

Northwest Atlantic



Fisheries Organization

Serial No. N1417

NAFO/GC Doc. 87/10

(Revised)

NINTH ANNUAL MEETING - SEPTEMBER 1987

Report of the General Council

Tuesday, 15 September - 1015-1130

Friday, 18 September - 1125-1430

1. The Chairman, Mr. H. Schmiegelow (EEC), opened the meeting at 1015 and initiated the proceedings by communicating to the participants (see Appendix I) that they had been invited by the EEC for a reception on board the inspection vessel "Cornide de Saavedra" from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, 15 September 1987 and by the Canadian Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and the Canadian Delegation for cocktails from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Wednesday, 16 September 1987 in the Regency Room of the Lord Nelson Hotel.
2. Following tradition, the Chairman appointed the Executive Secretary as Rapporteur and that was agreed.
3. The Agenda as proposed was adopted. (See Appendix II)
4. The delegate of Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland) asked for the floor to present some remarks concerning the functioning of the Council and also of the Fisheries Commission. Of the questions posed in past meetings, some had been solved by compromise, some were still outstanding. The efficiency of debates might be improved if, once discussions were finished, voting would not immediately follow. Enough time should be given to delegations to elaborate compromise solutions. Time should be adequate for that phase of the work, as it was of main importance. In some cases that would entail a postponement of decisions to the next day.

The Chairman took note and hoped that the method could be applied within the time constraints of NAFO work, especially in the Fisheries Commission.

The delegate of the EEC approved the suggestion in principle, although he felt that a 24-hour wait could be too much in most cases. However the given time should be sufficient for adequate inter-consultation and reflection, whenever necessary.

5. Coming to the subject of Admission of Observers, the Chairman explained to the Council that considerations of security had made it necessary to revise the question of observers. Since the Council was called to discuss that question, it had been felt that it would be better to discuss it before the Observers of Mexico and the U.S.A., who once again had sent participants, and were not the reason for the discussions, would be seated at the meeting. That was agreed.

The delegate of the EEC agreed that the invitation of Mexico and the U.S.A. was not under discussion. Moreover he thought that every year NAFO should invite as observer every nation which fished in the Regulatory Area. The delegate of Denmark (in respect of Faroe Islands and Greenland) was also of the opinion that those countries that fish in the Regulatory Area should be invited as observers to part or the whole of the meetings.

The delegate of Canada, although in broad agreement with what had been said, was of the opinion that the admission of Mexico and the U.S.A. should not be delayed and that the situation regarding other observers could be discussed during the meeting. The delegate of the USSR also agreed on taking immediately the decision to admit those that had arrived and had been present in previous years. At some time later, both in the General Council and in the Fisheries Commission, the general question of observers should be discussed as the corresponding Rules of Procedure were not developed so far. The Chairman then had the observers of Mexico and the U.S.A. admitted to the meeting and, as soon as they were seated, welcomed their presence on behalf of the General Council.

6. The Chairman then informed the Council that Publicity would be handled in the usual manner. That was agreed.
7. Coming to item 6 of the Agenda, on Current threats to Conservation, the Chairman introduced GC Doc. 87/3. The delegate of the EEC manifested the deep concern of that Contracting Party on the fact

that countries were fishing without being members of NAFO, when it was well known that some, if not all, of the resources of the Regulatory Area were vital to NAFO members. It should be requested that those countries should at least let NAFO know how much and what species they fished, allowing the Scientific Council to make and present realistic assessments. The delegate of the USSR also expressed concern that the resources in question were limited and it was important to ascertain the level of the fishing carried out by non-member countries. He suggested that the following measures should be taken: 1) Ask the Scientific Council to determine what species particular countries were fishing and how much. 2) Try to inquire from those countries the actual catch. 3) Request they take note of existing conservation measures and invite them to participate in the NAFO deliberations at least as observers.

The delegate of Canada declared also its concern. He informed the meeting that the Canadian Government had set up a Task Force to deal with the problem. That Task Force was chaired by him and formed by representatives of all the Fisheries Ministries of the coastal provinces. He hoped that later on he would be able to make a declaration on the Task Force decisions. He would request the Chair to cease the discussion for the moment but keep the agenda item to be reopened most probably after the discussion of the Enforcement problems.

