based on the availability of fish and so would not wish to be constrained by a specified fishery on a licence. Marking the type of fishery authorized on the hull of the vessel may also conflict with shipping regulations. The delegate of FRG agreed with the other delegates who stated that the licence or registration should not, in any case, be endorsed by ICNAF.

The delegate of Bulgaria pointed out that fishing vessels move in and out of the ICNAF Area as quotas are available, and each country should determine for itself how the quotas are to be taken. Vessel marking should also be determined by the Flag State. Transport ships are not involved with the actual taking of the fish and so should not be included in the registration system. If quota management is an objective of the registration system, the Board in Bulgaria already determines how these quotas are to be allocated to Bulgarian fishing vessels.

The delegate of USA noted that vessels had fished in "Others" quotas without notifying the Secretariat as required either before or after fishing on such a quota, and it may be necessary in these cases for countries to authorize their vessels to fish on an area-by-area basis. The delegate of UK did not feel that registration would be a practicable solution to this problem as withdrawals and changes in registrations could not be notified to other States in time to permit monitoring of quotas by this means.

The delegate of Canada emphasized that the proposal could be for registration rather than licensing as some control over the fishing activities by the vessel's Flag State is necessary. Vessel registration would assist in providing this control.

The Chairman asked the US delegation to re-write the proposal to include the comments of the other delegations. This would be prepared for consideration at a later meeting of STACTIC.

9. The meeting of STACTIC recessed at 1300 hrs, 4 March.

10. The meeting of STACTIC reconvened at 1500 hrs, 4 March to consider STACTIC Agenda Item 5(a), Review of all Regulatory Measures Adopted by the Commission Aimed at the Conservation of Fish. The delegate of Canada opened this discussion by mentioning two problems that related to the Scheme of Joint International Enforcement and the procedures for inspections. He stated that, while conducting over 250 boardings during 1974, Canadian inspectors had noted the unsafe condition of many of the boarding ladders, and that, under the sea conditions found year-round in Subareas 2 and 3, the fishing vessels should provide a lifeline for the inspector to ensure his safety while ascending the boarding ladder. He also noted that boarding vessels fishing on the largest single quota in ICNAF was nearly impossible during the winter months when the ice prevented safe small-boat operations. One solution to this would be to provide for boarding vessels from helicopters so that the boardings could be done safely and without inconvenience to the fishing vessel.

The delegate of FRG pointed out that the Scheme of Joint International Enforcement called for the fishing vessel master to follow all the "ordinary practices of good seamanship", a concept that should include providing a safe boarding ladder and a safety line as necessary. The delegate of Portugal agreed and reminded STACTIC that during deliberations at the last Annual Meeting, he had pointed out that a vessel should stop to provide the best conditions for boarding. As soon as a vessel had completed the haulback of his net, it could stop, and the master could provide the means necessary to facilitate boarding. To be safe, the vessel must stop. The helicopter proposal is also a good idea, once the problem of how the inspector gets from the helicopter to the vessel to be inspected after the helicopter lands on the ice is solved.

The delegate of USA supported the view that safety was of utmost importance in boarding and supported the Canadian delegate in his proposal concerning ladders and safety lines. He stated that there was no need necessarily to change the language of the Enforcement Scheme as long as both the inspector and the master of the vessel to be inspected understood their responsibilities for safety during the inspection. His delegation could support the helicopter proposal for ice conditions, but felt it was not the appropriate time to consider it for general use in boarding on the open sea. Removal from and placement of persons aboard vessels at sea from helicopters is inherently unsafe.

The delegate of USSR supported the delegate of Portugal in the idea that the safest time for an inspector to board a fishing vessel was after the vessel had stopped, and that the idea of good seamanship included providing safe ladders and a safety line if necessary. As it is more difficult to fish than to inspect vessels, the delegate of USSR was opposed to the use of helicopters for inspections, as this would mean one more thing for the fishing vessel master to worry about while fishing in the ice. Further time would be needed to study the problem in any case.

Some discussion ensued as to whose responsibility it would be to ensure the safety of the inspection party. The delegate of Portugal felt it was the responsibility of the inspection party, but called on the delegations of USA and Canada to recommend a safe ladder for use in inspections. The delegate of USA

reiterated his position that safety was the joint responsibility of both parties involved; otherwise, the fishing vessel could circumvent being inspected by providing a ladder in bad repair each time an inspector indicated a desire to come aboard.

The delegate of Canada suggested the addition of the words "in good repair and if necessary, a safety line when conditions warrant" after "a boarding ladder" in paragraph 4(1) in the Revised Scheme of Joint International Enforcement. The safety of the inspectors is jeopardized as these provisions are not currently spelled out. With regard to helicopters, Canadian inspectors have conducted two inspections of Soviet vessels in ice conditions during which the boarding ladders iced up, and in one case, the fishing vessel drifted into heavy pack-ice, making it extremely difficult to remove the inspection party. The delegate of Canada agreed to prepare a recommendation to the Commission as long as it was agreed that this matter of safety should be brought to the attention of the Commission as strongly as possible.

The delegate of FRG was opposed to amending the language of the Enforcement Scheme unless it was absolutely necessary and supported the idea of a recommendation or notation in the meeting record stating the concern shared by all present at STACTIC over the matter of safety. The delegate of USSR agreed to study the proposed changes in the language of the Enforcement Scheme but reiterated that the words "good seamanship" included providing any safety equipment necessary to conduct a boarding.

11. The Chairman introduced STACTIC Agenda Item 8, Consideration of the Problems Pertaining to the Appointment of National Observers (Specialists on Fisheries) on Board Fishing Vessels, and asked the delegate of USA to introduce his proposal for an ICNAF international observer program.

The delegate of USA noted that inspections conducted since the Enforcement Scheme entered into force had revealed that there were discrepancies in the catch aboard vessels and what is reported in statistics, that discards and by-catch often were not recorded or did not agree with reported statistics, and that the quality of logbook entries varied so widely between various nationalities that some measure has to be taken to obtain accurate data. The proposal called for observers or fisheries specialists to accompany vessels fishing in the Convention Area for periods of up to 30 days to ensure the proper functioning of the Commission's complex regulatory function.

The Chairman pointed out that observers aboard vessels fishing in the ice would help alleviate the boarding problem. The delegate of FRG pointed out the educational aspects of fishery specialists accompanying trawlers and requested information concerning the success of other observer programs such as the one conducted by the International Whaling Commission. The Chairman noted that US observers accompany tuna vessels of other flags for periods of up to three months to make marine mammal observations and that US observers embark on Japanese factory vessels in the North Pacific Ocean for the duration of those vessels' trips to grounds off Alaska. No problems have been encountered in these programs.

The delegate of Portugal noted that fishing vessels may not have accommodations for observers for periods as long as 30 days.

The delegate of FRG thanked the Chairman for this information and pointed out that, though the fishermen may not like to have these observers aboard, they would have to accommodate them if it was necessary. But the problem was whether the accommodation for an observer would be possible for a long period on most of the vessels, since it was already difficult to accommodate scientists from the FRG on their vessels.

The delegate of USSR felt that the words "urge the Member Governments" included in the preamble to the proposal were not an accurate reflection of the proceedings at the Fifth Special Commission Meeting held in Miami, and remembered that the Panels 4 and 5 requested that the Commissioners urge their respective Governments to provide for the accommodation of observers. It would also be necessary that the observer be a fisheries specialist, and that any arrangements for observers would result from bilateral consultations between the Governments involved.

The delegate of Canada agreed in principle with the observer program, but stressed that the observer should have a scientific function rather than an enforcement function. The attitude of the fishermen toward an enforcement officer might cause the fishermen to alter the normal course of their fishing operations, and so defeat the purpose of the proposal. As this would involve scientific data gathering to an extent, STACRES should be given the opportunity to comment.

The delegate of UK supported the delegate of Canada in his distinction between scientific observers and enforcement observers. He added that arrangements for observers would have to be made on a bilateral basis and that observers could be placed on board only with the agreement of the owners. The delegate of Spain agreed.

The delegate of Bulgaria considered that the observers may tend to diminish the authority of other inspectors. Further, since Bulgarian vessels are at sea fishing for a long time, there may not be enough berths aboard a vessel to accommodate an observer. The delegate of GDR felt that the possibilities of accommodating the observers were limited and their legal status aboard the vessels must be considered, but supported the idea of observers, in principle. The delegate of Poland supported the observer program, but felt

that, as accommodations would be limited aboard the trawlers, that the observer would better be placed aboard the mother ships.

The delegate of USA reminded the delegates present that the burden of proper enforcement is on all Contracting Governments, yet this enforcement has been carried out only by a few. The Enforcement Scheme and statistical reports have not worked to provide effective management of the fish stocks. Observers will add a management tool to supplement current statistical data reporting. The enforcement aspects of observers will supplement the current boarding programs. There are limitations on the program placed by costs of training an observer, but no matter what the usual occupation of the individual, he should be an inspector authorized to carry out duties under the Scheme of Joint International Enforcement.

12. The meeting of STACTIC recessed at 1730 hrs, 4 March.

13. The meeting of STACTIC reconvened at 1020 hrs, Wednesday, 5 March, and the Chairman invited further comments concerning the proposed observer program.

The delegate of USA restated his position that observers would have both a supplementary management function for gathering statistics and a supplementary enforcement function under the Enforcement Scheme. In response to questions from the UK concerning whether the concept of observers ought to be reconsidered and from Norway concerning whether there should be a special organization for observers, the delegate of USA made the following comments. The number of observers would initially be limited by the cost of training a group to serve as observers; their ultimate numbers would rest on the initial success of the program. It would, in any case, be difficult to have observers of any sort without preventative enforcement, and the observer should be empowered to write a report about his observations. This report may necessarily contain reports of infringements. The ICNAF observer program in its early stages would not be as extensive as some currently in existence, such as the International Whaling Commission observer program.

