

11. The Chairman of the Scientific Council then summarized the response of the Scientific Council to specific questions posed at the 1989 Annual Meeting by the Fisheries Commission on cod in Div. 3L (SCS Doc. 90/23).
12. In reporting on the ten stocks in the agenda, from 14 a) to 15 g), the Chairman of the Scientific Council noted that full analytical assessments were possible for only two stocks, due mainly to data inadequacies, including lack of catch reports and biological samples from non-member fisheries. He also mentioned the increasingly important role of research vessel survey data in assessments, although those data were highly variable. The Chairman advised that the Scientific Council was studying ways to improve further the stock summary sheets to avoid presentation of possibly misleading information.
13. For cod in Div. 3M, the Chairman of the Scientific Council indicated that, in 1989, reported catches of that stock were about 1,000 metric tons, while unreported catches were estimated at 40,000 metric tons. A similar quantity was probably taken in 1988 and 1990 catches were expected to remain at the same level. Survey data indicated a relatively strong 1986 year class. Nevertheless, the population was composed mostly of immature fish, with only 4-6% of the population being mature fish. The Scientific Council recommended for 1991 the continuation of the moratorium.
14. For cod in Div. 3NO, the Chairman of the Scientific Council reported that unreported catches were probably inconsequential. He stressed that the 1983-85 year classes were very weak, leading to a significant decline in stock biomass. The range of management options presented for 1991 were based on the assumption that 1990 catches would not exceed the 1990 TAC of 18,600 metric tons.
15. For redfish in Div. 3M, the Chairman of the Scientific Council advised that unreported catches were believed to be increasing, although no change in the biomass had been observed from 1988 to 1989. The strong 1980 year class was now recruiting to the fishery and the 1983 year class also appeared to be strong. The Scientific Council recommended a 1991 TAC of 43,000 metric tons.
16. For redfish in Div. 3LN, unreported catches were estimated at 8,000 tonnes in both 1987 and 1988. The Chairman of the Scientific Council also stated that research surveys indicated a declining spawning stock biomass and stock size generally. He advised that commercial catch rates were not indicative of stock condition. The Scientific Council was concerned about the declining trends in that long lived stock and recommended a TAC of 14,000 metric tons in 1991.
17. American plaice in Div. 3M was considered to be in a stable condition, with a possibly strong 1986 year class. Some data deficiencies had inhibited a thorough stock assessment at the June 1990 meeting. A 1991 TAC of 2,000 metric tons was recommended by the Scientific Council.
18. For American plaice in Div. 3LNO, the Chairman of the Scientific Council noted the use of non-member and estimated unreported catches in the assessment, as well as increasing catches of younger fish. Because of changing exploitation patterns, a revised yield-per-recruit analysis had been conducted in 1990. F values in 1986 and 1987 were 0.47, decreasing to F0.38 in 1988 and 1989. After a decline during the 1984-1988 period,

the spawning stock biomass appeared to have stabilized. Two sets of management options, each with TACs at varying F values, were provided for 1991.

19. For witch flounder in Div. 3NO, the Chairman of the Scientific Council reported that declining catch rates might be indicative of a declining stock size. The advice of the Scientific Council was that the 1990 TAC of 5,000 metric tons should remain in effect for 1991.
20. For yellowtail flounder in Div. 3LNO, the Chairman of the Scientific Council observed that although the stock size had declined, there were signs of stronger year classes to come. However, pressure on young fish was increasing which could dissipate potential improvements in recruitment. The Scientific Council advised a small increase in the 1991 TAC to 7,000 metric tons.
21. For capelin in Div. 3NO, the Chairman of the Scientific Council reported that no catch projections had been done for that stock but an exploitation rate of 10% of the mature biomass would equate to a TAC in 1991 of 30,000 metric tons.
22. For squid in subareas 3 and 4, the Chairman of the Scientific Council noted the low catches in recent years and stated that no management advice for 1991 had been offered.
23. Following a short break, it was agreed that the delegates would first have a general discussion of the scientific advice, followed by management decisions.
24. The delegate of Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland) congratulated the Chairman of the Scientific Council on a coherent, much improved report. He observed that the report provided a crystal clear picture of the pulse fisheries now taking place in the Regulatory Area. He noted that, despite the moratorium, the 3M cod fishery had developed more than ever before. That was a very disturbing situation.
25. The delegate of Canada expressed profound misgivings about the deteriorating condition of more and more of the stocks managed by NAFO. He observed that the picture provided by the Scientific Council report testified to the collective failure of NAFO and its Contracting Parties. The delegate of the USSR expressed satisfaction with the Scientific Council report and appreciated the management options provided for some stocks. He noted that insufficient data existed for the recommendations made for other stocks.
26. The delegate of the EEC complimented the Chairman of Scientific Council on the report, pointing in particular to the summary sheets for all stocks. He regretted the decline in most stocks. He wished that a range of management options had been provided for more than two stocks and deplored the routine advice offered yet again for some stocks. He considered that management options should be provided as much as possible, if the data were sufficient. The delegate of the GDR expressed appreciation for the excellent efforts of the scientists but noted that only a range of management options provided a basis for fisheries managers to find a middle way between protection of the stocks and prevention of economic dislocation in Contracting Parties dependent on certain fisheries.

27. The Chairman of the Scientific Council responded that, where analytical assessments had been possible, the summary sheets provided management options corresponding to $F_{0.1}$, $F_{current}$ and F_{max} . Using the graphs in Appendix 1 of the Scientific Council report, however, other options could be readily calculated.
28. The delegate of Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland) pointed out that the problem was not the scientific advice but the management decisions. He noted that Fisheries Commission decisions, to be good, would have to take into account STACTIC deliberations on surveillance and control in the Regulatory Area. The delegate of Canada observed that the issue of a range of management options had been discussed at length in previous years, without any additional fish being produced. As long as overfishing occurred, stock abundance would decline, leaving NAFO open to criticism from both fishermen and the general public.
29. The Chairman requested specific questions on the scientific advice.
30. The delegate of Canada asked for a breakdown of the estimated unreported 3M cod catches of 40,000 metric tons. The Chairman of the Scientific Council replied that he had no detailed information at hand but offered to consult and provide a breakdown later if available. The delegate of Canada asked if catch rate information available from Contracting Parties could be used to compute catch rates of non-Contracting Party vessels conducting fisheries for 3M cod. The Chairman of the Scientific Council answered in the affirmative and reported that some catch rate information relevant to the 3M cod fishery was available from non-Contracting Parties. It was agreed that the Chairman of the Scientific Council would provide more information later.
31. The delegate of the USSR outlined three questions: a) effect of catches of 40,000 metric tons on the 3M cod stock; b) extent of the decline in 3M redfish spawning stock biomass; and c) justification for the recommended 10% catch for 3NO capelin. The Chairman of the Scientific Council replied to a) that the 40,000 metric ton 3M cod fishery would reduce the numbers of the relatively strong 1986 year class surviving to spawning age and thus stopping that class from contributing significantly to recovery of the stock. To c) he indicated that the 10% catch for 3NO capelin was relatively conservative, citing the importance of that stock in the food chain and the general ecosystem. He requested time to prepare an answer to b).
32. The Chairman suggested that delegates pose further questions for response later by the Chairman of the Scientific Council. That was agreed.
33. The delegate of the USSR asked for a non-conservative management option for 3NO capelin, citing Articles 2 and 11 of the NAFO Convention. The delegate of Norway requested the assessment of 3L capelin and the rate recommended for its exploitation. The Chairman of the Scientific Council, in reply to the question of the delegate of Norway, stated that the 3L capelin assessment was being distributed at that moment.
34. The delegate of Canada, reserving the right to pose further questions, asked why the Scientific Council had advised continuation of the 3M cod moratorium when the biomass was now close to the exploitable biomass target set in previous years as a trigger for review of the TAC. He went on to ask why 3NO cod recruitment had declined and requested information on

discards and size composition of catches in the 3NO cod fishery, particularly in light of the small mesh size being used in the Spanish fishery for 3LNO American plaice. Pointing to the heavy pulse fishery for 3LN redfish in 1987, 1988 and 1989, he asked if the Scientific Council had confidence in reported landings of that stock in 1989 of 24,000 metric tons, and if not, why not. Citing the significant declines in the TACs for 3LNO American plaice since 1986, he asked whether that stock could serve as an example of the effects of heavy fishing. Finally, he asked whether the recommended TAC of 7,000 metric tons for 3LNO yellowtail flounder was conservative or optimistic and whether the recommendation took into account changes in the size distribution in catches, ie, the increasing numbers of small fish being taken.

35. The delegate of the EEC, as a general comment, requested additional sets of management options where not provided already, especially to supplement the routine advice offered for some stocks. Citing the reference by the delegate of Canada to the small mesh size used in the Spanish 3LNO American plaice fishery, he observed that it was not convincing to select one detail from a report as extensive as that of the Scientific Council, a detail that was not in any case proved beyond any doubt. That said, he noted the value placed by the EEC on mesh size as a fisheries management technique. The delegate of Canada stated that he had meant no discourtesy but had simply been seeking further information based on his reading of the Scientific Council report.

After it was agreed to resume at 10:00 hours September 12, the meeting adjourned at 16:35 hours.

The meeting reconvened at 10:30 hours on September 12, 1990.

36. The meeting began with responses by the Chairman of the Scientific Council to questions posed by delegates the previous day.
37. The Chairman of the Scientific Council advised that a written reply on the breakdown of 3M cod catches was being distributed (FC Doc. 90/7). He indicated that he had no direct information in reply to the question of the delegate of the USSR on the size of the 3M redfish spawning stock biomass. The total stock biomass had been stable over the last few years and the spawning stock biomass might increase in future on the strength of the 1980 year class. Nevertheless, the revised acoustic survey data pointed to a lower predicted biomass compared to the 1989 prediction and it was on that basis that a reduced TAC of 43,000 metric tons had been advised. The recommended 10% catch for 3NO capelin could be described as relatively conservative but conventional fishing mortality reference points were not relevant to capelin. The level of exploitation was a management decision, to be made in light of acceptable risks.
38. On the effects of high catches of 3M cod, the Chairman of the Scientific Council replied that 1989 catches of 40,000 metric tons had probably reduced the exploitable biomass to about half the estimated 1989 level of 100,000 metric tons. On the question of the target spawning stock biomass for 3M cod, he explained that spawning stock biomass was preferred as an indicator of stock condition to exploitable biomass, which was now in any case probably less than the 85,000 metric ton target. He regretted that he had no information to respond to the question of the delegate of Canada on the reasons for the decline in 3NO cod recruitment. Regarding discards in the 3NO cod fishery, the Chairman of the Scientific Council explained

that different fleets prosecuted the cod and flatfish fisheries in those divisions. Conventional mesh sizes were used in the cod fishery. By-catches of cod in the flatfish fisheries were low and discards minimal. He had no information on the size distribution of cod by-catches.

39. On 3LN redfish landings for 1989, the Chairman of the Scientific Council noted that the figure of 24,000 metric tons was valid, given the shift of fishing effort in 1989 to 3M redfish and 3LN Greenland halibut. He added that estimated 1989 catches by Korean vessels, which had not provided catch reports to NAFO, were 10-15,000 metric tons. Adding these to the reported landings of 24,000 metric tons meant total 1989 landings of 34,000-39,000 metric tons.
40. On the effects of overfishing of 3LNO American plaice, it was noted that the fishing mortality of F0.6 in recent years had exceeded the Fmax figure of F0.51. The stock had thus been reduced despite stable recruitment, albeit at a lower level than during the 1970s.
41. The Chairman of the Scientific Council acknowledged that the advised TAC for 3LNO yellowtail flounder in 1991 was optimistic, given the changed pattern of exploitation and the consequent lower yield per recruit. It was not possible to quantify that development, however, because no analytical assessment had been possible for that stock.
42. The Chairman of the Scientific Council regretted that he could not provide additional management options as requested by the delegate of the EEC. Additional information could be sought from the graphs in the STACFIS report and in the stock summary sheets in the Scientific Council report.
43. As there were no further questions regarding the scientific advice, the Chairman proposed that the delegates discuss the recommended TACs on a stock by stock basis, followed by reflection and informal meetings. Only then would votes be taken on the TAC recommendations. That was agreed.
44. The delegate of Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland) noted the relevance of improvements to surveillance and control programs and suggested as well that specific questions could be usefully put to STACTIC, such as commitments by Contracting Parties to surveillance ship and air time in 1991. He stressed the need to provide STACTIC with sufficient time to study such questions.
45. The delegate of the USSR agreed and observed that STACTIC would also have to review the cost of improved surveillance programs and the equal distribution of costs among Contracting Parties, as well as the efficiency of the surveillance system.
46. The delegate of Canada agreed with the observations of the delegates of the USSR and Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland). He thought the 3M situation was appalling and should galvanize the Contracting Parties into action. He promised the full participation of Canada in that effort. The delegate of the EEC agreed with the foregoing interventions.
47. At the suggestion of the Chairman, it was agreed that Fisheries Commission proposals would be submitted to STACTIC. There were no further comments under Agenda Item 13.