8. The Chairman agreed with that suggestion as it received no objections and, whilst proceeding accordingly, gave the floor to the Observer from Mexico to read a statement bearing on the same subject. (See Appendix III)

The delegate of Mexico made clear that Mexico would supply willingly all available fishing statistics once NAFO applied for them in writing.

9. The delegate of the EEC exhorted the delegate of Mexico to recommend that Mexico enter NAFO. The door was wide open and the EEC was sure that every member would back them.

The delegate of the USSR would wish to register that they certainly would welcome Mexico into NAFO. The delegate of the EEC returned to the subject to declare how deeply disappointed they were with the continuous absence of USA from the membership of NAFO. He would sincerely request that the USA come in, since it was clear that its interests were multiple in the region.

The Chairman closed then the discussion to return to the same agenda item in due time, as desired.

10. The Chairman declared the Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Meeting, September 1986 up for approval. They were approved.
  11. Coming to Agenda item 8, the Chairman declared that the Reviews of Membership should be taken up at a later occasion. That was accepted.
  12. The Chairman pointed out that, on Rules of Procedure, apart from Note 1 attached to the Provisional Agenda and GC Doc. 87/2 circulated well in advance of the meeting, there was a Danish proposal (see GC Doc. 87/6) to be considered. The Chairman proposed that a Working Group under the chairmanship of the Executive Secretary be convened by him and report back to the Council. That was adopted.
  13. The Chairman, opening item 10 of the Agenda for discussion, asked the Executive Secretary to address the subject of Modification to Subareas 4-5 Boundary. The Executive Secretary explained that, whilst applying Article XX of the Convention, the General Council had failed to determine the date on which the measure should come into force. The Executive Secretary had suggested the subsequent application of Article XXI to define that date. The Japanese authorities had formulated reservations to that method of solving the problem and the Department of External Affairs suggested that the decision of the General Council should come into force after a period of 120 days following the transmittal by the Depository. The Japanese delegation declared that that should need further discussion and the USSR delegation concurred.
- The Chairman asked the two delegations to discuss the matter with the Executive Secretary and that they all report the results of that discussion back to the Council. That was agreed.
14. The Chairman then declared that items 11, 13 to 18 inclusive, should be delegated to STACFAD, which was agreed.
  15. The Chairman informed the Council that he would not stand for re-election and proposed that the Council deal with the election of a new Chairman and Vice-Chairman later on. This was agreed.
  16. The Chairman proposed that the Press Statement be produced in the usual manner and this was agreed. (See Appendix IV)
  17. With the announcement that the Fisheries Commission would meet at the announced hour in the afternoon, not under the Chairmanship of Mr. Varea as he was ill and unable to be present, the Chairman explained that, as the Vice-Chairman was also absent, the Chair would be taken by the Chairman of STACTIC who

would immediately proceed to the election of a pro-tem Chairman.

The meeting was then adjourned at 1130.