The delegate of UK pointed out that it would be difficult for him to make a commitment to ICNAF binding UK vessels to support an observer program, and supported the view of the delegate of USSR who had stated that arrangements for such a program would best be made at the bilateral level. A resolution encouraging ICNAF Member Countries to make a commitment to make such bilateral arrangements would be appropriate. The delegate of Canada agreed with this proposal, and recommended that STACRES be requested to consider the matter at its meeting in April. The delegate of FRG felt that such a resolution should not necessarily be considered by STACRES as the observers would primarily serve an enforcement rather than a scientific function. Observers will advise the master concerning his observation of the Commission's regulations.

The Chairman called on the US delegation to prepare a resolution to the Commission from STACTIC recommending that the Member Governments make efforts to implement an observer program on a bilateral basis.

14. The Chairman reopened discussion of STACTIC Agenda Item 5(a) (see Section 10), 'to clarify the statement "provide a boarding ladder and....observe the practices of good seamanship" from the Joint Scheme of International Enforcement. STACTIC considered a proposed resolution prepared by the Canadian delegation. The delegate of FRG wondered whether it would be necessary for the resolution to go to the Commission or if STACTIC could simply recommend to the Member Governments that the masters of their vessels could be reminded of the requirements of good seamanship. The delegate of UK suggested that the recommendation be contained in a circular letter from the Executive Secretary to all the Contracting Governments. The delegates of Norway, USSR and GDR agreed. The delegate of Canada considered that a resolution would be much stronger than a letter and hoped that the safety of the inspectors would receive the strongest possible consideration.

At the Chairman's suggestion, STACTIC agreed that the matter of safety should be brought to the attention of the Contracting Governments immediately in the form of a circular letter from the Executive Secretary, and

agreed to recommend to the Commission

a Resolution Relating to Safe Boarding of Vessels at Sea by Inspectors under the ICNAF Scheme of Joint International Enforcement (Annex C).

The delegate of Portugal requested, in pursuing the matter of safety, that the USA or Canada propose a ladder that would meet the safety requirements for boarding, as ladders differ and two inspectors may not consider the same ladder safe.

The delegate of USA reminded the delegates that it was not appropriate to recommend to a vessel's master the type of equipment he should use for any specific purpose; and, as there are many types of ladders made of many different materials available for use, it would be difficult to specify which one may be the safest under any conditions. The delegate of FRG concurred and stated the safety requirements for equipment aboard

vessels are usually well regulated by the national authorities in each State. There is very little room for the inspector to tell the master of a vessel what type of equipment to use.

The delegate of USSR called the delegates' attention to the fact that in the case of the Soviet Union, the vessel flies the flag of the state, not of the Government. The Chairman noted that the appropriate changes could be made in the final draft.

15. The Chairman called the delegates' attention to the draft simplification of the Commission's mesh and by-catch regulations (Annex D) drawn up by the delegate of UK, and thanked him for his efforts. The delegate of USA wondered whether the regulations could be codified so that citations could be made by enforcement officers, reducing the present difficulties in describing an infraction. The delegate of UK suggested that the regulations be numbered consecutively, as today, they could only be referred to by date. The question of codification is different than the one of preparing a simplified guide for the fishermen.

The delegate of FRG considered that it would be valuable to have a code of regulations that would be binding on the Contracting Governments that specifically stated the duties of the vessels at sea spelled out in legal terms. The Chairman agreed and pointed out that it would be a difficult task requiring perhaps the efforts of a working group of experts in international law to produce a code that could be translated immediately into domestic law. It may be possible for the Executive Secretary to contract for such services on behalf of the Commission. The delegate of UK expressed the opinion that it may be extremely difficult to do this in a completely legally-binding sense. The working paper submitted was intended to be a simplified guide for the fishermen in a non-legal sense.

The delegate of FRG felt that it was important, prior to the development of any code, for a document similar to that titled "1975 ICNAF Fishery Regulations" (Comm.Doc. 75/6) to be distributed as soon as possible after each ICNAF meeting during which regulations are changed. The delegate of Canada agreed, stating that this document was the only common international source currently showing the exact status of all the regulations. The delegate of UK pointed out that Comm.Doc. 75/6 had been produced immediately after the January 1975 Special Commission Meeting in Bergen, including the changes in the regulations developed at that session, and felt that the Secretariat deserved the appreciation of all the delegates for doing a job that could not have been done faster.

The Chairman thanked the delegate of UK again for his draft simplification which would be given further consideration at the next STACTIC meeting.

16. The Chairman turned to consideration of STACTIC Agenda Item 7, Review of Problems Concerning the Issuance of Permission or Registration for Research Vessels Operating in the ICNAF Area, and called on the delegate of USSR to introduce his proposal.

The delegate of USSR reported that research fishing should be carried out in the Convention Area under special permits which are given to each vessel by a competent organization in the Flag State, providing that vessel operates on a program approved by a competent body and there is a competent specialist aboard. The permit would mean that any restrictions pertaining to the catches of fish in the Convention Area do not extend to the vessel involved.

When an international inspector visits a vessel in conformity with the recommendations of the Commission, he shall limit himself to checking the permit and the report of inspection compiled by the inspector shall contain the information contained on the permit. Each contracting party shall inform the Commission of the name of the competent organization in its country which shall issue the permits. The information on the permit shall contain the name of the owner of the vessel and his address, the type and name of vessel, the port of registration and the registration number, the name of the master of the vessel, the period of the validity of the permit, and the country and organization that issued the permit.

The delegate of FRG questioned whether the permit, allowing as it would unrestricted fishing in the Convention Area, also allowed fishing within the 9-mile coastal state exclusive fishing zones in the Convention Area. The delegate of USSR said it would not.

The delegate of Canada said that he could not accept the procedure as he was concerned about the degree of control exercised over research vessels. Canadian inspectors have encountered vessels which were operating in contravention to the Commission's regulations and which claimed to be research vessels, but may have been scout or searching vessels. In some cases, research vessels have been found to be filled to capacity with fish. In one case, a vessel had a permit to search for fish, but was authorized to conduct commercial fishing operations when some fish were found. He suggested that, before a vessel came into the Convention Area to conduct research, the name of the owner, his address, the type of vessel, the port of registry, and the organization, purpose and area of research should be notified to the Commission.

The delegate of USA agreed with the USSR about the importance of research but recommended some changes in the USSR proposal that would more adequately reflect the intent of registering research vessels. Two types of research could be specified, joint research conducted under the auspices of ICNAF or unilateral research directed by a competent authority of the Flag State of the research vessel. The data from both

types of research would have to be made available to the Secretariat for use by the Commission, and the primary mission of the vessel would have to be true research, not scouting. Having satisfied such limitations, a research vessel could have the restrictions removed from its operations for the duration of the research. It may also be necessary for a vessel to file a research plan, or have it available for any inspector. This plan would include the areas of research, including the track lines or station pattern, and the species of interest to the research. This research plan could be submitted to the Commission for interested Governments.

The delegate of Bulgaria felt that it was always necessary that the true intent of the research must not cause doubt about the vessel's true activities. The countries' needs for fish cannot be satisfied by research vessels, nor will the research vessels make a significant impact on the stocks of fish. STACRES makes conclusions about the stocks of fish based on the scientific observations - if the research vessels are regulated, they would not be able to provide the proper assessments.

The delegate of USSR pointed out that the function of the scouting vessels was to locate the concentrations of fish so that the trawlers can obtain the maximum catches. Scout vessels use gear regulated by the Commission and observe other fishing restrictions so that they can provide recommendations to the other trawlers within the limitations of the fishing conditions. Scout vessels have to use the correct fishing gear and follow the restrictions, or their recommendations would not be of use to the other trawlers. True research vessels, on the other hand, have no immediate results as their function is to predict stocks for the long-term period. Their research is organized over one year ahead of the scheduled expedition. It may be possible for a working group to consider the problem.

The delegate of USSR agreed to provide a chairman for a working group on the problem of research vessels. Other participants were to be Bulgaria, Canada, GDR, Poland, and USA. The delegate of Portugal expressed disappointment that he had another working group meeting scheduled for the same time and so would be unable to attend.

The delegate of USSR, in response to a question from the delegate from Portugal, said that 9-11 USSR vessels are employed in research in the Convention Area annually. These vessels fish during all seasons, even after the quotas are filled. This is necessary to get accurate assessments of fish stocks. The delegate of Norway noted that the distinction must be made between research and scouting vessels. The delegate of Portugal observed that scouting vessels seemed to conduct exploratory work for the rest of the Soviet fleet. The Chairman recommended that five questions be answered to determine the status of a research vessel:

1. Does the vessel have scientists aboard?
2. Does the vessel process, preserve or store fish?
3. Does the vessel use commercial scale fishing gear?
4. Does the fish caught count toward a quota?
5. Should exploratory or scout vessels be allowed to closed areas?

The delegate of USSR stated that exploratory or scout vessels have no privileges compared to commercial fishing vessels in the Convention Area, although a scientist may be present to sample the catch.

17. The meeting of STACTIC recessed at 1300 hrs, 5 March, to allow the STACTIC Working Group on Permits for Fisheries Research to commence at 1430 hrs.

18. The meeting of STACTIC reconvened at 1725 hrs, 5 March. Under STACTIC Agenda Item 6, the Chairman called for consideration of a re-draft of the US proposal concerning the registration of fishing vessels and fishery support vessels in the Convention Area (for previous discussion, see Section 8).