48. Under Agenda Item 14 (a), Cod in Div. 3M, the Chairman of the Scientific Council reviewed briefly the scientific advice for the stock. The delegate of Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland) outlined the management regimes applied to the stock to date: the current moratorium versus the previous regime of a TAC fixed at about 13,000 metric tons until achievement of the target exploitable biomass of 85,000 metric tons. As the moratorium had clearly not worked, he proposed a return to the old regime, together with an improved system of surveillance and control. He argued that it would be necessary to set a 3M cod TAC in order to provide Contracting Parties with the incentive to participate in an improved surveillance system.
49. The delegate of the USSR noted the more optimistic forecasts for 3M cod. Pointing to the development of a non-member fishery for the stock, he asked who were the winners and who the losers in the current situation.
50. The delegate of Norway agreed with the delegates of Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland) and the USSR. Having complied with the moratorium, Norway was one of the losers. He supported especially the Danish linkage of a 3M cod fishery in 1991 with a better control system, applicable as well to non-member vessels.
51. The delegate of Canada expressed sympathy with Contracting Parties who were losers because they complied with a NAFO decision. He noted that the winners and losers were evident in the breakdown of 3M cod catches provided earlier by the Chairman of the Scientific Council (FC Doc. 90/7). He reserved Canada's position on management of 3M cod in 1991 pending further discussion.
52. The delegate of the EEC also intended to consider the matter further, as there were contradictory indications about the state of 3M cod. Citing information provided in FC Doc. 90/7 on cod by-catches at certain depths in the 3M redfish fishery, he suggested limiting 3M redfish catches to other depths, to reduce cod by-catches.
53. The delegate of Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland) proposed deferring further discussion until further information had been obtained from STACTIC about improved surveillance and control. That was agreed.
54. Under Agenda Item 14 (b), redfish in Div. 3M, the Chairman of the Scientific Council summarized the scientific advice. The delegate of Canada sought clarification on the effect of the revised acoustic survey data on the TAC recommended for 1991 compared with the TAC set for 1990 at 50,000 metric tons. He observed that Contracting Parties, in setting TACs, should react just as quickly to a poor scientific prognosis as to a good one. He considered the recommended TAC of 43,000 metric tons the prudent course of action for the Fisheries Commission.
55. The delegate of the USSR indicated that he was scrutinizing the Scientific Council Report on that stock and would reflect further before stating a position on management of 3M redfish in 1991. The delegate of Bulgaria suggested maintaining the 1990 TAC of 50,000 metric tons, with a possible reduction at the 1991 meeting depending on information available then. The delegate of Cuba supported the Bulgarian proposal, citing the need to minimize changes in national allocations.

56. The delegate of the EEC reminded delegates that two management options had been provided: 43,000 metric tons corresponding to F0.1 and the Fmax level of 78,000 metric tons. The EEC commitment to Fmax as a legitimate management option was well known. He considered that an Fmax TAC would not damage the stock in the case under discussion. The delegate of Canada responded to the EEC intervention, observing that management strategies adopted for the northeast Atlantic were not appropriate to the northwest Atlantic and citing the dangers of Fmax as an unforgiving strategy that made no allowance for unpredictable developments and management errors. The delegate of the EEC responded that he had spoken in principle and was not pleading for a specific figure at that time. The delegate of the USSR reminded delegates that it was the mandate of the Fisheries Commission to discuss each stock specifically and referred to the concept of "optimum utilization" provided for in Articles 1, 2 and 11 of the NAFO Convention.
57. The Chairman of the Scientific Council advised that the Scientific Council had recommended a 1991 TAC of 43,000 metric tons in light of the long term productivity of the 3M redfish stock and that a higher fishing mortality would reduce more quickly the abundance of a strong year class. He indicated that higher catch levels could not be maintained on a long term basis. He advised delegates to keep in mind also the by-catch potential. The delegate of Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland) agreed.
58. Returning to Agenda Item 14 (a), cod in Div. 3M, the delegate of Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland) inquired whether cod by-catches in 3M fisheries would be counted against national 3M cod quotas, if a 3M cod TAC were set for 1991, given the by-catch regulation adopted by the Fisheries Commission at the 1989 meeting. It was agreed to seek further information on that question.
59. Under Agenda Item 14 (c), American plaice in Div. 3M, the Chairman of the Scientific Council reviewed briefly the scientific advice. The delegate of Canada expressed concern that the stock might imminently show the effects of high catches since 1987, despite current scientific advice that it appeared stable. He supported accepting the scientific advice of a 1991 TAC of 2,000 metric tons. The delegate of the EEC, speaking generally, observed that such a TAC was the most extreme case of routine advice with maintenance of the same TAC for many years. He noted that high fishing mortality was perhaps offset by the relatively strong 1986 year class.
60. Under Agenda Item 15 (a), cod in Div. 3NO, the Chairman of the Scientific Council reviewed the scientific advice, observing that fishing mortality over the last few years had been above the Fmax level. The delegate of Canada, citing Figure 6 on page 51 of SCS Doc. 90/23, asked whether the sharp decline in the spawning stock biomass was expected to continue. The Chairman of the Scientific Council answered in the affirmative, citing the weakness of the last three year classes. The delegate of Canada expressed concern, noting that the spawning stock biomass was now at the lowest level since 1976. He therefore supported the advised TAC of 13,600 metric tons for 1991.
61. The delegate of the EEC considered that adoption of the Fmax option of 20,800 metric tons was feasible as its effect on the size of the spawning stock biomass would not be appreciably different from the effect of the F0.1 option.

62. Under Agenda Item 15 (b), redfish in Div. 3LN, the Chairman of the Scientific Council reviewed the scientific advice, citing the declining stock biomass and the reduced proportion of older fish in the population. He advised that a TAC of 25,000 metric tons was too optimistic. The delegate of the GDR expressed support for a compromise TAC somewhere between the F0.1 and the Fmax options to take into account different management objectives. The delegate of Canada noted that the results of the 1989 acoustic survey had been much lower than the results of the two previous surveys and that the three results had been averaged by the Scientific Council in the assessment of the stock. He requested the F0.1 calculation on the basis of the 1989 results exclusively. The Chairman of the Scientific Council replied that the F0.1 TAC would be 7,000 metric tons, although there were some doubts about the validity of the 1989 survey results.
63. The delegate of the USSR noted the embarrassing decline in the stock although a TAC of 25,000 metric tons had been maintained for many years. He wondered whether environmental or oceanographic factors had contributed to the current condition of the stock. He expressed support in principle for the scientific advice but intended to reflect further before adopting a final position.
64. The delegate of Canada observed that the advised TAC of 14,000 tonnes, being the outcome of averaged scientific data, could be on the liberal side of prudence, especially in light of the high reported landings and unreported non-member catches in recent years. The sharp decline in the 1989 acoustic survey results might be confirmed next year. He nevertheless supported the advised TAC of 14,000 metric tons for 1991. The delegate of the USSR agreed.
65. Under Agenda Item 15 (c), American plaice in Div. 3LNO, the Chairman of the Scientific Council noted catches above TACs in recent years and above the Fmax level in 1989, as well as the declining spawning stock biomass and the deteriorating exploitation pattern. The delegate of Canada deplored the current condition of the stock, given its importance to the Canadian fishing industry, especially in Newfoundland. He drew the attention of delegates to the conclusion on page 26 of SCS Doc. 90/23 regarding the effective mesh size probably being used in the Spanish fishery for the stock. He supported the F0.1 TAC of 25,800 metric tons presented in Option A for management of the stock in 1991, on the grounds that it could be assumed with some confidence that the 1990 catches would approximate the TAC set for 1990. The delegate of the EEC agreed that it was justifiable to assume that 1990 catches would be close to the 1990 TAC.
66. At the suggestion of the Chairman, it was agreed that the Fisheries Commission would adjourn at 16:30 hours, in order to allow for a meeting of STACTIC to consider the proposals of the delegate of Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greeland) regarding improvements to the program of surveillance and control.
67. Under Agenda Item 15 (d), yellowtail flounder in Div. 3LNO, the Chairman of the Scientific Council explained the slightly increased TAC of 7,000 metric tons recommended for 1991, citing improved recruitment and a stable biomass. The delegate of Canada expressed concern about the size distribution in catches and the lower yield per recruit. He was prepared, however, to support a TAC of 7,000 metric tons for 1991. The Chairman of the Scientific Council responded that the recommended TAC made no allowance

for reduced yield per recruit due to a changed exploitation pattern. He suggested that it would be better to modify the exploitation pattern than to reduce the TAC. The delegate of Canada replied that his real concern derived from the high proportion of small fish taken in the 3LNO American plaice fishery.

68. Under Agenda Item 15 (e), witch flounder in Div. 3NO, the Chairman of the Scientific Council acknowledged that little was known about the stock. He expressed concern about excessive catch levels and declining catch rates. The advice, however, was to maintain the 1990 TAC of 5,000 metric tons in 1991. The delegate of Canada indicated that Canada and another Contracting Party had discussed possible joint deep water surveys and that better information might result. Meanwhile, he thought it would be prudent to accept the recommended TAC.
69. Under Agenda Item 15 (f), capelin in Div. 3NO, the Chairman of the Scientific Council reviewed the advice given previously. The delegate of the USSR pointed to several indicators of improved stock condition. He was of the opinion that the exploitation could be higher than in previous years and that it was not appropriate to adopt a conservative management strategy for such a short lived fish. He was convinced that a higher exploitation rate would not damage the stock. The delegate of Canada stressed the importance of the stock as a food supply for marine mammals and sea birds and cited the public sensitivity, in Canada and elsewhere, to the well-being of the latter. The Chairman of the Scientific Council agreed that capelin was a major food supply for sea mammals and birds and that collapse of capelin stocks in other areas of the north Atlantic had had effects on gadoid species. The delegate of Canada reiterated his concern about public sensitivity on that question. The delegate of the USSR inquired whether the advised exploitation rate had taken predation levels into account. The Chairman of the Scientific Council answered that it had not. The delegate of the USSR repeated his conviction that a 10% exploitation rate was an erroneous management strategy for the stock and disputed the relevance of public sensitivity as a factor to be weighed by the Fisheries Commission. He requested that the exploitation rate be reconsidered.
70. The delegate of Norway noted that capelin died after spawning and asked if there were a relationship between the spawning stock biomass and recruitment. The Chairman of the Scientific Council replied that there was no established spawning stock biomass/recruitment relationship and that the Scientific Council had not considered alternative management strategies. The delegate of Canada queried the present size of the biomass compared to historic levels. The Chairman of the Scientific Council replied that the size of the 1988 and 1989 year classes were unknown and that the biomass had been as high as 900,000 tonnes in the 1970s. The delegate of Canada, referring to the stock summary sheet in the Scientific Council Report, observed that the present biomass size was in fact about one-third the biomass since the mid-1970s. It was then agreed to continue discussion at a later meeting, given the need to allow sufficient time for a meeting of STACTIC.

After it was agreed to resume at 10:30 hours on September 13, the meeting adjourned at 16:30 hours.

The meeting reconvened at 11:30 hours on 13 September 1990.