18. The Chairman called the meeting to order at 1125 on Friday, 18 September, before the Observers had been admitted to the session.
19. Returning to the question of Admission of Observers, the Chairman presented a Resolution Proposal on Observers (see Appendix V) which had not been circulated before the meeting but was put forward by the Chairman as a result of previous discussion on the matter. The delegate of the USSR declared that he was not ready to accept immediately the resolution as it was drafted. In his opinion NAFO should be able to invite International Organizations which dealt with fisheries even if they were not Fisheries Organizations. Although invited to the meeting observers might not be permitted to attend some of the sessions, therefore invitations should only be issued for open sessions. The Chairman explained that the resolution tried to cover all aspects by subjecting the invitations to the agreement of the General Council. The USSR delegate would prefer the text to specify International Organizations dealing with fisheries. The delegate of the EEC supported the criterion that some sessions could be restricted, and consequently not open to observers. The delegate of Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland) supported the amendments suggested by the USSR. The delegate of Canada proposed that the resolution should not be taken up immediately. He felt NAFO should not rush into a decision which had not been given time to be properly considered. The delegate of the EEC on the other hand thought that ignoring the countries which fished in the Regulatory Area had been wrong. If the general feeling would be to delay a decision, the EEC would not disagree but it would like to express its disappointment. The delegate of the USSR felt it would be a good idea not to press the issue at this time and in his opinion the General Council should not try to draft a criterion for all times but make a decision every year. Carte blanche should be given for invitations from the President and the Executive Secretary.
20. The delegate of Norway proposed that the problem be solved by deciding at this meeting whom to invite next year. He proposed Mexico, and the USA and other non-member countries currently fishing in the Regulatory Area be invited to attend the 10th Annual Meeting. The delegate of Canada considered that there was no definition of what should be considered "fishing in the Regulatory Area". If one vessel from one country fished in the Regulatory Area for one day should that be considered sufficient grounds for an invitation? The Chairman suggested that as the Executive Secretary already had written to some non-member governments which had vessels fishing in the Regulatory Area, all those and only those should be invited. The delegate of Canada argued that the Chairman's suggestion proved the point he had raised: the idea had to be properly considered and discussed before a decision could be taken. After another brief exchange of views, the delegate of Canada declared that his delegation was not prepared for that discussion and it wished more time to reflect. The delegate of the EEC, although regretting that no decision could be taken, agreed that the debate be closed. The delegate of Norway withdrew his proposal and the project of resolution was withdrawn.
21. The General Council agreed that the Executive Secretary should invite Mexico and the U.S.A. to attend the next Annual Meeting. The observers were then admitted to the session.
22. The delegate of the USSR suggested that the subject should be discussed during the next Annual Meeting and the Executive Secretary should provide Contracting Parties with a list of non-member countries fishing in the Regulatory Area and the corresponding catch statistics.
23. The observer from the U.S.A. declared that the USA regularly provided monthly statistics and collaborated whenever possible in the scientific activities of NAFO. At that time, his government was actively evaluating its position with respect to membership in NAFO.
24. Under Review of Membership, the Chairman reported that as it had been agreed by the General Council (NAFO/GC Doc. 86/4, Revised, page 1, item 7) he had written to Romania but had received no reply. After a brief exchange of views, the General Council took note that the dispositions of Article XVI(9) were applicable and would be in effect until such time as Romania would pay its debts. Furthermore, it was considered that Romania no longer fulfilled the conditions of Article XIII.1 and consequently was no longer a member of the Fisheries Commission. The delegate of the USSR proposed that another letter from the President be addressed to Romania explaining the evolution of its situation. That was agreed.
25. Returning to the subject of the Rules of Procedure, the Chairman introduced GC Doc. 87/7, proposed by the Executive Secretary, Chairman of the corresponding Working Group. That was approved unanimously.
26. On item 10 of the Agenda, Modifications to Subarea 4-5 Boundary, following GC Doc. 87/8 the General Council decided, with the approval of all delegations and an expression of assent from the observer from the U.S.A., that the modifications to Subarea 4-5 boundary enter into force on 9 October 1987.

27. The Chairman called on the Chairperson of STACFAD to introduce its Report.
28. The Chairperson, Ms. D. Pethick (Canada), reported that the Committee has reaffirmed its earlier decision of the need to have NAFO specific staff rules. In order to provide a recommendation to the General Council at the next Annual Meeting, STACFAD agreed to recommend to the General Council that a Contracting Party be asked to provide guidance and foster progress of the work during the following twelve months. It was agreed that the most appropriate Contracting Party to undertake that task would be the host country for the next Annual Meeting.
29. The issue of the outstanding payments by some of the Contracting Parties continued to be a concern to the Organization.
30. The budget for 1988 represented only a 2% increase over last year. STACFAD felt that the budget provided adequate resources for the continued efficient operation of the Organization. If it had not been for the possible cost of the NAFO relocation, the budget would have in fact been maintained at current levels. The issue of the move had caused the Secretariat some difficulties in estimating the cost of meeting space for the Scientific Council meeting and other smaller working group meetings. STACFAD agreed to recommend the need to seek some firm assurances in that regard, whilst at the same time expressing the gratitude of the Organization to the Government of Canada for the provision of headquarter's accommodation. A Resolution to that effect was included in the report and proposed for adoption.
31. STACFAD had noted comments made during the Fisheries Commission Meeting that morning, concerning the possibility of an extraordinary or special meeting of the Commission in Brussels early in 1988. Authority existed in the financial regulations to enable the Executive Secretary to use funds in the accumulated surplus account for extraordinary or unforeseen expenditures. Therefore, it would not be necessary for STACFAD to increase the 1988 budget as presented in the report.
32. The attention of the General Council was called to the contributions of the Contracting Parties (see Annex VI to STACFAD Report), based on the proposed budget.
33. The delegate of the USSR moved that the Report of STACFAD be approved. That was seconded by Canada and the EEC with expressions of gratitude and thanks to the Chairperson. The Report was unanimously approved. (See Appendix VI)
34. The Chairman introduced a project of resolution (see Appendix VII) relating to the appointment of an Assistant Executive Secretary, a subject which had not been part of the Agenda, but had been discussed with the Chairman. The delegate of Canada had no objection to the resolution and the delegate of the EEC supported the resolution under the understanding that the final decision rested only with the Executive Secretary, as clearly stipulated under Article XV.3 of the Convention. The resolution was adopted.
35. Under item 12 of the Agenda, Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman, the Chairman called for proposals for the election of a Chairman. The delegate of the USSR, while regretting that Mr. Schmiegelow (EEC) would not be offering for re-election, nominated Mr. Hartung (GDR) to be elected Chairman. Mr. F. Hartung (GDR) was elected unanimously and thanked the Council by pronouncing a brief statement. (See Appendix VIII)