The delegate of FRG questioned whether the term "fishery support vessels" should include cargo, protection or other vessels that may operate with a fishing fleet in the Convention Area. The delegate of USA replied that as commonly used in the United States, it did. The delegate of FRG pointed out that exemptions in paragraph 4(1) of the Scheme of Joint International Enforcement referred to vessels engaged in the treatment of sea fish, limiting the application of that Scheme to processing vessels and fishing vessels. The delegate of USA agreed that the term "support vessels" in the US proposal should have the same meaning as it has in the Enforcement Scheme. The delegate of USSR advised the delegates that it would be difficult to foresee when other types of support vessels would be present in the Convention Area. The Chairman inquired whether inspection vessels should be included in this registration proposal to facilitate cooperative international enforcement. The delegate of Portugal pointed out that the names of the inspection vessels already had to be notified to the Commission, and considered that registration would best be applied to those vessels subject to the Enforcement Scheme. He inquired about the meaning of the term "Master of record of

the vessel". The delegate of USA replied that the master of record is the master signed aboard the vessel for the voyage, as it may be possible, due to a variety of circumstances, that he would not be aboard the vessel when an inspection is conducted.

19. The delegate of USA, on behalf of his delegation, expressed appreciation to the host Government for the excellent hospitality and meeting facilities. STACTIC then recessed at 1800 hrs, 5 March.

20. STACTIC reconvened at 1555 hrs, 6 March. The Chairman requested further consideration of STACTIC Agenda Item 7, Registration of Research Vessels Operating in the Convention Area (for previous discussion, see Section 16).

The Chairman of the Working Group introduced the report with the remarks that the observations made by the delegates at previous sessions of STACTIC (see Section 16) had been taken into consideration by the Working Group and appropriate changes had been made. The delegate of USA asked that, when the working paper was placed in the proper form of a recommendation, the record show that the USA considers the recommendation to be a statement of principle, and that the USA would submit a proposal that would contain specific recommendations for the implementation of the registration. The Chairman pointed out that there were two working papers tabled for consideration and that neither was in the proper format for submission as a recommendation. The delegate of Canada suggested that the report of the Working Group might be submitted as a recommendation to the Commission, and that the US proposal be considered by STACTIC at the next Annual Meeting of the Commission. The Chairman of the Working Group felt that the report of the Working Group could be considered by STACTIC and any recommendations to the Commission should arise from STACTIC. He pointed out that the US proposal was not a recommendation from the Working Group. The delegate of USA suggested that the report of the Working Group might be considered by STACTIC as a proposal to the Commission, and that the US proposal could be considered further by STACTIC at the next Annual Meeting. The delegate of Canada suggested that the Executive Secretary of the Commission could re-write the report of the Working Group to make it conform to the form necessary to be submitted as a recommendation to the Commission from STACTIC. STACTIC agreed that the report of the Working Group on Permits for Fisheries Research be accepted and cast by the Executive Secretary in the form of a recommendation to the Commission (Annex E), and that a US proposal detailing implementation of the research vessel registration scheme would be available for consideration at the next meeting of STACTIC.

21. Under STACTIC Agenda Item 6, the Chairman opened discussion of the US proposal for the registration of fishery and fishery support vessels in the Convention Area (Annex F). The delegate of USA pointed out that the re-draft had taken into consideration the remarks of the delegates at earlier meetings (see Sections 8 and 18).

The delegate of FRG requested that the wording "fishery support vessel" be changed to reflect the language in the Scheme of Joint International Enforcement so to read in all places "vessels engaged in fishing for sea fish or in the treatment of sea fish". STACTIC agreed to the changes.

The delegate of Portugal stated that, since the registration was already done in each country, and it was the responsibility of the Contracting Governments to ensure that their fishermen are aware of the regulations in force for the Convention Area, there was no further need for the certification of accomplishing these tasks. Further, he believed that it would be extremely difficult to specify the target species of a vessel as its fisheries may change.

The delegate of USA responded that it was the obligation of the Governments and the masters of their vessels to know and understand the regulations. Procedures should be established so that the fishermen can positively know and understand the regulations. US inspectors have discovered that fishermen found in violation of the Commission's regulations have often claimed or displayed ignorance of the regulations. If certification by the master that he had received the regulations was contained on a paper available to the inspector, the master would be more likely to adhere to them. This knowledge will be aided by the simplified guide prepared earlier by the delegate of UK (see Annex D). Also, in terms of the enforcement of quotas, the delegate of USA reported that there is strong evidence that some countries have no idea where their vessels are fishing, and some sort of notification to the Commission of the information on the licences may serve to provide this knowledge. Vessels may fish for one species or another, then change either the area fished or the species sought. These changes will be easier to follow if the registration is available to provide the necessary information.

The delegate of Portugal considered that this was really a licensing system and added to the workload at the ICNAF Secretariat. The requirement that changes to the registration should be filed within ten days of the change was not practicable. Ultimately, such a system would lead to vessels applying for and receiving a licence without ever fishing in the ICNAF Area, reducing the value of the system for enforcement purposes.

The delegate of UK supported the position of the delegate of Portugal and felt that the objectives of

the US proposal were (1) to assist in monitoring and controlling quotas, and (2) improve familiarity with the regulations. The first could not be attained by vessel registration, but the second could. In the first case, the vessel owners will circumvent the intention by applying for licences for all fisheries in all areas. To work, registration would have to be linked to areas, something that is not currently possible for some countries. In the second case, registration could improve the master's familiarity with the regulations if he were not given permission to fish without demonstrating such familiarity. The change in the provision of the proposal referring to the certification of the master's familiarity with the regulations to "provided with a copy of the regulations" may not serve the intention of the proposal. A statement by the master that he understands the regulations signed by the master would be far stronger. The delegate of Spain concurred with the delegates of Portugal and UK.

The delegate of USA pointed out that some countries do not license or register their vessels at all, some do not have any idea where their vessels are fishing, and some do not know that quotas they have agreed to have been filled, often many times over, until after the vessels return to port. He felt that it is impossible to establish any control over fishing vessels without some kind of registration; checking catches when they are landed is not sufficient. There must be a meaningful system for registration, and therefore, this proposal must be taken up at the Annual Meeting when STACTIC meets again.

The delegate of GDR gave his support to the delegates of Portugal and UK, providing the purpose of the registration is enforcement. All Contracting Governments have an obligation to ensure that their vessels observe the Commission's regulations. It may be necessary that each Government provide a description of its education measures to the Commission. A certificate that the master of a vessel is aware of the regulations should be kept aboard the vessel and provided to any inspector who wishes to see it.

The delegate of Canada shared the concern of the USA and indicated that many fishing captains are not aware of the Commission's regulations. Vessels fishing in closed areas as recently as one week ago had not received a communication from their Government since September 1974. Countries must maintain better control over their fleets. A system such as that proposed by the USA should be considered by all delegations during the period prior to the next Annual Meeting, as the delay in the report of catches renders the quotas ineffective in some cases, and a registration system is one way of addressing the problem.

The delegate of Norway reported that a domestic order of 24 November 1972 required that a registration be carried aboard all vessels fishing in the ICNAF Area and shall be available to present to inspectors. Norway would like to support the US proposal, in principle, but agreed with the UK concerning its effectiveness as an enforcement tool.

Finally, STACTIC agreed that the US proposal for a scheme of registration for vessels engaged in the fisheries or fishery support operations in the Convention Area (Annex F) should be given further consideration by STACTIC at the 1975 Annual Meeting.

22. Under STACTIC Agenda Item 8, National Observers on Board Fishing Vessels, the Chairman opened discussion of the draft resolution by STACTIC relating to enforcement of the Commission's fishery regulations (implementation of an international observer program).

The delegate of USA reported that the resolution had taken into consideration the earlier discussions concerning observers and noted that the resolution refers the subject of observers to the next Annual Meeting of the Commission. The delegate of UK felt it may be possible to commence making bilateral arrangements immediately to implement observer schemes before the next Annual Meeting. The delegate of USA pointed out that the resolutions on observers from the Fifth and Sixth Special Commission Meetings had made such recommendations, and, as these recommendations were referred to in the resolution under discussion, such bilateral negotiations could begin immediately. The delegate of Portugal suggested that, since the resolution would be directed at STACRES, at the suggestion of Canada, that some reference should be made to scientific measures in the resolution. Finally, STACTIC

agreed to adopt

a Resolution Relating to the Enforcement of the Commission's Fishery Regulations (Implementation of an International Observer Program (Annex G)).

23. STACTIC, having no other business before it, adjourned at 1745 hrs, 6 March 1975, after the Chairman, Mr W.G. Gordon (USA), had thanked the participants for their contributions to the success of the meeting.

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

SPECIAL MEETING
OF
STANDING COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL CONTROL (STACTIC)

Leningrad, USSR, 3-6 March 1975

List of Participants

Chairman: Mr W.G. Gordon, National Marine Fisheries Service, 14 Elm Street, Gloucester, Massachusetts, USA 01930

BULGARIA

Mr P. Kolarov, Research Institute of Fisheries and Oceanography, Blvd. Chervenoarmeisky 4, Varna
Mr N.T. Nedylkov, SEB "Ribno Stopanstvo", 3 Industrialna Str., Bourgas

CANADA

Mr S.W. Bartlett, Conservation and Protection (Nfld.) Branch, Fisheries and Marine Service, Environment Canada, P.O. Box 5667, St. John's, Nfld.
Mr J.S. Beckett, International Fisheries Policy, International Fisheries and Marine Directorate, Fisheries and Marine Service, Environment Canada, 580 Booth Street, Ottawa, Ont.
Mr D.R. Bollivar, International Activities Branch, Fisheries and Marine Service, Environment Canada, P.O. Box 550, Halifax, N.S. B3J 2S7
Mr L.J. Cowley, Fisheries Management (Nfld.), Fisheries and Marine Service, Environment Canada, P.O. Box 5667, St. John's, Nfld.
Mr J.E. Creeper, Fisheries Management (Maritimes), Fisheries and Marine Service, Environment Canada, P.O. Box 550, Halifax, N.S. B3J 2S7
Mr E.R. Elliott, Fisheries and Marine Service, Environment Canada, P.O. Box 550, Halifax, N.S. B3J 2S7
Mr M.B. Phillips, Legal Operations Division (FLO), Dept. of External Affairs, Ottawa, Ont.