71. Under Agenda Item 15 (f), the Chairman asked if there were any further comments, noting the recommended TAC of 30,000 metric tons. None were forthcoming.
72. Under Agenda Item 15(g), Squid (Illex) in Subareas 3 and 4, the Chairman of the Scientific Council noted the short life span of the stock and its unpredictable availability and advised that the Scientific Council had consequently provided no scientific advice. That was registered.
73. Under Agenda Item 15 (a), Cod in Div. 3M, the Chairman of STACTIC presented the report responding to the requests of the Fisheries Commission (FC Doc. 90/8). The delegate of Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland) complimented the Chairman of STACTIC on the report and proposed the establishment of two Working Groups, one to consider short term tasks, such as the hail system and vessel and gear markings, and the other to examine more long term projects, such as the observer program and an electronic tracking system. The Chairman asked if the Working Groups were to be proposed by STACTIC or the Fisheries Commission. The delegate of Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland) replied that the Fisheries Commission should set the deadlines for completion of the assigned tasks and STACTIC should appoint the members of the Working Groups.
74. The delegate of Poland reminded delegates that COFI/FAO together with the IMO had prepared recommendations on vessel and gear markings, which should be followed by STACTIC. The delegate of the EEC thanked STACTIC for its very valuable work despite the short notice and the concrete proposals to correct the embarrassing control system now prevailing in the Regulatory Area. He thought the proposals should be considered by a Working Group as soon as possible and that their applicability should not be confined to Division 3M. He pointed, however, to difficulties of capacity, time and money. The delegate of Canada agreed that the new proposals should be applicable to the entire Regulatory Area and asked if the short term tasks could be in place by the end of 1990. He was convinced that such an undertaking should be a priority issue for NAFO and was especially welcome to Canada as a coastal state.
75. The delegate of Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland) observed that on the basis of his own experience a hail system should be ready for implementation in the Regulatory Area by the end of 1990. He thought in any case that the end of 1990 should be the target deadline. He proposed the Working Group report by December 1, 1990, followed by a special meeting of the Fisheries Commission or a mail vote. The delegate of Norway stated that a hail system would work properly only if the hail reports were to the NAFO Secretariat rather than to Contracting Parties. It would be essential to have a single source of information. The delegate of Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland) suggested that terms of reference would have to be prepared for both Working Groups and noted that the long term Working Group could be requested to report to the Fisheries Commission at the 1991 Annual Meeting.
76. The delegate of Canada proposed that STACTIC should be asked to prepare a detailed work plan and report to the Fisheries Commission on September 14. The Chairman of STACTIC agreed and requested that the members of the Working Groups should be appointed by Contracting Parties before the end of the current Annual Meeting to avoid further delays. The Chairman agreed. The delegate of the EEC asked whether there could be only one Working Group, with separate terms of reference for the short term and the

long term tasks. He invited the Working Group to have its first meeting in Brussels. The Chairman asked for further comments to be incorporated into a final report from STACTIC on September 14. The delegate of the USSR supported the foregoing interventions and welcomed the EEC's suggestion for a quick meeting in Brussels. He also supported the suggestion of a single Working Group with separate terms of reference. He proposed that the Working Group should refer in its deliberations to the NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures. Agreement was reached and discussion concluded.

77. The Chairman referred to the question of the previous day from the delegate of Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland) regarding cod by-catches in Div. 3M (see item 58 of this Report) and called on Mr. R. Prier of the Canadian delegation to provide the answer. He explained that under the terms of Rules A1 and 2 of Part I of the Conservation and Enforcement Measures (FC Doc. 82/IX/13) the by-catches (or incidental catches) counted against national quotas.
78. Under Agenda Item 15 (a), Cod in Div. 3M, the delegate of the EEC inquired whether his question of the day before about limiting redfish catches to depths of more than 400 metres could be referred to the Scientific Council. The delegate of Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland) supported the reference to the Scientific Council but thought that the depth curve separating redfish from cod perhaps began at 500 metres. The Chairman of the Scientific Council agreed to study the matter and report later.
79. Under Agenda Item 14 (a), cod in Div. 3M, the delegate of Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland) formally proposed a return to the management regime for the stock followed during the 1982-87 period of a fixed TAC until the stock reached a biomass level of 85,000 metric tons. He explained that the TAC set during that period, 12,965 metric tons, was accepted by NAFO, although it had no scientific merit. He inferred from the deliberations of the previous day that the 3M cod biomass was probably now at a level of about 50,000 metric tons. The delegate of Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland) explained further that the regulated by-catch limit for 3M cod in the existing 3M fisheries was 25,000 metric tons. This meant that a 3M cod TAC of 12,965 metric tons in 1991 would result in an actual directed catch of about 10,000 metric tons, which corresponded to an F value of F0.18 or F0.19, very close to the standard F0.1 value. He therefore proposed a TAC of 12,965 metric tons for 3M cod in 1991.
80. The Chairman indicated that delegates should make specific TAC proposals on a stock by stock basis. The delegate of Norway seconded the Danish proposal for 3M cod. The delegate of Canada asked if all proposals were to be seconded. The Chairman replied that proposals were to be simply tabled but understood that the delegate of Norway supported the 3M cod proposal of the delegate of Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland).
81. The delegate of Canada expressed his philosophical commitment to the scientific advice for continuation of the 3M cod moratorium in 1991. That said, he indicated that the Canadian delegation was prepared to consider the matter further, especially in light of STACTIC proposals to come on an improved program of surveillance and control. The Chairman indicated that he would accept proposals at the time but voting would be delayed until delegations had had time to prepare.

82. The delegate of the EEC indicated support for the Canadian position in favour of continuation of the 3M cod moratorium in 1991. He added that the EEC, like Canada, would consider further the context of the Danish proposal as well as the scientific assessment of the current state of the stock.
83. Under Agenda Item 14 (b), redfish in Div. 3M, the delegate of Canada proposed a TAC of 43,000 metric tons, in accordance with the scientific advice. He added that he wanted nevertheless to listen to comments on his proposal from other Contracting Parties. The delegate of the USSR noted that the scientific assessment of the stock showed no signs of decline and expressed the opinion that the 1991 TAC could be set higher than the lowest option provided by the Scientific Council, 43,000 metric tons, without damage to the stock. He urged Contracting Parties to consider again the options contained in the Scientific Council report.
84. The delegate of the EEC thought that the TAC could be fixed at a level between the 43,000 and 78,000 metric tons options and suggested that maintaining the 1990 TAC of 50,000 metric tons would be appropriate. Although he did not want to suggest that a 50,000 metric ton TAC for the stock should become a matter of routine, he considered it would be desirable to maintain stability in the fishery for another year. The Chairman proposed that delegations should meet informally to continue discussions. That was agreed.
85. Under Agenda Item 14 (c), American plaice in Div. 3M, the delegate of Canada proposed maintaining the 1990 TAC of 2,000 metric tons, in accordance with the scientific advice. The delegate of the EEC recalled that the TAC for the stock had been set at 2,000 metric tons since 1976 and proposed, in light of the positive scientific assessment, that the TAC should be set at 2,500 metric tons, below the likely Fmax level of 3,000 metric tons. There was no further discussion.
86. Under Agenda Item 15 (a), cod in Div. 3NO, the delegate of Canada proposed a TAC of 13,600 metric tons, in accordance with the scientific advice. The delegate of the EEC favoured a higher TAC but intended to reflect further, keeping in mind that the Canadian proposal represented a significant reduction from the TAC of 18,600 metric tons established for 1990. The delegate of the USSR observed that he too intended to reflect further, in particular on the need to fix the TAC at a level that would allow for growth in the size of the spawning stock biomass.
87. Under Agenda Item 15 (b), redfish in Div. 3LN, the delegate of Canada proposed a TAC of 14,000 metric tons, in accordance with the scientific advice. The delegate of the GDR reminded delegates that the Scientific Council had provided two management options for 1991: 25,000 metric tons (Fmax) and 14,000 metric tons (F0.1). He supported a compromise solution that would both protect the stock and prevent economic dislocation and therefore proposed a 3LN redfish TAC for 1991 of 20,000 metric tons. The delegate of Canada recalled the unequivocal language used in the Scientific Council report to describe the present poor condition of the 3LN redfish stock and observed that a TAC of 14,000 metric tons might be, in fact, too high. The delegate of the EEC noted that the 14,000 metric ton TAC recommended by the Scientific Council represented a reduction of 11,000 metric tons from 1990. A drop of such significance could not be accepted lightly and he intended to reflect further before adopting a final position.

88. Under Agenda Item 15 (c), American plaice in Div. 3LNO, the delegate of Canada proposed a TAC of 25,800 metric tons, in accordance with scientific advice. The delegate of the EEC noted the reasonable approach of Canada to management of the stock in 1991. He expressed appreciation for the different management options provided by the Scientific Council and observed that the scientific assessment appeared to support a 1991 TAC as proposed by the delegate of Canada. He thought it correct to assume that 1990 catches would approximate the 24,900 metric tons TAC set for 1990.
89. Under Agenda Item 15 (d), yellowtail flounder in Div. 3LNO, the delegate of Canada proposed a TAC of 7,000 metric tons, in accordance with scientific advice. The delegate of the EEC agreed that the Canadian proposal was reasonable and accorded with the scientific advice.
90. Under Agenda Item 15 (e), witch flounder in Div. 3NO, the delegate of Canada proposed a TAC of 5,000 metric tons, in accordance with scientific advice. The delegate of the USSR expressed support for the scientific advice but wished to receive from the Chairman of the Scientific Council a report on the effect on the stock of maintaining the TAC at 5,000 metric tons for a ten year period.
91. Under Agenda Item 15 (f), capelin in Div. 3NO, the delegate of Canada stated that he had a twofold proposal: a 1991 TAC of 30,000 metric tons, in accordance with scientific advice and a request to the Scientific Council for a report at the next Annual Meeting on various aspects of managing 3NO capelin (FC Doc. 90/10). The delegate of the USSR indicated that he had no objections to the scientific assessment of that stock but disagreed with the recommended exploitation rate of 10%, which he judged to have no scientific basis whatsoever. He expressed support for the second component of the Canadian proposal but wished to specify that the Scientific Council should consider explicitly whether 3NO capelin should be managed in accordance with the principle of optimum utilization set out in the NAFO Convention. He also proposed that the Scientific Council should establish a Working Group to meet on that question in January or February 1992. The delegate of Norway requested that the Canadian and USSR proposals be distributed in writing for the consideration of other Contracting Parties. That was agreed.
92. Under Agenda Item 15 (g), squid (Illex) in Subareas 3 and 4, the delegate of Canada proposed, in the absence of scientific advice, maintenance of the 1990 nominal TAC of 150,000 metric tons. The delegate of the EEC supported the Canadian proposals for both 3NO capelin and the squid stock. The delegate of the USSR supported a TAC in 1991 of 150,000 metric tons but thought the Scientific Council should be requested to provide advice and a TAC recommendation for the stock to the Annual Meeting in 1991.
93. At the suggestion of the delegate of the EEC, it was agreed that all requests to the Scientific Council should be tabled in writing. Delegates then agreed to adjourn and to reconvene at 16:00 hours. The delegate of Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland) proposed a meeting of STACTIC in the meantime. That was agreed. The Chairman of the Scientific Council requested consultation with Contracting Party representatives to determine a time for a meeting of the Scientific Council.

The meeting adjourned at 12:45 hours.

The meeting reconvened at 17:25 hours.

94. The delegate of the EEC apologized for having delayed resumption of the meeting and requested postponement of voting on the various TAC proposals to September 14. That was agreed. The Chairman directed that the meeting would reconvene at 07:00 hours on 14 September 1990.

The meeting adjourned at 17:45 hours.

The meeting resumed at 07:25 hours, September 14, 1990.