Coming to the election of Vice-Chairman, the delegate of the EEC nominated Mr. Hoydal (Denmark in respect of the Faroes and Greenland) who was elected unanimously and expressed his thanks.
37. The delegate of the EEC called the Council's attention to the dates which had been approved for the next annual meeting in Ottawa and asked whether the Council could agree to have that meeting one week later on 12-16 September 1988. That was agreed.

The delegate of the EEC suggested that NAFO should consider holding the annual meeting during the second week of September in future years rather than the first week. The matter was deferred for discussion during the next year's annual meeting.
38. The delegate of the EEC then invited the Organization to hold the special meeting on the Joint International Enforcement Scheme in Brussels early in 1988 on a date to be fixed by correspondence as soon as possible. That was agreed.
39. After the Chairman confirmed that the Press Release would be handled as usual, the Council voiced its appreciation of the work of the Secretariat, and of Mr. V. M. Hodder, the Assistant Executive Secretary, who will retire in October, 1987. The General Council recognized the many valuable contributions made by Mr. Hodder, both in ICNAF and NAFO, for the last 16 years and wished him happiness in his retirement.
40. The Chairman, as there was no further business, adjourned the meeting at 1430.

NINTH ANNUAL MEETING - SEPTEMBER 1987

List of Participants - General Council

President of NAFO: H. Schmiegelow  
Directorate General for Fisheries  
Commission of the European Communities  
200 Rue de la Loi  
1049 Brussels, Belgium

CANADA

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

Representatives

- P. Meyboom (see address above)
- L. Forand, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent St., Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
- D. E. Pethick, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6

Advisers

- R. L. Ablett, Director, Fisheries and Fish Products Div., Department of External Affairs, 125 Sussex Dr., Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0G2
- C. J. Allen, International Directorate, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0G2
- R. Andrews, Deputy Minister, Newfoundland Dept. of Fisheries, P. O. Box 4750, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5T7
- B. I. Applebaum, Director-General, International Directorate, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
- J. S. Beckett, CAFSAC, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, BIO, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia B2Y 4A2
- R. Cashin, President, Fisherman, Food and Allied Workers, P. O. Box 10, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5V5
- B. Chapman, President, Fisheries Association of Newfoundland and Labrador Ltd., P. O. Box 8900, St. John's, Newfoundland A1B 3R9
- E. B. Dunne, Regional Director-General, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1
- A. A. Etchegary, Fishery Products International, 70 O'Leary Avenue, St. John's, Newfoundland
- F. P. H. Flewelling, Chief, Surveillance and Enforcement, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
- J.-E. Hache, Regional Director-General, Scotia-Fundy Region, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 550, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 2S7
- A. A. Longard, Director, Marine Resources, Nova Scotia Department of Fisheries, P. O. Box 2223, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 3C4
- W. M. Murphy, Mersey Sea Foods, P. O. Box 1290, Liverpool, Nova Scotia BOT 1K0
- L. S. Parsons, Assistant Deputy Minister, Science, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
- W. Rowatt, Assistant Deputy Minister, Atlantic Fisheries, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent St., Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
- R. J. Prier, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 550, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 2S7
- K. E. Roeske, Fisheries Councillor, Mission of Canada to the European Communities, Ave. de Tervuren 2, 1040 Brussels, Belgium
- D. Tobin, Director General, Atlantic Operations, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
- H. R. Trudeau, Director Atlantic Operations, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
- M. Yeadon, National Sea Products, P. O. Box 2130, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 3B7