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Dr D. Booss, Bundesministerium für Ernährung, Landwirtschaft und Forsten, D53 Bonn

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Miss B. Fleischer, VVB Hochseefischerei, 251 Rostock-Marienehe
Mr G. Haasler, VVB Hochseefischerei, 251 Rostock-Marienehe
Mr F. Hartung, VEB Fischkombinat Rostock, 251 Rostock-Marienehe
Mr B. Schreiber, Institut für Hochseefischerei und Fischverarbeitung, 251 Rostock-Marienehe

NORWAY

Mr A. Aasbø, Directorate of Fisheries, P.O. Box 185-186, 5001 Bergen
Mr K. Gidske, Fisheries Protection, Defence Headquarters, Oslo-Mil., Oslo
Mr E. Kvanmen, Ministry of Fisheries, Oslo
Mr M. Stene, Naval Fishery Protection Service, Harstad

POLAND

Mr W. Czajka, Sea Fisheries Institute, Skr. Pocz. 184, 81-345 Gdynia
Mr J.P. Jaremczuk, Ministry of Foreign Trade and Shipping, Dept. of Maritime Administration and Fishery Policy, Wiejska 10 Street, Warsaw
Mr W.J.P. Kalinowski, Fisheries Central Board, Odrowaza Street No. 1, Szczecin
Mr S. Rymaszewski, Sea Fisheries Institute, Skr. Pocz. 184, 81-345 Gdynia
Mr B. Zemla, Gdynia Maritime Board, Chrzanowskiego 10 Street, Gdynia

PORTUGAL

Capt J.C.E. Cardoso, Rua 9 de Abril 40, S. Pedro do Estoril
Capt A.S. Gaspar, Praca Duque da Terceira, 24/31E, Lisbon

SPAIN

Mr V. Bermejo, Direccion General de Pesca, Ruiz de Alarcon 1, Madrid 14
Mr G. Alvarez-Castellanos, Federacion Armadores, Madrid
Mr A. Martin-Mateo, Direccion General de Pesca, Ruiz de Alarcon 1, Madrid 14
Mr A. Serrats, Spanish Deep Sea Trawler Association, Pena Florida 10, San Sebastian

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Mr O.V. Bakurin, Ministry of Fisheries, 12 Rozhdestvensky Blvd., Moscow K-45
Mr L. Bankovsky, Regional Chief's Office, GLAVRYBVOD, Leningrad
Mr V.S. Belov, Deputy Chief's Office, GLAVRYBVOD, Moscow
Mr M. Kazarnovsky, All-Union Research Institute of Marine Fisheries and Oceanography (VNIRO), V. Krasnoselskaya 17, Moscow
Mr V. Kostsov, Regional Chief's Office, GLAVRYBVOD, Moscow
Mr V. Lipker, GLAVRYBVOD of Ministry of Fisheries, V. Krasnoselskaya 17, Moscow B-140
Mr E. Lomakin, Regional Chief's Office, GLAVRYBVOD, Moscow
Mr N. Matveev, Crimea Department of Fish Conservation, Kerch
Mr K.M. Medzhidov, GLAVRYBVOD, V. Krasnoselskaya 17, Moscow B-140
Mr A. Ruzov, Ministry of Fisheries, Moscow
Ms Irina Tsenker, All-Union Research Institute of Marine Fisheries and Oceanography (VNIRO), V. Krasnoselskaya 17, Moscow
Mr V. Vainer, SEVZAPRYBVOD, 63 Nevsky Prospect, Leningrad
Mr A. Volkov, Ministry of Fisheries, 12 Rozhdestvensky Blvd., Moscow K-45

UNITED KINGDOM

Mr P.J. Derham, Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, Great Westminster House, Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AE, England
Mr E. Gillett, Dept. of Agriculture and Fisheries, St. Andrews House, Edinburgh 1, Scotland
Mr P.G. Jeffery, Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, Great Westminster House, Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AE, England

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr A.W. Beers, National Marine Fisheries Service, State Fish Pier, Gloucester, Massachusetts 01930
Mr T.R. McHugh, Commandant (G-000-4), US Coast Guard, Washington, D.C. 20590
Mr L.N. Schowengerdt, Office of Oceans and Fisheries Affairs, (OES/OFA), US Dept. of State, Washington, D.C. 20520

SECRETARIAT

Mr L.R. Day, Executive Secretary, ICNAF
Mr W.H. Champion, Administrative Assistant, ICNAF
Mrs Vivian C. Kerr, Senior Secretary, ICNAF

SECRETARIAT ASSISTANCE

Mr A.F. Dashkevitch, GIPRORIBFLOT, 18-20 Gogolja Street, Leningrad
Mr G.S. Dmitriev, GIPRORIBFLOT, 18-20 Gogolja Street, Leningrad
Mrs L.A. Vorontsova, GIPRORIBFLOT, 18-20 Gogolja Street, Leningrad
Mrs M.L. Dreizina, All-Union Research Institute of Marine Fisheries and Oceanography (VNIRO), V. Krasnoselskaya 17, Moscow
Mrs N.I. Kuvshinnikova, All-Union Research Institute of Marine Fisheries and Oceanography (VNIRO), V. Krasnoselskaya 17, Moscow
Mrs G.V. Jakovitskaya, All-Union Research Institute of Marine Fisheries and Oceanography (VNIRO), V. Krasnoselskaya 17, Moscow
Mr Y.A. Maevsky, TSNIITEIRKH, Moscow
Mrs A.P. Tereschenkova, TSNIITEIRKH, Moscow
Mrs E.E. L'vova, GIPRORIBFLOT, 18-20 Gogolja Street, Leningrad
Mrs T.I. Antipenkova, GIPRORIBFLOT, 18-20 Gogolja Street, Leningrad

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

SPECIAL MEETING
OF
STANDING COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL CONTROL (STACTIC)

Leningrad, USSR, 3-6 March 1975

Agenda

1. Opening of the Meeting
2. Appointment of the Rapporteur
3. Adoption of the Agenda
4. Standardization of records in fishing logs
5. (a) Review of all regulation measures adopted by the Commission aimed at conservation of stocks
(b) Review of current Scheme of Joint Enforcement and its observance
6. Review of national systems of issuing licences for fishing or registration in certain ICNAF areas
7. Review of problems pertaining to the issue of permission or registration for research vessels operating in the ICNAF Area
8. Consideration of problems pertaining to the appointment of national observers (specialist on fisheries) on board fishing vessels
9. Elaboration of proposals to be submitted for discussion at the Annual Meeting of the Commission, June 1975
10. Other problems
11. Adoption of the Chairman's Report
12. Appointment of Chairman
13. Adjourning of the Meeting

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

SPECIAL MEETING
OF
STANDING COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL CONTROL (STACTIC)

Leningrad, USSR, 3-6 March 1975

- (1) Resolution Relating to Safe Boarding of Vessels at Sea by Inspectors under the ICNAF Scheme of Joint International Enforcement

STACTIC recommends the following resolution for adoption by the Commission:

The Commission

Having Considered the Scheme of Joint Enforcement, and in particular, paragraph 4 dealing with the boarding of vessels by ICNAF inspectors;

Recognizing that the ordinary practices of good seamanship include *inter alia* placing a duty upon the master of a vessel to provide a safe boarding ladder and any other equipment, such as safety lines, necessary to ensure the safety of a boarding inspector;

Requests that Governments

1. Draw the substance of this resolution to the attention of the masters of vessels flying the flag of their State and fishing in the Convention Area; and
2. Take any other appropriate action to ensure these safety precautions are observed.

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

SPECIAL MEETING
OF
STANDING COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL CONTROL (STAGIC)

Leningrad, USSR, 3-6 March 1975

DRAFT

Fishing Vessels' Guide to ICNAF Regulations (except quotas)

MESH AND BY-CATCH REGULATIONS

Minimum mesh of trawl or seine nets	Species	Maximum by-catch in other fisheries using smaller mesh nets
(Notes 1 & 2)	Subarea 1 Cod Haddock Redfish Halibut Witch American plaice Greenland halibut	Not specified
Trawl net of hemp, polyamide or polyester..... 120 mm	Subarea 2 Cod Haddock Redfish Halibut Witch American plaice Greenland halibut	
Trawl net of other material..... 130 mm		
Seine net..... 110 mm		
	Subarea 3 Cod Haddock Redfish Halibut Witch Yellowtail flounder American plaice Greenland halibut Pollock (saithe) White hake	Amounts specified in Note 3 Amounts specified in Note 3 For these species combined, amounts specified in Note 3
<u>Trawl net except codend:</u>	Subarea 4 Cod Haddock (4VW) Haddock (4X) Haddock (elsewhere) Flounders - witch - yellowtail - winter flounder - American plaice	Amounts specified in Note 3 See Note 4 See Note 5 Amounts specified in Note 3 For these species together, amounts specified in Note 3
(a) Cotton, hemp, polyamide, polyester..... 105 mm		
(b) Other material..... 114 mm		
<u>Codend of trawl net:</u>	Subarea 5 Cod Haddock Yellowtail	Amounts specified in Note 3 See Note 6 Amounts specified in Note 3
(a) Cotton, hemp, polyamide, polyester..... 120 mm		
(b) Other material..... 130 mm		
Seine net..... 110 mm		

- NOTES:** (1) Net measured wet, with taper gauge under force of 5 kg, average of 20 meshes.
- (2) No obstruction of mesh permitted except:
- authorized topside chafers - see ICNAF Notification Series Nos. 1, 4 and 8;
 - material to prevent damage attached to underside only of codend.
- (3) Maximum by-catch of these species or groups permitted on board
- vessels more than 10 days since off-loading - 10% by weight;
 - vessels on 3rd to 9th day since off-loading - 20% by weight, or 5,000 kg, whichever greater;
 - vessels off-loading less than 10 days since previously off-loading - 15% by weight, or 2,500 kg, whichever greater.
- (4) No directed fishery; by-catch not to exceed 2,268 kg, or 10% of catch, whichever greater.
- (5) For Canadian and US vessels, amounts specified in Note 3 above; for other vessels, an amount not exceeding 2,268 kg, or 10% by weight, whichever greater.
- (6) No directed fishery; for Canadian, Spanish, and US vessels, by-catch not to exceed amounts specified in Note 3 above; for other vessels, by-catch not to exceed 2,500 kg, or 10% by weight, whichever greater.