95. In response to the question of the previous day from the delegate of the EEC limiting 3M redfish fisheries to certain depths, the Chairman of the Scientific Council indicated that cod by-catches decline significantly at depths below 400-500 metres. At the same time, however, reduced redfish catch rates are experienced at the lower depths. More detailed information might clarify the problem. The delegate of the EEC requested the Scientific Council to research the question.
96. The Chairman asked for formal TAC proposals on a stock by stock basis. Under Agenda Item 14(a), Cod in Div. 3M, the delegate of Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland) proposed a TAC of 12,965 metric tons, seconded by the delegate of Norway and supported by the delegate of Cuba. The delegate of Canada recalled his already expressed concern about changing the management regime of that stock and departing from the scientific advice to continue the moratorium and stated his intention to abstain. The delegate of the EEC echoed the Canadian concerns and requested a formal vote. The Danish proposal was carried by eight votes in favour: Bulgaria, Cuba, Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland), the GDR, Japan, Norway, Poland and the USSR and two abstentions: Canada and the EEC.
97. Under Agenda Item 14(b), Redfish in Div. 3M, the delegate of the USSR proposed a TAC of 50,000 metric tons. The delegate of Canada proposed that the TAC for that stock be set at 50,000 metric tons for 1991, subject to acoustic survey results during the year and advice next year from the Scientific Council whether the biomass had reached a level of 450,000 metric tons. The delegate of the EEC thought a 50,000 metric ton TAC was justifiable and expressed support for it. Support was also voiced by the delegates of the GDR and Cuba. The delegate of the USSR agreed with the Canadian proposal. The delegate of the EEC agreed with the Canadian concerns but objected to restricting the authority of the Fisheries Commission to make a decision at the next Annual Meeting. The Chairman proposed that the decision for 1991 be taken without conditions but that the Canadian concerns be put on the record. That was agreed. The USSR proposal was carried unanimously.
98. Under Agenda Item 14(c), American plaice in Div. 3M, the delegate of Canada proposed a TAC of 2,000 metric tons, seconded by Denmark and Bulgaria. The delegate of the EEC proposed a TAC of 2,500 metric tons. A discussion ensued on voting procedure, concluding with agreement that NAFO practice dictated a vote first on the second, EEC proposal. The delegate of the USSR, in the interests of achieving consensus, expressed support for the Canadian proposal but suggested an additional quota of 500 metric tons for Others. The delegate of Japan objected to the USSR proposal as an unacceptable precedent for setting the Others quota. The delegate of the GDR then seconded the EEC proposal, which was defeated by a vote of two in favour: the EEC and the GDR; six against: Canada, Cuba, Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland), Japan, Norway and Poland; and two

abstentions: Bulgaria and the USSR. The Canadian proposal was then carried unanimously. For the record, the delegate of the EEC explained that he had supported the Canadian proposal in order to vote with the majority but judged nevertheless that a TAC of 2,500 metric tons would have been scientifically justified.

99. Under Agenda Item 15(a), Cod in Div. 3NO, the delegate of Canada proposed a TAC of 13,600 metric tons, seconded by the USSR. The delegate of the EEC proposed a TAC of 17,000 metric tons, in keeping with his understanding of the scientific advice and socio-economic considerations. The delegate of Norway expressed agreement generally with the EEC remarks but noted that the scientific advice called for caution. On that basis, he wished to second the Canadian proposal. The delegate of the GDR seconded the EEC proposal. The EEC proposal was defeated by two votes in favour: the EEC and the GDR; and eight against: Bulgaria, Canada, Cuba, Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland), Japan, Norway, Poland and the USSR. The Canadian proposal was then carried unanimously. For the record, the delegate of the EEC explained that he had voted in favour in accordance with the apparent wishes of the majority, although he maintained his stated position that a TAC of 17,000 metric tons would have been scientifically justified. The delegate of the GDR also explained for the record that he had voted with the majority in a spirit of compromise.
100. Under Agenda Item 15(b), Redfish in Div. 3LN, the delegate of Canada proposed a TAC of 14,000 metric tons, seconded by Poland. The delegate of the GDR proposed a TAC of 20,000 metric tons. The delegate of the EEC, emphasizing that he was not seconding the GDR proposal, expressed support for it on the grounds that a TAC of 14,000 metric tons in 1991 was too sharp a decline from the 1990 TAC of 25,000 metric tons and that the GDR proposal was scientifically justified. The Chairman called for a seconder for the GDR proposal. The delegate of Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland) expressed support for the Canadian proposal. The delegate of the USSR indicated support for the more cautious TAC of 14,000 metric tons because the TACs had been significantly exceeded in recent years and the stock was consequently in poor condition. He explained, however, that he felt inclined to support the GDR proposal because the USSR fleet stood to lose the most from setting the TAC at the lower level. In answer to a question from the delegate of the EEC, the Executive Secretary confirmed that a proposal did not need a seconder for a vote to proceed. The delegate of the EEC observed that NAFO rules on procedural questions such as the one just placed should be set down in writing. The GDR proposal was then put to a vote and defeated by one vote in favour: the GDR; seven votes against: Bulgaria, Canada, Cuba, Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland), Japan, Norway and Poland; and two abstentions: the EEC and the USSR. The Canadian proposal was then carried by eight votes in favour: Bulgaria, Canada, Cuba, Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland), Japan, Norway, Poland and the USSR; and two abstentions: the EEC and the GDR.
101. Under Agenda Item 15(c), American plaice in Div. 3LNO, the delegate of Canada proposed a TAC of 25,800 metric tons, seconded by the USSR, in accordance with the scientific advice and minimal interest in the stock by the USSR fleet. There were no other proposals and the Canadian proposal was carried by consensus.

102. Under Agenda Item 15(d), Yellowtail flounder in Div. 3LNO, the delegate of Canada proposed a TAC of 7,000 metric tons. There were no other proposals and the Canadian proposal was carried by consensus.
103. Under Agenda Item 15(e), Witch flounder in Div. 3NO, the delegate of Canada proposed a TAC of 5,000 metric tons, seconded by the USSR, who asked to have on record his request of the previous day for a scientific assessment of the effect on the stock of keeping the TAC at that level for many years. The Canadian proposal was carried by eight votes in favour: Bulgaria, Canada, Cuba, Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland), Japan, Norway, Poland and the USSR; and two abstentions: the EEC and the GDR.
104. Under Agenda Item 15(f), Capelin in Div. 3NO, the delegate of Canada, jointly with the delegate of the USSR, made a twofold proposal of a) a TAC of 30,000 metric tons; and b) a request to the Scientific Council for advice on managing the stock in accordance with the NAFO principle of optimum utilization (FC Doc. 90/9). The delegate of the USSR expressed his full support for the Canadian proposal but stressed again, for the record, his view that a TAC of 30,000 metric tons, based on an exploitation rate of 10 per cent, had no scientific basis whatsoever. There were no other proposals and the Canadian proposal was adopted by consensus.
105. Under Agenda Item 15(g), Squid (*Illex*) in Subareas 3 and 4, the delegate of Canada proposed a TAC of 150,000 metric tons, seconded by the USSR, noting, however, his view that the proposed TAC had no scientific basis. There were no other proposals and the Canadian proposal was carried by consensus.
106. Under Agenda Item 15(h), Cod in Div. 3L, the delegate of Canada opened the discussion, noting the current very serious condition of the 2J3KL cod stock, its special importance to Canadian Atlantic fishing communities and the drastic action now being taken by the Government of Canada to ensure its recovery. Recalling NAFO's decision for the last three years to establish a moratorium on fishing for that stock in Div. 3L outside the Canadian 200 mile limit, the delegate of Canada sought continuation of the moratorium for 1991, citing the same reasons given in previous years: the stock occurred almost exclusively inside the Canadian fishing zone and was fully subscribed inside the Canadian zone.
107. The delegate of the USSR expressed support for continuation of the moratorium for 1991, noting that the Labrador cod stock had been in the past the basis of the northwest Atlantic fisheries, including those of the USSR fleet. He added that wide annual fluctuations were characteristic of the stock and appreciated the Canadian difficulties in managing it. He offered the assistance of Soviet scientific experts. The delegate of Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland) observed that the Fisheries Commission had discussed the problem before and that while he understood the Canadian difficulties, he did not think continuation of the moratorium was the proper solution. He concluded that Danish vessels would nevertheless respect the decision of NAFO.
108. The delegate of the EEC noted his understanding of the Canadian difficulties in managing the stock and appreciated its importance to Canada. Part of the stock, however, occurred outside the Canadian zone and, although small, this part should therefore be managed by NAFO, consistently with management measures decided by Canada, as set out in Article 11 of the NAFO Convention. A moratorium applicable only outside

the Canadian 200 mile limit was not consistent with Canadian management decisions. He therefore formally objected to the Canadian proposal. The Canadian proposal was then carried by six votes in favour: Bulgaria, Canada, Cuba, Japan, Poland and the USSR; two votes against: the EEC and the GDR; and two abstentions: Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland) and Norway. The delegate of the EEC explained for the record that he had voted against the proposal because the Fisheries Commission did not have scientific advice in support of the moratorium.

109. Under Agenda Item 16, Fishing Activities by Vessels of Non-Member States in the Regulatory Area, the delegate of Canada indicated that two pertinent documents were not in delegates' boxes: a draft resolution and a proposal for establishment of a Standing Committee to continue study of the matter. He suggested that the Fisheries Commission Report note that the subject would be discussed in the General Council. That was agreed.
110. Under Agenda Items 9, Conservation and Enforcement Measures, 10, Annual Return of Infringements, 11, Fishing Vessel Registration and 12, Report of STACTIC, the Chairman of STACTIC reported on the very productive deliberations in STACTIC and highlighted certain elements of the final Report of STACTIC (Appendix 4). The Chairman of STACTIC noted the very gratifying increase in support that year for programs of international control in the Regulatory Area. The delegates of Canada, Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland), the USSR and the EEC expressed their appreciation for the excellent work produced by STACTIC and their thanks to the Contracting Party representatives on the Committee. The Chairman also expressed his thanks to the Committee and its members. The Report was adopted unanimously.
111. Under Agenda Items 14, Management Measures of Fish Stocks in the Regulatory Area and 15, Management Measures of Fish Stocks Overlapping National Fishing Limits, the Chairman indicated that the proposed Quota Table of 1991 had been distributed. He informed delegates that the quotas to each Contracting Party for each stock had been determined in accordance with the past distribution key and asked if the Table could be adopted by consensus. The delegate of the USSR proposed adoption of the Quota Table, seconded by Cuba.
112. The delegate of the EEC indicated that he had no difficulties with the Table but observed that Footnote 7 was new and should not be in the Table but rather in the record as a unilateral statement by Canada in order not to prejudice a decision by the Fisheries Commission in 1992. The delegate of the EEC formally requested deletion of footnote 7 from the Table. The delegate of the EEC asked whether Footnote 3, stipulating a July 1 opening date for the fishery, was necessary. Regarding Footnote 7, the delegate of Canada agreed that it should be deleted from the table. The Chairman of the Scientific Council, in reply to the question on Footnote 3, explained that squid enjoy a rapid growth rate during their one year life span and the July 1 opening date for the fishery was necessary to ensure that the fish had reached a reasonable size for exploitation. The delegate of the EEC accepted that explanation.
113. The delegate of the EEC inquired whether Footnote 4 should be re-formulated to make it applicable to all quota transfers, of which there were many, rather than to squid only. The delegate of Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland) reminded delegates that Agenda Item 17 dealt with the question of quota transfers and noted that squid was the only

stock which did not require a vote before a quota transfer could be finalized. He suggested that the question of quota transfers should be discussed generally before any change was made to the transfer rule for squid. The delegate of the EEC agreed.