CUBA

Head of Delegation: E. Baez  
Ministerio de la Industria Pesquera  
Barlovento, Sta Fe  
Havana

Representatives

E. Baez (see address above)  
B. R. Garcia, International Relations Directorate, Ministry of the Fishing Industry, Barlovento, Sta Fe, Havana  
J. Varea, Ministerio de la Industria Pesquera, Barlovento, Sta Fe, Havana

Advisers

R. Dominguez, Flota Cubana de Pesca, Desamparados Esq. Mercado, Havana Vieta, Havana  
E. Fabregas, Ministerio de la Industria, Barlovento, Sta Fe, Havana

DENMARK (IN RESPECT OF THE FAROE ISLANDS AND GREENLAND)

Head of Delegation: S. A. Abrahamsen  
Greenland Home Rule  
Strandgade 100  
DK 1028 Copenhagen

Representatives

S. A. Abrahamsen (see address above)  
K. Hoydal, Foroya Landsstyri, P. O. Box 87, FR-110, Faroe Islands  
J. Paulsen, Greenland Home Rule, Erhvervsdirektoratet, Box 269, DK-3900, Copenhagen

Alternates

K. Løkkegaard, Gronlands Hjemmestyre, Danmarkskontoret, Box 2151, DK-1016 Copenhagen  
O. Samsing, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Asiatisk Plads, DK-1448, Copenhagen  
J. S. Søndergaard, Gronlands Hjemmestyre, Danmarkskontoret, Box 2151, DK-1016 Copenhagen

Advisers

A. Olafsson, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Asiatisk Plads 2, DK-1448 Copenhagen

EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY (EEC)

Head of Delegation: R. de Miguel  
Commission of European Communities  
200 Rue de la Loi  
1050 Brussels, Belgium

Representatives

R. de Miguel (see address above)  
E. J. Spencer, Directorate General for Fisheries, Commission of the European Communities, 200 Rue de la Loi, 1049 Brussels, Belgium  
V. Groebner, Commission of the European Communities, 200 Rue de la Loi, 1040 Brussels, Belgium

Alternates

- H. Schmiegelow, Directorate General for Fisheries, Commission of the European Communities, 200 Rue de la Loi, 1049 Brussels, Belgium  
P. Woodroffe, Commission of the European Communities, Rue de la Loi 200, 1040 Brussels, Belgium

Advisers

- M. J. Ibbotson, Min. of Agric., Fisheries & Food, Great Westminster House, Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AE  
P. Kristensen, 67 Rue d'Arlon, Brussels, Belgium  
R. Jordens, Federal Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Forestry, D-5300 Bonn, Federal Republic of Germany  
M. Cunha, Secretaria da Estado das Pescas, Av. 24, Julho 80, 1200 Lisbon, Portugal  
J. G. Boavida, Secretaria da Estado das Pescas, Av. 24, Julho 80, 1200 Lisbon, Portugal  
M. S. Christiansen, Ministry of Fisheries, Stormgade 2, DK-1470 Copenhagen K, Denmark  
M. Vaes, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries of the Netherlands, Bezuidenhoutsweg 73, 's Gravenhage, Netherlands  
D. Piney, Direction des Peches Maritimes et des Cultures Marines, 3, Place Fontenoy, F-75700 Paris, France  
M. I. Aragon, Secretaria General de Pesca Maritima, Jose Ortega y Gasset, 57, 28006-Madrid, Spain  
A. Beauvalot, M. Le Chef du Quartier des Affaires Maritimes, B. P. 4206, F-97500 Saint Pierre, St Pierre et Miquelon  
A. Bette, Secretariat General of the Council of the European Communities, 170 Rue de la Loi, 1048 Brussels, Belgium  
R. Cavestany, Consegen de Agricultura y Pesca, Embayada de Espana Washington, 2558 Massachusetts Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C. 20008  
M. G. Larraneta, Instituto Investigaciones Pesqueras, Muelle de Bouzas, Vigo, Spain  
J. Meseguer, Secretaria General de Pesca Maritima, Jose Ortega y Gasset, 57, 28006-Madrid, Spain  
E. Ruiz Molero, Ministerio de Asuntos Exteriores, Plaza de Santa Cruz, 2, Madrid, Spain  
W. J. Muschkeit, Verband der Deutschen, Hochseefischerei, Baudirektor-Hahn Str., Cuxhaven, Federal Republic of Germany  
A. J. Parres, Union des Armateurs a la Peche, 59 Rue des Mathurins, F-75008 Paris, France  
C. Soto, Sub-Directora General de Relaciones Pesqueras Internacionales, Secretaria General de Pesca Maritima, Jose Ortega y Gasset, 57, 28006-Madrid, Spain  
A. Vazquez, Instituto Investigaciones Marinas, Muelle de Bouzas, Vigo, Spain  
D. Wooldridge, President, Westphal Enterprises, Division Boydline Ltd., Hull, England