RESTRICTED AREAS

Name of Area	Nature of Restriction	Period
Salmon closed area	No fishing for salmon in Convention Area outside national fishing limits; not applicable to Danish, Norwegian, and FRG vessels, but restrictions in Proposal (1) of June 1972 apply to all Governments	All year
US coast (Map No. 1)	No fishing (except for crustacea) by vessels over 39.6 m, using bottom fishing gear (see Note 1)	All year
Browns Bank (Map No. 2)	No fishing with bottom fishing gear (see Note 1)	February, March, and April
Haddock closed area (a) (Map No. 3) (b) (Map No. 4)	No fishing with bottom fishing gear (see Note 1), except hooks with gape not less than 3 cm. No fishing with bottom fishing gear (see Note 1).	March, April, and May March, April, and May
Capelin closed area (Map No. 5)	No fishing for capelin	All year

NOTE: (1) Bottom fishing gear means gear other than pelagic gear; no device for demersal fishing permitted.

SIZE LIMITS

Species	Area	Minimum size
Sea scallops	5Z	Shell 95 mm, and meats with average weight of less than 11.3 gm.
Herring	4W south of 44°52' 4X south of 43°50'	22.7 cm (see Note 1)

NOTE: (1) Smaller herring may be taken if not exceeding 10% by weight, or 25% by count, of all herring on board per trip (i.e., not more than 90 days on grounds).

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

SPECIAL MEETING
OF
STANDING COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL CONTROL (STACTIC)

Leningrad, USSR, 3-6 March 1975

(1) Recommendation Relating to the Adoption of Permits for Fisheries Research in the Convention Area

STACTIC

recommends

that the Commission, at its 1975 Annual Meeting, formulate proposals, for joint action by the Contracting Governments, for the adoption of permits for fisheries research in the Convention Area, using the following guiding principles:

- i) that the fisheries research activity in the Convention Area shall be implemented under special permits which are to be given for each cruise of the vessel according to the form at Attachment 1;
- ii) that the permit shall be issued by a competent organization of the Flag State on condition the vessel operates in accordance with the program approved by a competent research body and the permit shall be carried on board the vessel;
- iii) that the ICNAF Secretariat shall be notified of the research cruise prior to its commencement and shall be provided with all relevant information contained on the permit for distribution to all Member Countries;
- iv) that, when the conditions specified above are met and the permit has been issued, then any restrictions pertaining to the taking of fish (mesh size, size limit, closed seasons and areas, quotas, etc.) fixed in the Convention Area shall not extend to the vessel conducting the research;
- v) that no vessel, however, shall be granted exemption from ICNAF regulations on the basis of a research program if such vessel is conducting scouting or commercial operations;
- vi) that, when an authorized ICNAF inspector visits a permanent research vessel, he shall limit his inquiries to verification of its permit but, in the case of vessels normally engaged in scouting or commercial fishing activity, he may conduct such inspection of the research permit, and the vessel, as provided by the Scheme of Joint Enforcement as may be necessary to ascertain that the vessel is not conducting a commercial fishing operation.

RESTRICTED

Appendix II
ANNEX E
Attachment 1

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

SPECIAL MEETING
OF
STANDING COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL CONTROL (STACTIC)

Leningrad, USSR, 3-6 March 1975

Permit for Fisheries Research in the ICNAF Convention Area

Permit No. _____

1. Name of vessel owner and his address
2. Type and name of the vessel
3. Port of registration and registration number
4. Name of master of the vessel
5. Name of chief fishing specialist on board
6. Period of validity of the permit
7. Country and organization issuing the permit
8. Research organization approving research program
9. Purpose and area of the research and plan of program

Date of issuing the permit

Signature of issuing officer

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

SPECIAL MEETING

OF

STANDING COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL CONTROL (STACTIC)

Leningrad, USSR, 3-6 March 1975

US proposal for a scheme of registration for vessels engaged in the fisheries or fishing support operations in the Convention Area or Statistical Area 6

STACTIC recommends that the Commission transmit to the Depository Government the following proposal, for joint action by the Contracting Governments:

That pursuant to paragraph 5 of Article VIII of the Convention as amended by the 1963 Protocol, the following arrangements for registration of fishing and fishery support vessels for the purpose of more effectively managing the fisheries of the Northwest Atlantic Ocean be made:

- "1. All vessels conducting fishing or fishery support operations in the Convention Area and Statistical Area 6 shall be registered on a form approved by the Commission. A copy of this registration shall be filed with the ICNAF Secretariat prior to 1 January of each year, when possible, or no later than 30 days after departure of the vessel from its home port, or by message as soon as possible if the vessel changes the terms of its registration.
- "2. Such registration shall include:
 - (a) Name of vessel, both native and Latin alphabet spelling,
 - (b) Official number of Flag State registry,
 - (c) Home port and nationality of vessel,
 - (d) Owner of vessel,
 - (e) Master of vessel,
 - (f) Certification that master has been provided with the regulations in force for area where fishery will be conducted,
 - (g) Principal target species of the vessel while engaged in fishing in the Convention Area or Statistical Area 6, or purpose of the fishery support vessel while in the Convention Area or Statistical Area 6,
 - (h) Date of registration.
- "3. A copy of the registration shall be maintained aboard the vessel and shall be made available to any authorized inspector conducting an inspection under the provisions of the Scheme of Joint International Enforcement.
- "4. If the activities or purposes of any properly registered vessel as stated on the registration form are changed, endorsements with the changes noted shall be submitted to the ICNAF Secretariat within ten days of the date of the change, and message endorsements may be appended to the registration form aboard the vessel to reflect the Flag State's acknowledgement of such changes.
- "5. The ICNAF Secretariat will provide to Member Countries requesting such information, monthly listings of all vessels registered to fish in the Convention Area or Statistical Area 6, including the activities the vessel is authorized to conduct."

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

SPECIAL MEETING
OF
STANDING COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL CONTROL (STACTIC)

Leningrad, USSR, 3-6 March 1975

- (2) Resolution Relating to the Enforcement of the Commission's Fishery Regulations (Implementation of an International Observer Program)

STACTIC

Having Examined the Resolution Relating to the Enforcement of the Commission's Fishery Regulations adopted by Panels 4 and 5 in November 1974 (Fifth Special Commission Meeting Proceedings, page 37), and the Resolution Relating to the Enforcement of the Commission's Fishery Regulations in Subareas 2 and 3 adopted by Panels 2 and 3, in joint session with Panel 4, in January 1975 (Sixth Special Commission Meeting Proceedings, page 13);

Recognizing that the problems described in those resolutions are generally applicable to management in the whole of the Convention Area;

Having Reviewed the US proposal for an observer program presented to STACTIC (see Attachment 1);

Refer the proposal to STACRES for consideration at its next meeting prior to the 1975 Annual Meeting of the Commission;

Request the Commissioners and Member Governments to consider implementation of the proposal at the 1975 Annual Meeting of the Commission.

RESTRICTED

Appendix II
ANNEX G
Attachment 1

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

SPECIAL MEETING
OF

STANDING COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL CONTROL (STACTIC)

Leningrad, USSR, 3-6 March 1975

US proposal for an ICNAF international observer program

At the Commission's Fifth Special Meeting held 11-15 November 1974, the United States noted that evidence of widespread violations of ICNAF regulations forced the conclusion that the Commission's existing regulatory system was not functioning. In Commissioners' Documents 74/41 and 74/42 the United States presented evidence of violations including serious overfishing of national quotas and the maintenance of incomplete and incorrect catch records. The United States further noted that implementation of the Commission's Scheme of Joint International Enforcement had not been complete due to the failure of Member Governments to maintain inspection vessels within the Convention Area, and that control by Member Governments over their vessels fishing in Subareas 4, 5 and Statistical Area 6 was inadequate. In view of this the United States emphasized the need to establish procedures to assist Member Governments in their efforts to regulate their fleets, and to provide generally for improved enforcement methodology to facilitate prompt compliance with existing regulations.

Recognizing this need, Panels 4 and 5 urged that Member Governments provide for the accommodation of designated observers from other Members of the Commission aboard vessels flying their national flags in Subareas 4 and 5 and Statistical Area 6, and that the present meeting of STACTIC further consider the implementation of an observer program in order to provide specific proposals for consideration by the full Commission at its 1975 Annual Meeting.

It is the view of the United States that final action must be taken on such a program at the 1975 Annual Meeting in order to help ensure the proper functioning of the Commission's complex regulatory system. Such a program should involve observations by qualified observers for periods not to exceed 30 days on board vessels fishing in the Convention Area and Statistical Area 6. The objectives of the program will be to:

- 1) Provide a more effective means of determining adherence to mesh size regulations for the various species, and the effect of mesh utilized in chafing gear;
- 2) To help ensure compliance with closed area regulations, and to provide better data on the capabilities of various types of pelagic gear to take incidental catches of demersal species in order to ensure improved compliance with demersal fishing gear restrictions;
- 3) Provide more adequate data on adherence to the first-tier overall and second-tier species quotas;
- 4) Monitor compliance with regulations prohibiting directed fisheries for haddock and yellowtail flounder and ensure that the incidental catch of such species is maintained within agreed limits;
- 5) Provide more accurate information regarding percentages of by-catch or incidental fisheries;
- 6) Allow Member Governments to ascertain the true magnitude of the discard problem, thereby providing necessary information regarding fisheries waste, both international and otherwise.