114. The Chairman asked if the Quota Table for 1991 could be adopted as circulated. The delegate of the EEC responded that he accepted it without Footnote 7. On that understanding, the Table was adopted by consensus.
115. Under Agenda Item 17, Transfer of Quotas between Member States, the delegate of Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland) explained that Denmark had requested a discussion of this item because of the lack of balance between on the one hand the present rigid quota-key system, and on the other hand the two only flexibilities in the system: the "other quotas" (which are very small) and the present practice of quota transfers. Because of lack of time it was agreed that the item would be on the 1991 agenda for the Fisheries Commission.
116. Under Agenda Item 18, Time and Place of Next Meeting, it was agreed that the Fisheries Commission would abide by the decision of the General Council on the matter.
117. Under Agenda Item 19, Other Business, the delegate of Norway, referring to FC Doc. 90/9, reminded delegates that the report of the Working Group on Surveillance and Control would be circulated to Contracting Parties by December 1, 1990 and asked what was to be done then in response to the report. He explained that could be either an extraordinary meeting of the Fisheries Commission or a mail vote. He favoured the latter option. The Chairman proposed a 30-day mail vote on the recommendations contained in the report. The delegate of Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland) noted that it was hard to make a final decision at that stage but that it would be important to acknowledge the Working Group Report as soon as possible after its circulation and to vote on it before the end of the year. That was agreed.
118. The delegate of the EEC asked whether a draft of the Fisheries Commission's request to the Scientific Council had been circulated and how it was to be dealt with. The Chairman replied that the draft request (FC Doc. 90/10) had been circulated and requested comments. The text of the request as circulated was adopted by consensus.
119. The delegate of the EEC requested the record to show that since he had abstained in the votes on the TACs for 3LN redfish and 3NO witch flounder, it followed logically that the EEC abstained also on the quotas established for those stocks as set out in the Quota Table. In response to a question from the delegate of Canada, the delegate of the EEC confirmed that he had also abstained in the vote on the TAC for 3M cod.

Following closing remarks by the Chairman and delegates, the meeting adjourned at 1030 hours.

Appendix 1LIST OF PARTICIPANTS-12th ANNUAL MEETINGBULGARIA

Head of Delegation: L. Yanev
Chairman "RIBNO STOPANSTVO"
No. 3 Industrialna Str
Bourgas

Alternate

P. Kolarov, Research Secretary, Institute of Fisheries, Boul. Chervenoarmeisky No. 4, 9000 Varna

Representative

L. Yanev (see address above)
C. Panayotov, Trade Commissioner of Bulgaria, 100 Adelaide Street W, Suite 1405, Toronto, Ontario
M5H 1S3

Advisers

P. I. Roussinov, Director "Foreign Economic Cooperation", "RIBNO STOPANTSVO", No. 3 Industrialna Str., Bourgas

CANADA

Head of Delegation: P. Meyboom
Deputy Minister
Fisheries and Oceans
200 Kent Street
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6

Alternate

V. Rabinovitch, Assistant Deputy Minister, International Relations, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans,
200 Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6

Representatives

P. Meyboom (see address above)
M. Yeadon, Vice-President, Fleet Operations and Government Relations, National Sea Products, P. O.
Box 2130, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3L 4R7
R. Cashin, Fishermen Food and Allied Workers, P. O. Box 10, St. John's, Newfoundland

Advisers

C. J. Allen, Resource Allocation Br., Atlantic Fisheries, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent St., Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
B. Applebaum, Director-General, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
B. E. Armstrong, Office of Ambassador for Marine Conservation, Dept. of External Affairs, 125 Sussex Dr., Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0G2
J. S. Beckett, Director, Fisheries Research Branch, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent Street, 12th Floor, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
N. Bellefontaine, Regional Director, Fisheries & Habitat Management, Dept. of Fisheries, Scotia Fundy Region, P. O. Box 550, Halifax, N. S. B3J 2S7
R. Belliveau, Deputy Director, Fisheries Trade Policy Div., Dept. of External Affairs, 125 Sussex Drive, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0G2
J. P. Lussiaa-Berdou, Ministere de l'Agriculture, des Pecheries et de l'Alimentation, 200A Chemin Ste Foy, Quebec, QC G1R 4X6
A. Blum, Director General, European Community Bureau, Dept. of External Affairs, 125 Sussex Drive, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0G2
W. R. Bowering, Dept. of Fisheries & Oceans, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1
B. Chapman, President, Fisheries Association of Newfoundland and Labrador Ltd., P. O. Box 8900, St. John's, Newfoundland A1B 3R9
H. Clarke, Vice-President, Fishery Products Intl., 70 O'Leary Avenue, P. O. Box 550, St. John's, Newfoundland

- L. J. Dean, Adm Policy Planning, Dept. of Fisheries, Gov't of Nfld-Labrador, P. O. Box 8700, St. John's, Newfoundland A1B 4J6
- D. Delcorde, International Commissions Finance and Administrative Officer, 1452-200 Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
- E. B. Dunne, Director General, Newfoundland Region, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1
- L. Forand, A/Director, Atlantic Div., International Directorate, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent St., Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
- D. Gill, East Bloc Officer, International Directorate, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
- J. E. Hache, A/Assistant Deputy Minister, Atlantic Fisheries, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent St., Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
- C. L. Jones, Senior Advisor, Foreign Fisheries, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 550, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 2S7
- J. A. Lugar, Executive Assistant, Seafood Producers Association of Nova Scotia, P. O. Box 991, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia B2Y 3Z6
- C. MacKinnon, Marine Advisor, Groundfish and Seaplants, N. S. Dept. of Fisheries, P. O. Box 2223, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 3C4
- E. McCurdy, Secretary-Treasurer, Fishermen Food and Allied Workers, P. O. Box 10, St. John's, Newfoundland
- P. McGuiness, Vice-President, Fisheries Council of Canada, 77 Metcalfe St., Suite 505, Ottawa, Ontario K1P 5L6
- B. Mewdell, Communications Manager, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent Street, Room 1411, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
- E. Mundell, International Directorate, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
- W. M. Murphy, Mersey Seafoods Ltd., P. O. Box 1290, Liverpool, Nova Scotia B0T 1K0
- M. C. O'Connor, Manager, Fleet Services, National Sea Products, 1959 Upper Water St., 6th Floor, Halifax, Nova Scotia
- A. Peart, Ministers Office, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent St., 15th Floor, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
- R. J. Prier, Director, Conservation and Protection, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 550, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 2S7
- D. Rivard, Senior Advisor, Marine Fish, Fisheries Research Br., Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
- M. Short, Director, Inshore Fishery, Fishermen Food and Allied Workers, Box 10, 53 Bond St., St. John's, Newfoundland
- J. M. Sloan, Communications Mgr., External Affairs & International Trade, C-2, BPT...Lester B. Pearson Bldg., 125 Sussex Drive, Ottawa, Ontario K2P 1B3
- R. Stirling, President, Seafood Producers Assn. of N. S., P. O. Box 991, Dartmouth, N. S. B2Y 3Z6
- L. Strowbridge, Enforcement Coordinator (Offshore), Nfld. Region, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1
- N. Taylor, Assistant International Fisheries Officer, Stn. 1452, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
- G. Traverse, Chief Resource Management Div., Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1
- H. Trudeau, Director, Atlantic Operations, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent St., Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
- D. Vardy, Deputy Minister of Fisheries, Government of Newfoundland, P. O. Box 8700, Confederation Bldg., St. John's, Newfoundland A1B 4J6
- K. Veinot, Chief, Enforcement & Training, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 550, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 2S7
- F. Way, Nfld. Dept. of Fisheries, Confederation Bldg., St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5T7
- E. Wiseman, Counsellor (Fisheries), Canadian Mission to the European Communities, 2, Av de Tervuren, 1040 Brussels, Belgium
- F. Woodman, Chairman, Fisheries Council of Canada, 77 Metcalfe St., Suite 505, Ottawa, Ontario K1P 5L6

CUBA

Head of Delegation: A. Carcedo
 Director, Relaciones Internacionales
 Ministerio de la Industria Pesquera
 Barlovento, Sta Fe, Havana

Alternate

- O. Muniz, Representative of the Cuban Fishing Fleet in Canada, c/o Pickford and Black Ltd., P. O. Box 1117, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 2X1

Representatives

A. Carcedo (see address above)

Advisers

B. Garcia, International Organizations Specialist, Direccion de Relaciones Internacionales, Ministerio de la Industria Pesquera, Barlovento, Sta Fe, Playa, La Habana

DENMARK (in respect of Faroes and Greenland)

Head of Delegation: E. Lemche
Gronlands Hjemmestyre
Sjæleboerne 2
DK 1122 Copenhagen
Denmark

Alternate

K. Hoydal, Director of Fisheries, Foroya Landsstyri, Box 64, FR-110, Faroe Islands

Representatives

E. Lemche (see address above)
O. H. Larsen, Head of Section, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Asiatisk Plads 2, DK-1448, Copenhagen

Advisers

S. Christensen, Greenland Home Rule, Box 269, 3900 Nuuk, Greenland
M. Olsen, Skaltavegur 30, FR-700, Klaksvik, Faroe Islands
M. Olsen, Joensen & Olsen, 700 Klaksvik, Faroe Islands
Sv. Aa. Horsted, Gronlands Fiskeri Undersogelser, Tagensvej 135, DK-2200, Kobenhaven N, Denmark
H. Hovgaard, Greenland Fisheries Research Institute, Tagensvej 135, DK 2200, Kobenhaven N, Denmark
H. Lassen, Gronlands Fiskeri Undersogelser, Tagensvej 135, 1, DK-2200, Kobenhaven N, Denmark
H. Leth, Head of Section, Greenland Home Rule, Box 269, 3900 Nuuk, Greenland

EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY (EEC)

Head of Delegation: P. Hillenkamp
Acting Counsellor
Commission of the European Communities
200 Rue de la Loi
B1049 Brussels

Representatives

P. Hillenkamp (see address above)

Advisers

J. Lecomte, Ambassador, Delegation of the Commission of the European Communities, 350 Sparks St., Suite 1110, Ottawa, Ontario K1R 7S8
M. Newman, Administrator-Inspection and Control, Commission of the European Communities, 200 Rue de la Loi, 1049 Brussels
R. Noe, Principal, Administrator, Directorate General for Fisheries, Commission of the European Communities, JII 99, 6/40, 200 Rue de la Loi, B 1049 Brussels
H. I. Duck, Director, Secretariat General of the Council of the EEC, 170 Rue de la Loi, Brussels 1048
F. Zampini, Embassy of Italy, 275 Slater St., Ottawa, Ontario K1P 5H9
D. J. Dunkley, Inspection and Control DG XIV, Commission of the European Communities, Rue Joseph II 99, 7/24, 1049 Brussels
T. Abadia, Principal Administrator, Commission of European Communities, Rue de la Loi 200, B-1049 Brussels
G. F. Kingston, Senior Assistant, Economic & Commercial Affairs, EEC Delegation 350 Sparks St., Suite 1110, Ottawa, Ontario K1S 1A3
C. Albuquerque, Director de Servicos, Direccao Geral das Pescas, Av Brasilia, 1400 Lisboa, Portugal
M. I. Aragon, Jefe de Seccion, Ortega y Gasset 57, Madrid, Spain
N. Bollen, Ministry of Agriculture Marine Management and Fisheries, Bezuidenhoutswaeg 73, P. O. Box 20401, 2500 EK The Hague, The Netherlands

- C. Soto Calvo, Subdirectora General de Relaciones, Pesqueras Internacionales, Jose Ortega y Gasset, 57, 28006 Madrid, Spain
- E. Cardenas, Instituto Espanol de Oceanografia, P. O. Box 240, Santander, Spain
- H. P. Cornus, Sea Fisheries Institute, Hamburg 50, Federal Republic of Germany
- J. Fontan, General Manager, ASPE c/Policarpo Sanz 1, Oficina J01, Spain
- G. P-Gandaras, Instituto de Invest. Marinas, Eduardo Cabello No. 6, Bouzas, Vigo, Spain
- H. Gonzalez Garcia, ANAVAR & AGARBA, Puerto Pesquero, Edificio Vendedores, Oficina 1-6, Apdo 1078, Vigo 36200, Spain
- M. L. Godinho, Instituto Nacional de Investigacao das Pescas, Av. Brasilia, 1400 Lisbon, Portugal
- M. Iriondo, Avda Ategorrieta, 11, Donostia, Spain
- B. W. Jones, Sea Fisheries Laboratory, Lowestoft, Suffolk NR33 0HT, United Kingdom
- A. de Melo, Instituto Nacional de Investigacao das Pescas, Av. Brasilia, 1400 Lisbon, Portugal
- J. L. Mesequer, Secretario General, Asociacion de Empresas de Pesca de Bacado, Especies Afines y Asociadas (ARBAC), Enrique Larreta, 10-Madrid, 28036 Spain
- Ph. Mogueudet, IFREMER, B. P. 4240, F-97500 Saint Pierre et Miquelon
- A. J. Parres, Delege General, Union des Armateurs a la Peche, 59 Rue des Mathurins, F-75008 Paris, France
- D. Pelletier, IFREMER, B. P. 1049, F-44037, Nantes-Cedex, France
- D. Piney, Charge de Mission pour les Conventions Internationales, Direction des Peches, Ministere de la Mer, 3 Place de Fontenoy, 75700 Paris, France
- C. A. Sousa Reis, President, Instituto Nacional de Investigacao das Pescas, Av. Brasilia, 1400 Lisboa
- M. Roitmann, Fisheries Counsellor, Danish EEC-Representation, 73 Rue D'Arlon, B-1040 Brussels
- H. Schlapper, Bundesministerium fur Ernährung, Landwirtschaft und Forsten, Rochusstr. 1, D-5300 Bonn 1, Federal Republic of Germany
- C. C. Southgate, Room 428, Nobel House, Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, Smith Square, London SW1P 3HX
- A. Vazquez, Instituto de Investigaciones Marinas, Muelle de Bouzas, Vigo, Spain