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Head of Delegation: F. Hartung  
AHB Fischimpex Rostock  
251 Rostock 5  
An der Jagerbak 1

Representatives

- F. Hartung (see address above)  
W. Mahnke, Institut fur Hochseefischerei und Fischverarbeitung, 251 Rostock-Marienehe, (HAUS 2)

JAPAN

Head of Delegation: M. Morimoto  
Oceanic Fisheries Department  
Fisheries Agency, Government of Japan  
1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
Tokyo

Representatives

- M. Morimoto (see address above)

Advisers

- T. Iwado, Embassy of Japan, 255 Sussex Drive, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1N 9E6  
T. Kosaka, Nippon Suisan Kaisha Ltd., Nippon Bldg., 6-2 Otemachi 2-Chome, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo  
T. Toyama, Fisheries Agency, Government of Japan, 1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda ku, Tokyo  
Y. Wada, Japan Fisheries Assoc., Ste. 1101, Duke Tower, 5251 Duke St., Halifax, N. S., Canada B3J 1P6  
H. Yamamoto, c/o Taiyo Fishery Co. Ltd., Fishery Div. Trawl Dept., 1-1-2 Otemachi, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo  
M. Yoshida, Japan Deep Sea Trawlers Assoc., Yasuda Bldg., 6F, 3-6 Ogawa-cho Kanda, 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. Zygmanski, Consul  
Trade Commissioners Office of Poland  
3501 Ave du Musee  
Montreal, Quebec  
CANADA H3G 2C8

Representatives

J. Zygmanski (see address above)

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS (USSR)

Head of Delegation: V. K. Zilanov  
Ministry of Fisheries  
Department of Foreign Relations  
12 Rozhdestvensky Boul.  
Moscow K-45, 103045

Representatives

V. K. Zilanov (see address above)

Alternates

V. Tsoukalov, Ministry of Fisheries, 12 Rozhdestvensky Boul., Moscow K-45, 103045

Advisers

V. Fedorenko, Assistant Representative of the USSR in Canada on Fisheries, 2074 Robie St., Suite 2202, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3K 5L3  
Y. B. Riazantsev, All-Union Research Institute of Marine Fisheries and Oceanography (VNIRO), 17 V. Krasnoselskaya, Moscow B-140, 107140  
L. Shepel, Representative of the USSR in Canada on Fisheries, 2074 Robie St., Suite 2202, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3K 5L3

OBSERVERS

Mexico

F. Castro y Castro, Secretaria de Pesca, Subsecretaria Infraestructura Pesquera, Av. Alvaro Obregon 269, Mexico 06100 D.F.  
D. Luna, Secretaria de Pesca, Av. Alvaro Obregon 269-8°, Mexico 06100 D.F.  
E. Perez, Embassy of Mexico, 190 Lees Ave., Apt. 2116, Ottawa, Ontario K1S 5L5

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

C. Terpak-Malm, NMFS/NOAA, F/IA1, 1825 Connecticut Ave. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20235  
H. S. Tinkham, Office of Fisheries Affairs, OES/OFA, U.S. Department of State, Room 5806, Washington, D.C. 20520