JOINT ICNAF/NEAFC MEETING ON JOINT INTERNATIONAL ENFORCEMENT

Leningrad, 4-7 March 1975

Report of Meeting
of the
Enforcement Committee
of the
North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission

Agenda item 1: Address of Welcome

The Chairman (Captain J.C.E. Cardoso, Portugal) welcomed delegates to the Joint Enforcement Meeting. A list of delegates is at Annex A.

Agenda item 2: Appointment of Rapporteur

Mr P.J. Derham (United Kingdom) was appointed as rapporteur.

Agenda item 3: Adoption of Agenda

There were two alterations suggested for the provisional agenda. The Soviet delegation wished to remove Agenda item 16 (Information on the USSR organisation for the enforcement of international and domestic fisheries regulations) in view of the comprehensive display in the entrance lobby saying they were always ready to answer any questions and suggested that two extra items should be included, namely:-

1. Communications regarding catch quotas, and
2. Annual Reports of Infractions.

These were adopted as items to follow provisional Agenda items 4 and 5, respectively. The United Kingdom delegation wished to present a paper on industrial fishing and by-catch. It was agreed that this be considered under Agenda item 13 (Control of mixed fisheries).

The Agenda was adopted as amended (Annex B).

The Committee was notified by the Chairman that a Joint ICNAF/NEAFC Working Group on logbooks and other matters had been formed. He invited non-ICNAF members of the Committee to join this Group and the Netherlands delegation expressed their wish to do so.

Agenda item 4: Review of practical implementation of the Scheme of Joint Enforcement

The United Kingdom's paper EC/3 was discussed at length, with particular reference to the following questions:-

1. Master's signature on the report form

It was explained that the purpose of tabling this issue was based on legal objections in the United Kingdom where there was no legal provision to require that a Master must sign the report form. It was agreed by all delegations that such a signature did not in any way show that the Master agreed with the remarks of the inspector and that it was a basic understanding that no-one could be required to implicate himself. However, there was a decided advantage in that the Master's signature confirmed his presence on board and also that he should be able to make any remarks concerning the inspection if he so wished. In this case he should sign them. After further consideration of this particular point and the fact that probably the signature contributed towards the authenticity of the report, it was agreed that the current procedure should continue.

2. Code signal for boarding fishing vessels

The question of the stop signal was studied in depth and various points of view were offered on what signal should be used. All delegations were of the opinion that the signal should be kept as simple as possible and it was finally agreed that probably the most suitable signal contained in the International Code of Signals, SQ3, should be adopted as it had in ICNAF. Delegations would do their best to educate their fishermen as to the full meaning of this signal and also of the NEAFC Pennant in the context of the Scheme of Joint Enforcement in that skippers so signalled should provide all the necessary facilities for the inspector to board the vessel and carry out his inspection; that he was not required to stop or manoeuvre

while fishing, shooting or hauling and that he should communicate with the inspection ship by radio. It was agreed that such difficulties as may arise could be left to the inspector's initiative in using the full facilities of the International Code.

3. Reporting vessels which failed to stop or incidents of obstructing an inspector

The United Kingdom delegation had tentatively proposed that such a report should be made on the inspection form but it was pointed out that this was not entirely practicable and that it would be far better to treat such incidents as separate entities. The inspector's Flag State should communicate the fullest possible facts to the Flag State of the fishing vessel concerned.

4. Logbooks

It was agreed that the format of logbooks should be left to the Joint Working Group but a point was made by the Norwegian delegation that in view of the numbers of small boats involved in their fisheries it would be impracticable to ask for logbooks to be kept by all vessels. They suggested that this requirement which was a sensible one should be confined to boats over a certain size. The United Kingdom delegation shared this view and the Chairman suggested that probably such a requirement might be confined to vessels over 50 tons.

5. Harmonisation and adaptation of the report of inspection

A suggested form for the Report of Inspection which would be suitable for both ICNAF and NEAFC purposes and which would provide a facility for reporting any infraction of the Recommendations currently in force in both Commission areas was tabled by the United Kingdom delegation and was discussed in some detail. The Committee, however, were divided in their views as to the need for changing to this new format, some delegations feeling that the current form had presented no difficulties whilst others, although agreeing with this latter view, foresaw that there would be further recommendations to enforce in the future, and that in particular where countries had vessels fishing on both Convention areas it was far more convenient that inspectors should have a common form. The main point at issue in this discussion was whether there was a real need or not to make provision on the form for noting under-sized fish and fish under quota. It was agreed that a final discussion on this matter should be left to the Joint Meeting with ICNAF but that if the form was adopted then it should be in some standardised international size and that it would be easier to complete if the layout were in block form.

6. Harmonisation of ICNAF/NEAFC Questionnaire

This was referred to the Joint Working Party.

Agenda item 4a: Communications regarding catch quotas

The USSR Agenda item 4a/Paper 1 was considered. As the subject was really outside the scope of the meeting it was decided not to discuss it.

Agenda item 5: Reports of Infractions

The United Kingdom delegation presented Paper EC/4, pointing out that it was simply their intention to put the record of infractions straight. The French delegation were not available to answer the paper but the USSR undertook to check and inform the United Kingdom as soon as possible. The Belgian delegation pointed out that some countries had not provided addresses to which reports of inspections should be sent. The United Kingdom delegation endorsed this stressing the importance which was attached to radio reports of infractions from inspectors which enabled vessels to be checked on arrival at their home port. The Chairman agreed and asked that all delegations inform the Secretariat before the meeting adjourned of up-to-date addresses, telegraphic addresses or telex numbers to which inspectors might radio or cable reports of infractions.

Agenda item 5a: Annual Reports of Infractions

The USSR delegation proposed (Agenda item 5/Paper 1) the adoption of the ICNAF report forms saying that in their view this was an improvement on those currently used by the Secretariat. The meeting agreed to adopt this proposal.

Agenda item 6: Standardisation of log entries

Referred to the Joint Working Group.

Agenda item 7: Consideration of national systems of licensing or registration for fishing in specified area or areas

The Chairman gave an outline of the proposal made by the United States in an earlier ICNAF meeting

that vessels should be licensed by the national authorities. The general feeling of the meeting was that whereas there were no objections to licensing as such, it would be very difficult for either Commission to lay down regulations because of the various legal systems employed by Flag States. However, they thought the Commissioners could suggest suitable guidelines which should be followed in the compilation of the licences and it was suggested by the Netherlands delegation that the form of the licence should be drawn up in such a way that it would be recognised by all inspectors.

Agenda item 8: Form of licence to be issued for scientific research vessels operating in the Convention Area

The USSR delegation presented their paper EC/1 Revise. The Irish delegation suggested an amendment in line 3 of the memorandum in that the phrase "outside national fishing limits" should be added after the word "vessel" and this was agreed. It was pointed out by two delegations that the articles of the Convention permitted research work to be carried out without having to abide by the Recommendations. Therefore, it was suggested that there was no need to have a permit. However, other delegations pointed out that there had been cases where inspectors had been unsure of the status of some vessels engaged in research, particularly those that were fishing vessels and not permanently engaged in this work. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic suggested that there might be two types of licence issued:-

1. to cover those research vessels permanently engaged in research work, and
2. to cover those vessels which, although normally fishing commercially, had been chartered for research work.

The format of such licences was to be re-considered by the USSR delegation and copies of this would be circulated to the Committee. It was agreed that ordinary fishing vessels used as temporary research vessels be covered by a suitable permit and that if the Commission eventually decides that regular research vessels should also be documented as to their activities, one format of Permit would be sufficient for both types of vessels. Proposed form of amended format and original USSR proposal are at Annexes C and D, respectively. It is understood that vessels holding such a Permit shall not be subject to inspection.

Agenda item 9: Mesh measuring methods and problems

It was agreed that this matter should be left to the Joint Working Group.

Agenda item 10: Identification of net or gear materials

The Chairman explained that the USSR delegation would submit a paper on this subject to ICNAF and that it might be better to await consideration of this matter until after that paper had been presented.

Agenda item 11: Control of closed areas and periods

The Netherlands delegation explained that they had some misgivings about how quota systems would operate. They asked if any other delegation who might have more experience could put forward their views. After some discussion it was agreed that the most efficient way of enforcing quota arrangements was on landing but that once a quota had been closed then of course this was a matter for enforcement at sea. There was some discussion as to the procedures which should be followed when vessels landed quota species at a foreign port and it was decided that the Committee should recommend that such landings should be reported by the Flag State in which they were landed to the vessel's parent country so that it could deduct such amounts from its national quota. Such reports should be copied to the Secretariat. The Netherlands delegation suggested this subject be discussed at the next meeting of the Enforcement Committee. Finally, they suggested that the Enforcement Committee be consulted by the Commission about any regulation needing international control.

Agenda items 12 and 13: Control of by-catches and discards
Control of mixed fisheries

The United Kingdom delegation presented a paper on industrial fishing and by-catch. The methods used in ICNAF for control of by-catch were outlined and it was suggested that such measures might be adopted by NEAFC. This was agreed and the Chairman suggested that the United Kingdom should put forward definite proposals to the Commission.