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Head of Delegation: M. Heinemann
Under-Secretary of State
Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Forestry
Kopenickel Allee 58-63
Berlin

Representatives

- M. Heinemann (see address above)
- N. Poerschke, 150 Kent Street, Suite 710, Ottawa, Ontario K1P 5P4
- W. Ranke, Head of Department, Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Forestry, Kopenickel Strape 58-63, Berlin

JAPAN

Head of Delegation: K. Yonezawa
c/o Fishery Division
Economic Affairs Bureau
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
2-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo

Representatives

- K. Yonezawa (see address above)

Advisers

- Y. Aoki, Fishery Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100
- H. Inoue, Nippon Suisan Ltd., 2 Otemachi, Chiyoda-ku Tokyo, Japan
- T. Hasegawa, Japan Fisheries Association, Suite 1101, Duke Tower, 5251 Duke Street, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada B3J 1P6
- T. Mori, Fisheries Agency, Ministry of Agriculture, Forest and Fisheries, 1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo
- Y. Uozumi, Far Seas Fisheries Research Laboratory, 5-7-1 Orido, Shimizu City
- M. Yoshida, Japan Deep Sea Trawlers Association, 601 Yasuda Bldg., 3-6 Kanda, Ogawa-cho, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo

NORWAY

Head of Delegation: P. Gullestad
 Directorate of Fisheries
 P. O. Box 185
 5002 Bergen

Representatives

P. Gullestad (see address above)

POLAND

Head of Delegation: J. L. Kleniewski
 Principal Advisor
 Dept. of International Cooperation
 Ministry of Transport and Maritime Economy
 ul. Chalubinskiego 4/6
 00-950 Warsaw

Alternate

J. Zygmanski, Odra Deep Sea Fishing Co., ul. Jana Soltana 6, 72-602 Swinoujscie

Representatives

J. L. Kleniewski (see address above)
 J. Stremiau, Consul, Polish Trade Commissioner's Office, 3501 Ave du Musee, Montreal, Canada

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS (USSR)

Head of Delegation: V. K. Zilanov
 Deputy Minister
 Ministry of Fisheries
 12 Rozhdestvensky Boul.
 Moscow K-31, 103045

Representatives

V. K. Zilanov (see address above)

Advisers

V. Fedorenko, Representative of the USSR in Canada on Fisheries, 2074 Robie St., Apt. 2202, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada B3K 5L3
 A. A. Mikhailov, Assistant to the Representative of the USSR on Fisheries in Canada, 2074 Robie St., Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada
 Y. Riazantsev, All-Union Research Institute of Marine Fisheries and Oceanography (VNIRO), 17 V. Krasnoselskaya, Moscow B-140
 V. P. Serebryakov, Head Laboratory, VNIRO, 17 V. Krasnoselskaya, Moscow, USSR 107140
 L. Shepel, Chief of Division for Affairs with Canada, USA, Indo-Pacific Region, Ministry of Fisheries, 12 Rozhdestvensky Boul., Moscow K-31
 V. Solodovnik, Executive Secretary, Soviet-American Fisheries Commission, Ministry of Fisheries, 12 Rozhdestvensky Boul., Moscow K-31
 V. Tsoukalov, Deputy Chief, Industry Dept., Ministry of Fisheries, 12 Rozhdestvensky Boul., Moscow K-31

OBSERVERSMEXICO

F. S. Sosa y Avila, Vice-Director of Politics and International Treaties, Av. Alvaro Obregon 269, 8 piso, Mexico 06700, D.F.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

S. Alexander, Consul, 910 Cogswell Tower, Scotia Square, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada B3J 3K1
 J. L. Bailey, Foreign Affairs Specialist, Office of International Affairs (F/IA1), NMFS/NOAA/DOC, 1335 East West Highway, Silver Spring, MD 20910
 H. S. Tinkham, Senior Atlantic Fisheries Officer, US Dept. of State, OES/OFA, Rm 5806, Washington, DC 20520-7818

SECRETARIAT

J. C. Esteves Cardoso, Executive Secretary
T. Amaratunga, Assistant Executive Secretary
W. H. Champion, Administrative Assistant
F. D. Keating, Finance and Publications Clerk-Steno
B. J. Cruikshank, Senior Secretary
D. C. A. Auby, Clerk-Typist
G. Moulton, Senior Statistical Clerk
B. Crawford, Clerk-Duplicator Operator
R. Myers, Clerk-Duplicator Operator

Appendix 2

12th Annual Meeting of NAFO
Lord Nelson Hotel, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada
5-14 September 1990

Fisheries CommissionAgendaOPENING PROCEDURES

1. Opening by the Chairman, Mr. J. Zygmanski (Poland)
2. Appointment of Rapporteur
3. Adoption of Agenda
4. Admission of Observers
5. Publicity

ADMINISTRATION

6. Approval of the Report of the 11th Annual Meeting, September 1989 (FC Doc. 89/13, Revised)
7. Review of Commission Membership

COMMISSION PROPOSALS

8. Status of Proposals (See Circular Letter 90/60)
9. Conservation and Enforcement Measures (Consideration of any revisions by STACTIC, see FC Doc. 90/1)

INTERNATIONAL CONTROL

10. Annual Return of Infringements
11. Fishing Vessel Registration
12. Report of STACTIC

CONSERVATION

13. Summary of scientific advice proffered by the Scientific Council
14. Management measures for fish stocks in the Regulatory Area
 - a) Cod in Div. 3M
 - b) Redfish in Div. 3M
 - c) American plaice in Div. 3M

15. Management measures for fish stocks overlapping national fishing limits
 - a) Cod in Div. 3NO
 - b) Redfish in Div. 3LN
 - c) American plaice in Div. 3LNO
 - d) Yellowtail flounder in Div. 3LNO
 - e) Witch flounder in Div. 3NO
 - f) Capelin in Div. 3NO
 - g) Squid (*Illex*) in Subareas 3 and 4
 - h) Management measures for the following stocks, if available in the Regulatory Area, in 1991:

Cod in Div. 3L
16. Fishing Activities by vessels of Non-Member States in the Regulatory Area
17. Transfer of quotas between Member States (Requested by Denmark on behalf of Faroes and Greenland - FC Doc. 90/2)

ADJOURNMENT

18. Time and Place of Next Meeting
19. Other Business
20. Adjournment

Appendix 3NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES ORGANIZATIONTWELFTH ANNUAL MEETING - SEPTEMBER 1990Press Release

1. The Twelfth Annual Meeting of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO) was held in Halifax, N. S., Canada, during 5-14 September 1990 under the chairmanship of Mr. K. Hoydal (Denmark in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), President of NAFO. The sessions of the Scientific Council, the General Council and the Fisheries Commission and their Committees were all held at the Lord Nelson Hotel.
2. Attending the meeting were delegates from the following Contracting Parties: Bulgaria, Canada, Cuba, Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), European Economic Community (EEC), German Democratic Republic (GDR), Japan, Norway, Poland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic (USSR). Observers from Mexico and the United States of America were present at the meeting.
3. The Scientific Council, under the chairmanship of Mr. B. W. Jones (EEC), presented scientific advice on the management of the stocks and advised on a number of questions referred to it by the Fisheries Commission. It also completed work which it had not had the possibility of finalizing at the June Meeting in Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, Canada.
4. During 5-7 September 1990, there was a Special Session on Management Under Uncertainties.

The Council endorsed the general discussions and conclusions presented to STACFIS by the convener, J. Shepherd (EEC), at the end of the Special Session. The Council made special note that participants considered the Special Session to be a very successful meeting and resulted in highlighting observations regarding management under uncertainties.

5. Based on STACTIC recommendations, the Fisheries Commission, under the chairmanship of Mr. J. Zygmanowski (Poland), decided to reinforce and improve the Surveillance and Control in the Regulatory Area and for that purpose a special meeting of a Working Group on the matter is to be organized in Brussels in the coming month of October.
6. On the basis of the scientific advice provided by the Scientific Council from its meeting in June 1990 and at the present meeting, agreement was reached by the Fisheries Commission, on conservation and management measures for 1991, regarding total allowable catches (TACs) and allocations for certain stocks, which are either entirely outside the 200-mile fishing zones or occur both within the zones and in the Regulatory Area. The TACs and national allocations for stocks in Division 3M and those overlapping the 200-mile boundary lines are given in the attached Quota Table. It is to be underlined that most of the decisions were obtained unanimously.

7. The Fisheries Commission agreed to continue the moratorium for 1991 on cod fishing by Contracting Parties in Division 3L outside the Canadian zone, in the continuation of the restrictive measures of the past years in favour of the recuperation of the stock.
8. The General Council reviewed and approved the Organization's budget and accounts.
9. Deciding on a request from the Under-Secretary-General of the United Nations on information on large scale pelagic drift net fishery - Resolution 44/225 - which was also considered by the Fisheries Commission, the Executive Secretary was instructed to reply that:
 1. Large scale pelagic drift net fishing is not presently practised by NAFO Contracting Parties in the Conservation Area.
 2. NAFO endorses the U.N. Resolution on large scale drift net fishing.
10. A Standing Committee on Fishing Activities of Non-Contracting Parties in the Regulatory Area was created in order to:
 - obtain and compile all available information on such activities;
 - obtain and compile all available information on landings and transshipments of fish caught in the Regulatory Area by non-Contracting Parties;
 - examine and assess all options open to NAFO Contracting Parties;
 - recommend measures to resolve the problem.
11. The General Council passed a Resolution, which, upon consideration of the most important Articles of U.N. Convention on the Law of the Sea and of the NAFO Convention bearing on the matter, is quoted as attached to this release.
12. The General Council selected, from among the candidates, the new Executive Secretary who will take over at the end of December from the present Executive Secretary, who will retire then.

Since this would be the last Annual Meeting before the change-over, the compliments to the new convener and the good-byes to the present Executive Secretary took place before the acclamations of the General Council and the return of thanks by the two people involved.

SCHEDULE I
Quota Table¹ for 1991

Column I Contracting Party	II		III		IV		V		VI		VII		VIII		IX		X		XI	
	Cod	Div. 3M	Cod	Div. 3M	Redfish	Div. 3M	Redfish	Div. 3M	American plaice	Div. 3M	American plaice	Div. 3M	Yellowtail	Div. 3M	Witch	Div. 3M	Capelin	Div. 3M	Squid ^{3,4} (Illex)	Subareas
1. Bulgaria	-	-	-	-	750	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	500	-
2. Canada	100	100	6,484	1,250	5,964	150	5,964	150	25,425	25,425	25,425	6,825	6,825	3,000	3,000	800	800	800	N.S. ⁵	-
3. Cuba	480	480	-	4,375	1,372	-	1,372	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	750	750	750	2,250	-
4. Denmark (Faroes & Greenland)	2,900	2,900	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5. European Economic Community	6,465	6,465	5,016	7,750	-	350	-	350	329	329	329	140	140	-	-	750	750	750	N.S. ⁵	-
6. German Democratic Republic	-	-	-	-	476	-	476	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7. Iceland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8. Japan	-	-	-	1,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
9. Norway	1,200	1,200	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,800	2,800	2,800	2,250	-
10. Poland	500	500	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	900	900	900	1,000	-
11. USSR	1,270	1,270	1,624	34,625	6,104	1,000	6,104	1,000	-	-	-	-	-	1,950	1,950	15,000	15,000	15,000	5,000	-
12. Others	50	50	476	250	84	500	84	500	47	47	47	35	35	50	50	-	-	-	5,000	-
13. Special Reservation ²	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
14. Total Allowable Catch	12,965	12,965	13,600	50,000	14,000	2,000	14,000	2,000	25,800	25,800	25,800	7,000	7,000	5,000	5,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	150,000 ⁶	-

¹Quotas are in metric tons.