NAFO SECRETARIAT

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

SECRETARIAT ASSISTANCE

D. Appleby, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 550, Halifax, N. S. B3J 3S7

APPENDIX II

Ninth Annual Meeting of NAFO  
Lord Nelson Hotel, Halifax, N. S., Canada, 14-18 Sep 87

General Council

Agenda

OPENING PROCEDURES

1. Opening by the Chairman, H. Schmiegelow (EEC)
2. Appointment of Rapporteur
3. Adoption of Agenda
4. Admission of Observers
5. Publicity

SUPERVISION AND COORDINATION OF INTERNAL AFFAIRS AND EXTERNAL RELATIONS

6. Current Threats to Conservation in the Regulatory Area (See GC Doc. 86/4, Revised, items 17 and 21, see also GC Doc. 87/3)

ADMINISTRATION

7. Approval of Proceedings of 8th Annual Meeting, September 1986 (See GC Doc. 86/4, Revised)
8. Review of Membership
  - a) General Council
  - b) Fisheries Commission
9. Rules of Procedure for decision taking in voting by mail or telex (See GC Doc. 87/2)
10. Modifications to Subareas 4-5 Boundary
11. Administrative Report
12. Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman

FINANCE

13. Auditor's Report
14. Executive Secretary's Pension Fund (See GC Doc. 86/4, Revised, Items 29 and 30)
15. Amendment to Rule 3.3 of the Financial Regulations
16. Review of Meeting Dates
17. Report of STACFAD

CLOSING PROCEDURES

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

Statement of the Mexican Observer Delegation

The Observer delegation of Mexico presents its respectful regards to all distinguished delegations of member countries of NAFO on the fourth occasion it attends this meeting, our delegation also expresses its warm appreciation to the Executive Secretary, Captain Cardoso.

I apologize if I speak in Spanish, which is our official language of the United Nation System and it is the language of my country. Because of the financial constraints that NAFO faces, I understand that it has not been possible to have interpretation facilities for Spanish speaking countries.

I would thank all distinguished delegates to take note that our country fulfills with all the rules of procedures in order to notify the credentials of the observers who will attend this meeting.

My delegation has the impression that current rules and practices have been established in order to discourage and non-facilitate our presence. Mexico has shown its deep interest to become a member country of this Organization, but each year it is more difficult to fulfill not only the written, but also non-written understandings.

Our country has received written communication from a coastal state, on behalf of NAFO, directly interested in the fisheries resources recommending that Mexican flag vessels which have not a convenience flag as an expression of our sovereignty, should discontinue its operation in high seas waters adjacent to its Economical Exclusive Zone.

Such Mexican flag vessels operate according to the United Nation Law of the Sea Convention (UNCLOS), catching no migratory resources found in the high seas; fisheries inspections are performed in that area as if they were a national jurisdiction area. We consider that such inspection activities may be carried out only if they are based on specific agreements accepted by the interested countries.

My delegation states once again that Mexico is not a Contracting Party of any such bilateral or multilateral agreement, and that is why my country should not fulfill any of those agreements, neither take care of infringements to any convention that Mexico was not invited to join.

We cannot be responsible for the failure of a coastal state which does not encourage negotiations with the government of Mexico, even when my country clearly expressed its interest in maintaining friendly and equitable relations with other countries.

It is a matter of confusion for my country to know that a coastal state of NAFO can participate in regional organization and projects for the administration of fisheries resources in the Caribe Sea and the Gulf of Mexico, and on the other hand this country is reluctant to negotiate agreements in the area of the north Atlantic, adjacent to its jurisdictional waters.

It is clear to the Mexican delegation that this country has supported cooperation activities with other developing countries which play a main role in this Organization; nevertheless as far as our country is concerned we have been asked to stop our vessels operations at the high seas of the Atlantic, without the appropriate juridical bases and without taking into account the friendly and equitable relations among our countries.

Mexico is convinced of the need of proper administrative and conservation measures, in order to ensure the appropriate exploitation of the fisheries resources found at high seas adjacent to national jurisdictional waters; but Mexico also considers that it is important that NAFO invites our country to carry out negotiations based on the principles of the United Nation Law of the Sea Convention.