Agenda item 14: Instruction of skippers of vessels engaged in international fisheries

The Chairman invited delegations to give their views on what instructions had been or could be issued to skippers in order to keep them informed of the current recommendations. Although some delegations reported that some guidance and instructions were issued, in particular on the Joint Enforcement Schemes, it was generally agreed that there was a possible need for a guidebook to be produced by the Commission. The Chairman suggested that delegations should pass any copies of guides or instructions they may have to the Secretariat for circulation so that this matter could be considered with a view to the Commission producing a general handbook. This proposal was agreed by the Committee. The Irish delegation pointed out that

the information in any such guidebook would have to be carefully considered in order to avoid confusion with national legislation which in some cases may differ from the exact terms of the Recommendations.

Agenda item 15: Implementation of scheme for deployment of national observers on board fishing vessels

The Chairman explained that this item had been proposed in ICNAF and he was simply asking for observations in order that a general view could be obtained which could be put to the Joint Committee. He explained that the idea was that observers would not be inspectors but would have a function of educating the fishermen on such matters as quota operations, by-catch and discard recommendations. The Committee thought that the most effective way of informing fishermen was to do this on shore and that in general, they did not support this proposal.

Agenda item 16: Drafting of proposals for consideration by the Commission at the next Annual Meeting

This was deferred until the closing of the meeting.

Agenda item 17: Any other business

The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany informed the Commission that their Government would, in the forthcoming year, be ratifying the International Policing Convention. This Convention was of interest to the Committee since it meant that the Convention would then enter into force and contained recommendations for the marking of fishing vessels.

Office of the Commission
Leningrad
6 March 1975

NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES COMMISSION

MEETING OF THE ENFORCEMENT COMMITTEE

LENINGRAD 4TH - 5TH MARCH 1975

Chairman: Captain J.C.E. Cardoso (Portugal)

List of Delegates

BELGIUM

Monsieur J.J.M. Pottier
Fisheries Division, Ministry of Agriculture
Ostend

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC
REPUBLIC

Mr B. Schreiber
Institute for Deep Sea Fisheries and Fish Processing
Rostock

Mr G. Haasler
Central Fisheries Board
Rostock

GERMANY, FEDERAL
REPUBLIC OF

Dr Masberg
Federal Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Forestry
Bonn

IRELAND

Mr D.P. O'Sullivan
Assistant Secretary, Fisheries Division
Department of Agriculture and Fisheries
Dublin

Dr A.E.J. Went
Consultant, Department of Agriculture and Fisheries
Dublin

NETHERLANDS

Mr F.G. van Dijck
General Inspectorate, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries

Mr W. Steemers
General Inspectorate, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries

Commander W.A.J. Wevers
Ministry of Defence

NORWAY

Mr A. Aasbø
Head of Division, Directorate of Fisheries
Bergen

Mr M. Stene
Naval Fishery Protection Service
Harstad

POLAND

Mr W.J.P. Kalinowski
Central Fisheries Board
Szczecin

Mr W. Czajka
Sea Fisheries Institute
Gdynia

SPAIN

Mr A. Martin Mateo
Direccion General de Pesca
Madrid

Mr G. Alvarez-Castellanos
Federacion Armadores
Madrid

SWEDEN

Mr S. Wenker
Ministry of Agriculture
Stockholm

Mr I. Olsson
National Board of Fisheries
Göteborg

Mr V. Fryksmark
Coast Guard Office
Göteborg

UNION OF SOVIET
SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Mr V.S. Belov
Deputy Chief, GLAVRYBVOD
Moscow

Mr E. Lomakin
Regional Chief, GLAVRYBVOD
Moscow

Mr V. Kostsov
Regional Chief, GLAVRYBVOD
Moscow

Mr L. Bankovsky
Regional Chief, GLAVRYBVOD
Leningrad

UNITED KINGDOM

Mr P.G. Jeffery
Chief Inspector of Fisheries
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food
London

Mr P.J. Derham
Deputy Chief Inspector of Fisheries
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food
London

Office of the Commission
Leningrad
5 March 1975

NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES COMMISSION

MEETING OF THE ENFORCEMENT COMMITTEE

LENINGRAD 4TH - 5TH MARCH 1975

Agenda

1. Address of Welcome
2. Appointment of Rapporteur
3. Adoption of Agenda
4. Review of practical implementation of the Scheme of Joint Enforcement (Memorandum by the United Kingdom delegation - EC/3)
- 4a. Communications regarding catch quotas
5. Reports of Infractions (Memorandum by the United Kingdom delegation - EC/4)
- 5a. Annual Reports of Infractions
6. Standardisation of log entries
7. Consideration of national systems of licensing or registration for fishing in specified area or areas
8. Form of licence to be issued for scientific research vessels operating in the Convention Area (Memorandum by the USSR delegation - EC/1)
9. Mesh measuring methods and problems (Memorandum by the USSR delegation - EC/2)
10. Identification of net or gear materials
11. Control of closed areas and periods
12. Control of by-catches and discards
13. Control of mixed fisheries
14. Instruction of skippers of vessels engaged in international fisheries
15. Implementation of scheme for deployment of national observers on board fishing vessels
16. Drafting of proposals for consideration by the Commission at the next Annual Meeting
17. Any other business

Office of the Commission
Leningrad
4 March 1975

RESTRICTED

Appendix III
ANNEX C

NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES COMMISSION

MEETING OF THE ENFORCEMENT COMMITTEE

LENINGRAD 4TH - 5TH MARCH 1975

PERMIT No. _____

For fisheries research in
the Convention Area

1. Name of vessel-owner and his address
2. Type and name of the vessel
3. Port of registration and registration number
4. Name of Master of the vessel
5. Period of validity of the Permit
6. Country and organization issued the Permit
7. Purpose of research cruise

Date of issuing the Permit

Signature of the Officer

Seal of the organization
issued the Permit

NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES COMMISSION

MEETING OF THE ENFORCEMENT COMMITTEE

LENINGRAD 4TH - 5TH MARCH 1975

P R O C E D U R E

of research fishing in the Convention Area

Research fishing in the Convention Area shall be implemented under special Permits which are to be given for each cruise of the vessel according to the form attached. The Permit shall be issued by a competent organization of the Flag State on condition the vessel operates in accordance with the programme approved by a competent research body and there is an appropriate specialist on board.

The availability of a duly-authorized Permit on board a vessel means that any restrictions pertaining to catches of fish (mesh size, size limit, closed seasons and areas, quotas, etc.) fixed in the Convention Area do not extend to the vessel involved. When an international inspector visits the vessel in conformity to the recommendation of the Commission, he shall limit himself with checking the Permit and the Report on Inspection compiled by the Inspector in a fixed order shall contain the description of principal information on the Permit.

Each Contracting Party shall duly inform the Secretariat of the Commission of the name of a national competent organization which shall be responsible for issuing Permits for research catches of fish in the Convention Area.

Office of the Commission
Leningrad
4 March 1975

RESTRICTED

Appendix III
ANNEX D
Attachment I

NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES COMMISSION

MEETING OF THE ENFORCEMENT COMMITTEE

LENINGRAD 4TH - 5TH MARCH 1975

PERMIT No. _____

on the right of research fishing
in the Convention Area

1. Name of vessel-owner and his address
2. Type and name of the vessel
3. Port of registration and registration number
4. Name of Master of the vessel
5. Period of validity of the Permit
6. Country and organization issued the Permit

Date of issuing the Permit

Signature of the Officer

Seal of the organization
issued the Permit

JOINT ICNAF/NEAFC MEETING ON JOINT INTERNATIONAL ENFORCEMENT

Leningrad, 4-7 March 1975

Report of Meetings of the Joint ICNAF/NEAFC Working Group on Logbooks and Joint Enforcement

1. Introduction. The Joint Working Group on standardized logbooks and on modifications to the Joint Enforcement Scheme's inspection questionnaire and report form met on five occasions under the chairmanship of Mr J.S. Beckett (Canada), with representatives from Canada, FRG, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, USSR, UK, and USA present.

2. Logbooks. The Joint Working Group recognized that differences in the fisheries conducted by Member Countries made it very unlikely that a common logbook would be suitable for all fisheries. The Joint Working Group, therefore,

recommends

that each country should be free to design its own logbook, but that each such logbook should contain *inter alia*, certain common entries.

The headings for these common entries should be identified by a code number which would enable the entries to be readily identifiable, whatever the language used in the log. The entries to be included in all logs were discussed at length, the discussion being based on suggestions submitted by the UK, and those recommended as essential by the Joint Working Group are attached (Attachment 2). It is emphasized that these elements could be arranged within the national logbook as determined by the individual country, but that they should be identified by code numbers. Particular discussion centred around:

- (a) Time and area information. This should be compiled by 24-hour periods, although the Joint Working Group recognized that accurate scientific assessments would be greatly facilitated by more detailed time and area information, e.g. haul-by-haul data;
- (b) Type of gear. This should be identified by FAO coding;
- (c) Species of fish. These should be identified by the FAO species code, both when the species name is printed in the log or when it is entered by the logkeeper;
- (d) Cumulative catch data. This was not considered an essential aspect for international logs but the Joint Working Group did recognize that an additional record of cumulative catch by subarea or region, using a form such as at Attachment 1, would be of considerable assistance to national authorities and fishing masters alike, in compiling the required monthly reports, and to international inspectors when carrying out inspections.

The Joint Working Group felt that, while it is extremely desirable that fishing records be maintained aboard all fishing vessels, it would only be feasible to require vessels over a certain size to maintain logbooks. The Joint Working Group was not unanimous with regard to the need for a minimum size, but does recommend that logbooks should only be mandatory aboard vessels of more than 25 m in length or 100 Gross Registered Tons. Member Countries should obtain catch and effort data from smaller vessels in a manner suitable to their individual situations.