²There are no Special Reservations for 1991.

³The opening date for the squid (Illex) fishery is 1 July.

⁴Any quota listed for squid may be increased by a transfer from any "coastal state" as defined in Article 1, para 3 of the WAFO Convention, provided that the TAC for squid is not exceeded. Transfers made to Contracting Parties conducting fisheries for squid in the Regulatory Area shall be reported to the Executive Secretary, and the report shall be made as promptly as possible.

⁵Not specified because the allocation to these Contracting Parties are as yet undetermined, although their sum shall not exceed the difference between the total of allocations to other Contracting Parties and the TAC.

⁶The TAC would remain at 150,000 tons subject to adjustment where warranted by scientific advice.

Resolution of the General Council
on Non-NAFO Fishing Activities

Resolves that:

- (1) All Contracting Parties should communicate through diplomatic channels with non-Contracting Parties whose vessels fish in the NAFO Regulatory Area to request that they take all necessary measures to prevent any fishing contrary to NAFO conservation measures;
- (2) The Executive Secretary of NAFO draw to the attention of the non-Contracting Parties involved the activities of their vessels in the Regulatory Area, and the negative impact of such fishing on the conservation of fish stocks in the Regulatory Area;
- (3) The Executive Secretary and Contracting Parties individually contact non-Contracting Parties, whose vessels fish in the Regulatory Area, to request them to provide NAFO with complete and accurate statistical reports on their catches in the NAFO Regulatory Area to the end of 1990;
- (4) All Contracting Parties should take effective measures to reduce the benefits of any fishing activities undertaken by vessels from non-Contracting Parties in the NAFO Regulatory Area where such fisheries take place contrary to NAFO conservation measures, with the aim of causing them to withdraw from such activities;
- (5) In full respect of the international obligations of Contracting Parties, further measures should be developed for consideration by the General Council at its 1991 annual meeting, including the possibility of introducing a system under which all Contracting Parties would require that all fish and fish products of a species managed by NAFO, imported from non-Contracting Parties whose vessels fish in the NAFO Regulatory Area, be accompanied by a certificate indicating harvest origin outside that Area.

Appendix 412th Annual Meeting - September 1990Draft Report of the Standing Committee on
International Control (STACTIC)

The Standing Committee on International Control (STACTIC) met on five (5) occasions during the week of 10-14 September 1990. The initial session convened at 1015 on 10 September 1990.

1. Introduction by Chairman

The Chairman of STACTIC, Mr. O. Muniz (Cuba), welcomed all delegations to the 12th Annual Meeting of NAFO. STACTIC delegations included: Canada, Cuba, Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland), EEC, Japan, Norway and the USSR.

2. Appointment of Rapporteur

Mr. R. J. Prier (Canada) was appointed Rapporteur.

3. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted. (See Attachment 1)

4. Review of Annual Return of Infringements

The Chairman made reference to the request of the Executive Secretary that all Contracting Parties should make every endeavour to submit their Annual Return of Infringements in a timely manner to ensure their discussion at the annual meeting of STACTIC. The item was deferred to a later session of STACTIC.

5. Review of Registration of Vessels Fishing in the Regulatory Area

The Chairman referred the delegates to page 36 of NAFO Circular Letter 90/63 and asked all delegates who had not submitted their list of vessels which intended to fish in the Regulatory Area in 1990 to do so as soon as possible.

6. Conservation and Enforcement Measures

The Chairman requested all delegates to review NAFO/FC Doc. 90/1 and be prepared to discuss that document at the next session of STACTIC. It was the Chairman's desire to see those amendments reviewed that year.

7. Revision of the Scheme of Joint International Inspection

The Chairman requested that all delegates review FC Doc. 89/11 and 89/12 and be prepared to discuss those papers at a later session of STACTIC. The Chairman made reference to the EEC's request at the last annual meeting of STACTIC to delay any amendments until after the Scheme had had a chance to operate for a few years.

8. Inspection in the Regulatory Area

The EEC delegate indicated they would be presenting an oral report to STACTIC at a later date. Both Canada and USSR indicated they would provide written documents on their inspections in the Regulatory Area for 1989 at a future session of STACTIC.

9. Time and Place of Next Session

The time and place of next session would be posted on the NAFO notice board or announced by the Chairman of the Fisheries Commission.

10. Other Matters

There were no other matters to be discussed. The first session of STACTIC was adjourned at 1035 on 10 September 1990.

STACTIC reconvened at 1120 on 11 September 1990.

The Chairman indicated that he would like to get approval for agenda items 5 and 6 during that session.

11. Review of Registration of Vessels, Item 5

The Chairman stated that there had been no change to attachment 2 which outlined those nations who had provided lists to the Executive Secretary of vessels which would be fishing in the Regulatory Area in the forthcoming year. The Chairman requested that any changes or additions to those lists be conveyed to the Executive Secretary in order that a final list of vessels could be published prior to the end of calendar year 1990. All Contracting Parties agreed and that item was closed.

12. Conservation and Enforcement Measures, Item 6

The Chairman requested the Executive Secretary to review FC Doc. 90/1 in which he outlined his concerns about rules on Conservation and Enforcement Measures which might require clarification.

By-catch

The rule required clarification in order to indicate that it was the vessel of a Contracting Party that should limit its incidental catch. It was agreed to amend the Conservation and Enforcement Measures Part 1.A.4 to read as follows:

Vessels of a Contracting Party shall limit their incidental catch to a maximum of 2500 kg or 10% whichever is the greater, for each species listed in Schedule 1 for which no quota has been allocated in that subdivision to that Contracting Party.

The remaining two paragraphs of PART I.A.4 remain as written.

Ropes in Reinforcements in Trawls

With reference to the use of ropes in reinforcements for trawls, it was agreed by STACTIC that the Executive Secretary's recommendation that a fourth paragraph be added, to PART II.B Mesh Size, as appended below:

Rule Part II.B.4 - Strengthening ropes, splitting straps and codend floats may be used on trawls within the Regulatory Area, as long as these attachments do not in any way restrict the mesh authorized in the Conservation and Enforcement Rules or obstruct the mesh opening.

Measurement of meshes of different types of chafers

The EEC expressed the opinion that STACTIC should not be legislating methodology on how to carry out measurements which have already been covered in Contracting Parties rules. Canada concurred with the EEC and agreed that STACTIC should not include that amendment into the Measures. There was consensus that the amendment was not to be recommended.

13. Request from the Under-Secretary General of the United Nations on information on large-scale pelagic drift net fishing - Resolution 44/225.

The Chairman referred to the request of the General Council for STACTIC to review United Nations Resolution 44/225. He requested that all Contracting Parties review the resolution and be prepared to discuss it and provide recommendations. The delegate of Canada stated that to the best of his knowledge there were no nations fishing with drift nets in the Northwest Atlantic. He suggested that should be confirmed and, if that were the case, the Committee should unanimously agree that it would not want to see drift nets used in the Northwest Atlantic. Japan was not agreeable to the last part of the Canadian proposal for the reason that the UN resolution did not call for a total ban on drift net fishing. It should be sufficient that the Committee simply express their endorsement of the UN resolution.

Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland) stated that the UN had sent that resolution to other Organizations and indicated that NASCO had made a resolution endorsing the substance of the resolution as written. The USSR stated that scientific information should be gathered on the use of large-scale pelagic drift nets and the effects those nets might have on the environment. The Chairman requested that Contracting Parties take into consideration the views expressed and be prepared to put forth the opinion of STACTIC to the Fisheries Commission at a future session of STACTIC.

STACTIC adjourned at 1210 on 10 September 1990.

STACTIC reconvened at 0910 on 121 September 1990.

14. Review of Annual Return of Infringements, Item 4

The Chairman stated that the disposition of apparent infringements was the key to effective control within the Regulatory Area. Therefore, all Contracting Parties should pay particular attention to the disposition of an infringement. Norway reported on an apparent infringement of a Norwegian vessel in 3M. The delegate of Norway stated that it concerned a vessel engaged in sedimentary fishery which was not covered by the rules

of the Scheme. However, he indicated that all Norwegian vessels operating in the Regulatory Area had been instructed to allow boardings while fishing. The USSR indicated that it would ensure that its inspection vessels were aware that vessels fishing for sedimentary species were not under the Scheme so that courtesy boardings only were to be conducted. The Executive Secretary commented on the decision of STACTIC to only authorize comments to be placed on the report of inspection of vessels apparently not authorized to fish in the Area. He suggested that it should be listed in the apparent infringement section and allow the Contracting Party responsible for the vessel to determine if an apparent infringement had taken place. STACTIC would consider his advice.

Japan reported on an apparent infringement reported on one of its vessels operating in the Regulatory Area. That vessel was operating in the Regulatory Area under a joint venture without the authorization of the Japanese Government. The vessel was ordered to return to Japan and be confined to port for 180 days. The company owning the vessel had subsequently gone bankrupt.

STACTIC accepted FC Doc. 90/3 as printed.

15. Inspection in the Regulatory Area, Item 8

The Chairman indicated that there were three papers to review and that the EEC would make a verbal report. The delegate of Canada reviewed the highlights of his paper FC Doc. 90/5:

Sea days	88
Air hours	199
Inspections	113 on Contracting Parties 17 Courtesy boardings
Sightings	2678

He drew attention to the fact that there were 3 new entrants and one registry transfer identified in the Regulatory Area. Sightings in the 3M area had been highlighted in the report and, while sightings did not give an indication of fishing, they did imply a high level of activity within 3M.

The delegate of Norway indicated that there would be great difficulty in making decisions on the moratorium in 3M based on the activity reported. He asked whether the report submitted by Canada reflected the level of activity Canada would develop in the area in 1991. The delegate of Canada stated that Canada would attempt to maintain the same level; however, it was working towards increasing its surveillance. He also informed that the effectiveness of air surveillance, due to changing to a private contractor, had increased substantially. Cuba asked if it would be possible to relate sightings to boardings. Canada replied that it was not done in the report but information was available which would permit the correlation to be done.

The USSR introduced its report contained in FC Doc. 90/6. In 1989 the following surveillance effort was accomplished:

Sea days	340
Inspections	77 Soviet
	119 Foreign
	23 Soviets in port
Apparent Infringements	4

The USSR delegate indicated that he liked the way the Canadian report was presented and would take steps to follow that format in the future.

The EEC delegate reported that in each of 1988 and 1989 the EEC had applied 60 sea days in the international control of fishing activity in the Regulatory Area. In 1990 it hoped to apply 80 days and in 1991, if its budget would be increased to the level expected, it would have an inspection vessel in the Regulatory Area for seven months. The EEC delegate stated that after two years of experience in the Regulatory Area the EEC had concluded that there was no substitute for inspection vessels within the Area. In addition the follow-up action to apparent infringements must be followed through to their conclusion. The delegate of the EEC urged other Contracting Parties to increase their surveillance efforts in the Area. He referred to the Canadian paper which indicated increased activity in 3M and emphasized the need for increased surveillance. He revealed that Canada and the EEC had met to coordinate surveillance and that had proven to be effective. He would like to extend an invitation to the USSR to coordinate its efforts. In fact that offer of cooperation was certainly extended to all Contracting Parties. He also requested that reports of inspection and apparent infringements be disseminated as quickly as possible to ensure speedy resolution.

Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland) indicated that it had an inspection vessel in the Regulatory Area in 1989 and intended to continue in the future (FC Doc. 90/11). The representative from Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland) expressed concern about the unauthorized fishing taking place within the Regulatory Area and asked STACTIC to look at ways to improve the reporting of fishing activities and thus make the time spent by inspection vessels on the grounds more effective. Norway agreed with the remarks of the previous speaker but stressed that NAFO should not only be looking to control Contracting Parties but also non-Contracting Parties and flags of convenience. The USSR stated it would continue to provide the same level of surveillance next year and agreed with the views expressed by the EEC, Norway and Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland). It also agreed to ensure that reports be disseminated in a timely manner.

The delegate of Canada supported the comments made by his colleagues and stated that the sharing of information was essential to ensure an efficient and effective surveillance operation. In his opinion, how to maximize participation by all would have to be explored.

16. The Chairman apologized for not having recognized earlier the presence of the Observers from the USA and welcomed them to the STACTIC meeting.
17. The Chairman stated that he was encouraged by the increased presence of Contracting Parties inspection vessels within the Regulatory Area and the emphasis which all Contracting Parties were placing on ensuring effective

surveillance and control within the Regulatory Area. He reviewed the mandate of STACTIC and encouraged all Contracting Parties to increase the quality of inspections and their follow-up action which could result in recommendations for improvement of the overall Scheme.

STACTIC reconvened at 1800 on 12 September 1990.

18. The Chairman welcomed the observers from the U.S.A. and Mexico to the STACTIC meeting.
19. The Chairman stated that the meeting had been called to order so that it would deal with the request from the Fisheries Commission to examine ways to improve the surveillance and control within the Regulatory Area. The rapporteur repeated the tasking from the Fisheries Commission which required STACTIC to look at ways to improve the surveillance and control within that Area. That review was to include such things as the availability of ship time and the number of inspection vessels for next year, and also to look at other methods, which would complement inspection by vessels, such as an International Observer Program, a HAIL system for reporting in and out of the Regulatory Area, an electronic tracking system and any other systems STACTIC might feel would improve surveillance and control within the Regulatory Area. In addition the cost of such programs should be identified. The Chairman then opened the meeting for suggestions.
20. The delegate of Canada indicated that experience within the Canadian zone had shown that the most effective program was the observer program. He therefore proposed the introduction of an International Observer Program in 3M to enable NAFO to get a handle on the problems which had been identified in 3M. He stated that the Observer Program was complex and it was difficult to equate a domestic system to an international system. He suggested that, as part of the overall approach to improved surveillance and control within the Regulatory Area, STACTIC look at an International Observer Program. The delegate of Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland) stated that he was aware of the observer logistics problems and their need to be analyzed. However, there were other means which could be implemented more quickly such as a system of reporting in and out of the Regulatory Area. That could possibly be a task given to the Secretariat of NAFO, and Part III of the Conservation Measures be amended to reflect that requirement. He stressed the fact that there was an urgency to get a new control system in place for the complete Regulatory Area.
21. The delegate of the EEC stated that he had listened with interest to the Canadian and Danish proposals. However, with reference to the Observer Program he had a lot of reservations on how it would work in practice as well as from a legal point of view. He also agreed that there were large differences between the requirements of a domestic and of an international observer program but they were worthy of being addressed. Referring to the HAIL system, he thought that it was more practical and could be introduced a lot quicker. The EEC had prepared a working paper which set out the details of a HAIL system for consideration by STACTIC. He further added that STACTIC must consider along with any of those recommendations the cost factor and how it was to be funded. He indicated that the Community was about to consider an in-depth study on satellite tracking. That would be a medium term solution rather than a short-term solution, but he stated that the EEC would be prepared to present a paper at the

conclusion of its studies. In reference to the Danish request for speed in the setting up of a system for improved surveillance and control, he felt that it could best be done by all Contracting Parties increasing the presence of their inspection vessels within the Regulatory Area. As earlier reported, the EEC was pressing for increased budget allocations to meet that goal. He stated that the Executive Secretary should also play a role in the coordination of the flow of information to improve surveillance and control.

The delegate of the EEC agreed with the Danish statement that the list, submitted by Contracting Parties, of vessels which intended to fish in the Regulatory Area should be restricted only to vessels which definitely intended to fish there. He also indicated that they had a working paper for consideration by STACTIC on amendments to the Conservation Measures to improve the marking of vessels and gear for ease of identification by inspection vessels. He summed up his comments by agreeing with the need to do something quickly but added that any system must first be legally sound, practical and within the budgets of the Contracting Parties.

22. The delegate of Norway stated that the hailing system was good but must be combined with inspections and should be capable of being implemented prior to 1 January 1991. To be effective, the hailing system must be a real time system sent to the Secretariat. Inspection vessels would be required to communicate with the Secretariat. Further, he stated that the fishing vessels should also report catches on board when first entering the Regulatory Area. They should report 24 hours prior to entering the Regulatory Area and when they changed zones.
23. The delegate of the USSR indicated that it was most important to maintain inspection vessels in the zone, and that the USSR intended to keep a high level of coverage in the forthcoming year. Economic considerations were very important and the USSR representative stated that NAFO should look at ways of sharing costs. He stated that improved communications between all Parties would make the Scheme more effective. The system had to include coordination of surveillance effort and exchange of information. He pointed out that many USSR vessels used the Regulatory Area as a holding area prior to proceeding to other areas and thus it might be difficult to predict when vessels would be in the Regulatory Area. He agreed with the ideas for better reporting and would ensure on his return to his country that the USSR look into improving their reporting system with regard to inspections.
24. The Chairman asked if Contracting Parties would have difficulty allowing the Executive Secretary to task Contracting Parties inspection vessels within the Regulatory Area. Canada stated and other Contracting Parties agreed that they would have difficulty with giving that authority to the Executive Secretary. However, if the Executive Secretary conveyed a need for inspection vessels, Canada would consider such a request. The USSR agreed with Canada as did Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland).
25. The delegate of Canada stated that he had listened with interest to other Contracting Parties indicating that the registration system for vessels intending to fish in the Regulatory Area should be strengthened. He stated that the Committee should also examine, as under the Fisheries Commission request, the introduction of a licensing system for Contracting Parties vessels intending to fish in the Regulatory Area. In his opinion all the proposed systems were good but even the HAIL system might be difficult to

implement. He recommended that STACTIC go back to the Commission with a list of proposals and recommend that a working group be formed to work out the details of implementation of the proposals and that time frames be established for implementation of both the short-term and long range proposals by the Commission. The urgency would dictate the workload of the working group.

26. The EEC stated that unless NAFO would have an increased presence of inspection vessels in the zone, the proposals would not help the control system. It was understood that to obtain that would increase costs to Contracting Parties but those increased costs should be shared amongst all Contracting Parties. The EEC stated they had submitted two working papers on proposals for increased surveillance and control to show the Commission that the Committee was making progress.
27. The rapporteur summarized the discussions on proposals to improve surveillance and control within the Regulatory Area as requested by the Commission and outlined the format for the report to the Commission. (See FC Doc. 90/8)

The meeting adjourned at 1920 on 12 September 1990.

STACTIC reconvened at 0930 on 13 September 1990.

28. Fisheries Commission Request for STACTIC proposals on possible improvement to Surveillance and Control in the Regulatory Area

As a follow-up to STACTIC discussions of 12 September on the above subject, the Chairman tabled NAFO/FC Doc. 90/8 titled "Report to the Fisheries Commission on Proposals by STACTIC to Increase Surveillance and Control Within the Regulatory Area".

Canada noted that two additional proposals should be considered for inclusion in the FC Doc. 90/8. They were:

1. The proposed working group should be tasked to complete a comprehensive review of the NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures (including the Joint International Inspection Scheme) both in relation to STACTIC's response to the Fisheries Commission and the general requirement for improvement in the present Measures (Scheme).
2. The proposed working group should develop methods/procedures that would provide improved coordination of surveillance resources assigned to NAFO duties.

The Chairman noted that the proposed working group could also be tasked to review FC Doc. 89/11 and 89/12 which outline a series of editorial changes to the Joint International Inspection Scheme.

The EEC delegate noted that he generally agreed with the substance of FC Doc. 90/8, however he wished to suggest the following improvements related to the document's presentation:

1. FC Doc. 90/8 should be worded in a manner that clearly supported the establishment of a working group to develop proposals for improved surveillance and control in the Regulatory Area.
2. The list of proposals in FC Doc. 90/8 should be used by the working group as a guide for future discussions and not be considered as an exhaustive list.

The EEC delegate also noted that, while the working group could review methods/procedures to improve the coordination of surveillance resources assigned to NAFO duties, it would perhaps be beneficial if Contracting Parties could begin discussions on the matter in advance of the Working Group's initial meeting. Equally, the proposal related to increased surveillance in the Regulatory Area could also be reviewed, and possibly implemented, by competent authorities of Contracting Parties.

The USSR delegate presented the three (3) following points for consideration:

1. From a practical point of view, it was very important that Contracting Parties increase their inspection presence in the Regulatory Area. Hopefully, Contracting Parties could consider increasing their presence prior to the final deliberations of the Working Group.
2. The working group should be provided with a precise timetable for development of proposals related to improved surveillance and control in the Regulatory Area.
3. FC Doc. 90/8 should include a recognition of the threat to conservation of fish stock in the Regulatory Area posed by fishing vessels from Non-Contracting Parties. The working group might also consider proposals to deal with that issue.

After a general discussion of the USSR's final point, all STACTIC members agreed that FC Doc. 90/8 should recognize the threat posed by vessels from Non-Contracting Parties. As well, it was agreed that the final report of the working group should clearly state that the proposals for improved surveillance and control in the Regulatory Area would not resolve the problem of increased fishing pressure by vessels from Non-Contracting Parties.

Finally, it was agreed that all relevant comments would be incorporated into FC Doc. 90/8 and circulated to STACTIC members.

29. Scheme of Joint International Inspection, Agenda item 7

As noted, NAFO/FC Doc. 89/11 and 89/12 (suggested revisions to the Scheme) would be referred to the working group recommended in FC Doc. 90/8.

30. Request from the Under-Secretary-General of the United Nations on information on large scale pelagic drift net fishing-Resolution 44/225

The delegate of Japan suggested that, with respect to drift net fishing in the Northwest Atlantic, STACTIC recommend to the Fisheries Commission

that the Executive Secretary's reply to the Under-Secretary-General, United Nations include two main points:

1. confirmation that large scale pelagic drift net fishing is not presently practised by NAFO Contracting Parties in the Convention Area
2. endorsement, by NAFO, of the UN resolution on large scale pelagic drift net fishing.

All STACTIC members agreed with the suggestion.

31. Review of Annual Return of Infringements, Agenda Item 4

Canada sought clarification on the STACTIC discussion of 12 Sept 90 regarding a Norwegian vessel's failure to allow a USSR NAFO inspector on board. Canada noted that while the NAFO Convention did not apply to sedentary species, NAFO inspectors could not always ascertain directed species through a visual observation of a fishing vessel and, therefore, Contracting Party vessels fishing sedentary species should allow NAFO inspectors on board. Once it had been determined by an inspector that a vessel was not fishing a species governed by the NAFO Convention then the inspection should cease.

STACTIC members generally discussed the Canadian interpretation and agreed that the issue should be referred to a future meeting.

As that was the final session of STACTIC, the Chairman thanked the Contracting Parties for their cooperation and looked forward to seeing their representatives at the next annual meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 1030 on 13 September.

Attachment 1
(to Appendix 4)

12th Annual Meeting of NAFO
Lord Nelson Hotel, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada
5-14 September 1990

Standing Committee on International Control (STACTIC)

Agenda

1. Opening by Chairman, O. Muniz (Cuba)
2. Appointment of Rapporteur
3. Adoption of Agenda
4. Review of Annual Return of Infringements
5. Review of Registration of Vessels fishing in the Regulatory Area
6. Conservation and Enforcement Measures - consideration of any revision.
7. Scheme of Joint International Inspection
8. Inspection in the Regulatory Area
9. Time and Place of Next Meeting
10. Other Matters
11. Adjournment