The Joint Working Group, therefore,

recommends

- i) the attached list of entries (Attachment 2) be required of all logbooks,
- ii) that logbooks be required to be kept on all vessels over 25 m in length or 100 GRT,
- iii) the entry headings be identified by code numbers, such as those indicated in the attached list (Attachment 2),
- iv) that species of fish and type of gear be identified by FAO codings,
- v) that entries be summaries for 24-hour periods, but that national authorities give serious attention to requiring haul-by-haul data,
- vi) that national authorities consider utilization of forms showing the cumulative daily catch, by utilization, by subarea (Attachment 1).

3. Inspection Questionnaire. The Joint Working Group considered the ICNAF Questionnaire and suggested Canadian and US modifications, and prepared the attached revised format (Attachment 3) which it recommends should be adopted by both ICNAF and NEAFC. The revisions are intended to update the Questionnaire in terms of recent changes in the ICNAF and NEAFC Schemes of Joint International Enforcement, and to enable the Questionnaire to be used by inspectors operating under ICNAF, NEAFC, or ICSEAF.

4. Form for Report of Inspection. The Joint Working Group considered the question of up-dating the ICNAF form for recording the results of an inspection under the International Scheme of Joint Enforcement, and to modify the form so that it becomes suitable for use under the NEAFC Scheme of Enforcement. The discussion was based on joint Canadian and US proposals, and many of the suggestions were incorporated in the draft Report of Inspection (Attachment 4). The Joint Working Group

recommends

that the draft Report of Inspection be adopted.

JOINT ICNAF/NEAFC MEETING ON JOINT INTERNATIONAL ENFORCEMENT

Leningrad, 4-7 March 1975

RECORD OF ACCUMULATIVE CATCH

VESSEL NAME/NUMBER _____ SUBAREA _____

DATE	SPECIES NO.:			SPECIES NO.:			SPECIES NO.:					
	DAY	MO.	YR.	TODAY	DIS.	CUMULATIVE	TODAY	DIS.	CUMULATIVE	TODAY	DIS.	CUMULATIVE

NOTE: Cumulative listings are not to subtract any fish off-loaded while vessel is operating or will operate in ICNAF Areas.

Disposition (all 3 categories to be included in cumulative totals):

1. Human consumption
2. Fishmeal
3. Discards

JOINT ICNAF/NEAFC MEETING ON JOINT INTERNATIONAL ENFORCEMENT

Leningrad, 4-7 March 1975

ENTRIES REQUIRED IN ALL LOGBOOKS

<u>Item of Information</u>	<u>ICNAF/NEAFC Code</u>
Vessel name	01
Vessel nationality	02
Vessel registration number	03
Registration port	04
Types of gear used (daily)	10
Type of gear	FAO Code
Date - day	20
- month	21
- year	22
Situation - latitude	31
- longitude	32
- statistical area (alternative to 31 and 32)	33
*No. of hauls during the 24-hour period	40
*No. of hours gear fished during the 24-hour period	41
Species names	FAO Code
Daily catch of each species (metric tons live weight)	50
Daily catch of each species for human consumption in the form of fish	61
Daily catch of each species for reduction	62
Daily discard of each species	63
Place(s) of landing or trans-shipment	70
Date(s) of landing or trans-shipment	71
Master's signature	80

* When two or more types of gear used in same 24-hour period, records should be separate for two types.

JOINT ICNAF/NEAFC MEETING ON JOINT INTERNATIONAL ENFORCEMENT

Leningrad, 4-7 March 1975

INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES INSPECTION QUESTIONNAIRE

PART I

1. I am an inspector under ICNAF/NEAFC/ICSEAF. Here is my identity card. I would like to inspect your nets/other fishing gear/and catch.
2. I should like to see the master of this vessel.
3. Please give me your name.
4. Please cooperate with me in my examination of your catch, equipment, and documents in accordance with the international regulations for this area.
5. Please check your position and time (in GMT) at the moment of our arrival on your vessel.
6. I am reporting your position as° lat° long at GMT. Do you agree?
7. Would you like to check your position with my instruments on board the inspection ship?
8. Do you now agree?
9. Please show me the documents establishing the nationality of your vessel, and the bridge log, fishing logs, or other pertinent documents.
10. Please write down the name and address of the owners of this vessel in the space I am indicating on the Report Form.
11. What principal species are you fishing for?
12. Are you fishing for industrial purposes?
13. I agree (Yes).
14. I do not agree (No).
15. Please take me to: (a) the working deck;
(b) your processing area;
(c) your fish holds.
16. Do you use any net attachment? If so, what type? Please write it down in the space I am indicating.
17. Please switch on these lights.
18. I wish to examine that net and/or chafing gear.
19. Show me the other fishing gear you have on or near the fishing deck.
20. Show me your net gauge, if any.
21. Ask your men to hold that net so that I can measure it.
22. Please make that dry net wet for ten minutes under water.
23. I have inspected meshes in this net.
24. See that I have recorded accurately on the Form in the space I am indicating the width of the meshes I have measured.
25. I wish to inspect your catch. Have you finished sorting the fish?

26. Will you please lay out those fish?
27. I wish to estimate the proportion of regulated species in your catch.
28. Please turn to the copy in your language of the official Inspection Form and supply me with the necessary information to complete this document. I will indicate what sections of the Form are of interest.

PART II

29. If you do not give your collaboration as I have requested, I will report your refusal to your Flag State.
30. I have found the average width of the meshes I have measured in that net is mm. This appears to be below the minimum applicable mesh size, and will be reported to your Flag State.
31. I have found net attachments and/or other fishing gear which appears to be illegal. This will be reported to your Flag State.
32. I shall now affix the identification mark to this piece of fishing gear which is to be preserved with the mark attached until viewed by a fisheries inspector of your Flag State at his demand.
33. I have found undersized fish in the number I inspected. I shall report this to your Flag State.
34. I find that you are apparently fishing in this area
 - (a) during a closed season;
 - (b) with gear not permitted;
 - (c) for species not permitted.

This will be reported to your Flag State.
35. I have found a by-catch of regulated species which appears to be above the permitted amounts. I shall report this to your Flag State.
36. I have made copies of the following entry (entries) in this document. Please sign them to certify that they are true copies of the above entry (entries).
37. I would like to communicate with a designated authority of your Flag State. Please arrange for this message to be sent and for any answer to be received.
38. Do you wish to make any observations concerning this inspection including its conduct and that of the inspector? If so, please do so in your own language in the space I am indicating on the Report Form on which I have set out my findings. Please sign the observations. Do you have any witnesses who wish to make observations? If so, they may do so in their own language in the space I am indicating on the Report Form.
39. I am leaving. Thank you.

JOINT ICNAF/NEAFC MEETING ON JOINT INTERNATIONAL ENFORCEMENT

Leningrad, 4-7 March 1975

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES/NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES COMMISSION¹

SCHEME OF JOINT ENFORCEMENT

REPORT OF INSPECTION

(Inspector: Please use CAPITAL BLOCK LETTERS)

AUTHORIZED INSPECTOR

1. Name..... Nationality.....
2. Name and identifying letters and/or number of ship carrying him.....

INFORMATION ON VESSEL INVOLVED

3. Nationality & Port of Registry.....
4. Vessel's name & Registration Number.....
5. Master's Name.....
6. Owner's Name and Address.....
- 7A. Position as determined by inspector at GMT; latitude..... longitude.....
- 7B. Position as determined by fishing vessel's master at GMT; latitude.....longitude.....

DATE AND TIMES THE INSPECTION COMMENCED AND FINISHED

8. Date..... Time arrived on board..... Time of departure.....

FACTS RESULTING FROM INSPECTION

	1st Net	2nd Net	3rd Net			
9. Type of net (trawl net, seine net, etc.)						
Material (chemical category, if possible)						
Single or double twine						
Net measured wet or dry ²						
On or near trawl deck (ICNAF only)						
Type of net attachments inspected						
Remarks.....						
.....						
Average mesh size of gear measured						

NET INSPECTIONS - SAMPLES OF 20 MESHES OF THE NET MEASURED IN MILLIMETRES

10. Codend

	Width (mesh size)										Average Width	Legal Size
1st Net												
2nd Net												
3rd Net												

Chafer

	Width (mesh size)										Average Width	Legal Size
1st Net												
2nd Net												
3rd Net												

Rest of Net

	Width (mesh size)										Average Width	Legal Size
1st Net												
2nd Net												
3rd Net												

¹ Delete as necessary.

² Nets measured under NEAFC regulations must be wet.

11. CATCH INSPECTIONS - LENGTH OF FISH IN MILLIMETRES

Species name	Code	No. of individuals in sample	No. of individuals undersized	Average length (where applicable)	Legal Size

12. RESULT OF INSPECTION OF FISH OBSERVED IN LAST TOW (WHEN INSPECTED)

Total Tons	List of ALL SPECIES TAKEN IN LAST TOW	Percentage of each	Percentage discarded
	Total catch		

13. SUMMARY RECORD OF CATCH

Date of entry into Area or Subdivision	Subdivision	Fish Species with Code No.	Catch (metric tons)	How Processed (include discards where known)

- 14. Weight of whole fish reduced.....
- 15. Weight of whole fish canned or otherwise processed.....
- 16. Date of departure from ICNAF Subarea (if known).....
- 17. (For ICNAF only) Date and place of last landing or
trans-shipment or start of fishing in ICNAF Area.....

COMMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS

- 18. List of & comments on documents inspected during boardings.....
.....
.....

- 19. Citation for apparent infringement _____

- 20. Statements of photographs taken with description of subjects.....
.....
.....
- 21. Other comments and/or observations by inspector.....
.....
.....
- 22. Signature of inspector.....
- 23. Statement of inspection witness(es).....
- 24. Signature of witness(es).....
- 25. Statement of master's witness(es).....
- 26. Signature of witness(es).....
- 27. Comments and/or observations by the master of the vessel.....
.....
.....Signature of the master

COPY TO MASTER, ORIGINAL TO BE RETAINED BY INSPECTOR FOR SUBSEQUENT DISSEMINATION.