At the same time Mexico welcomes other regulations based on the justice, equity and good faith of all the States.

Mexico reiterates that it is prepared and stood ready to engage in bilateral as well as multilateral consultation with other countries about its presence in the high seas located in the North Atlantic. Such consultations should be based on the International Law of the Sea and maintaining the friendly and peaceful relations that Mexico is willing to have with all member states of this Organization.



NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES ORGANIZATION

NINTH ANNUAL MEETING - SEPTEMBER 1987

PRESS RELEASE

1. The Ninth Annual Meeting of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO) was held in Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada, during 14-18 September 1987, under the chairmanship of Mr. H. Schmiegelow (European Economic Community), 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 in Halifax.
2. Attending the meeting were delegates from the following Contracting Parties: Canada, Cuba, Denmark (in respect of Faroe Islands and Greenland), European Economic Community (EEC), German Democratic Republic, Japan, Norway, Poland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR).  
  
Observers from Mexico and the United States of America were present at the meeting.
3. The Scientific Council, under the chairmanship of Dr. J. Messtorff (EEC), gave advice on matters, requested by the Fisheries Commission on resources in the Regulatory Area and on special questions affecting those resources.
4. During 9-11 September 1987, there was a special session of the Scientific Council on Deepwater Resources of the North Atlantic, which involved 27 scientific contributions mostly on Greenland halibut and grenadiers.
5. The Scientific Council adopted several recommendations which were aimed at improving future research activities on resources in the Convention Area and the ongoing policy regarding its publications.
6. The Scientific Council elected the following officers for the term 1988 to 1989:
 

Chairman	- J. S. Beckett (Canada)
Vice-Chairman	- Sv. Aa. Horsted (Denmark in respect of the Faroes and Greenland)
Chairman (STACFIS)	- A. Maucorps (EEC)
Chairman (STACREC)	- A. Vazquez (EEC)
7. On the basis of the scientific advice provided by the Scientific Council from its meeting in June 1987 and at the present meeting, agreement was reached by the Fisheries Commission, under the Chairmanship of Mr. R. J. Prier (Canada), on conservation and management measures for 1988, 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.
8. The Fisheries Commission agreed to continue the moratorium for 1988 on cod fishing by Contracting Parties in Division 3L outside the Canadian zone to allow scientific information to be generated prior to any NAFO management decision for cod in that area.
9. The Fisheries Commission with the concurrence of the coastal state requested that the Scientific Council, at its meeting in advance of the 1988 Annual Meeting, provide advice on the scientific basis for management in 1989 of various fish stocks in the Regulatory Area and to consider different management options.
10. The Fisheries Commission agreed to hold a special meeting in Brussels, Belgium, in January 1988 to continue the work of developing a new Scheme of International Enforcement.
11. The Fisheries Commission elected its officers for the term 1988 and 1989, as follows:
 

Chairman	- K. Yonezawa (Japan)
Vice-Chairman	- J. Zygmanski (Poland)
The STACTIC Committee reelected as Chairman	- R. J. Prier (Canada)

12. The General Council decided that modifications to Subareas 4 and 5 reflecting the agreement reached on the maritime boundary between Canada and the United States of America in this area enter into force on 8 October 1987.
13. The General Council review and approved the Organization's budget and accounts.
14. The General Council elected the following officers for the term 1988 and 1989:

Chairman	- F. Hartung (GDR)
Vice-Chairman	- K. Hoydal (Denmark in respect of the Faroes and Greenland)

NAFO Secretariat  
18 September 1987

SCHEDULE I  
Quota Table 1 for 1988

Column I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI
Contracting Party	Cod Div. 3M	Cod Div. 3NO	Redfish Div. 3M	Redfish Div. 3LN	American Plaice Div. 3M	American Plaice Div. 3LNO	Yellowtail Div. 3LNO	Witch Div. 3NO	Capelin Div. 3NO	Squid (Illex) Subareas 3, 4
1. Bulgaria	-	-	300	-	-	-	-	-	-	500
2. Canada	-	19,070	500	10,650	150	39,415	14,630	3,000	400	N.S. <sup>5</sup>
3. Cuba	-	-	1,750	2,450	-	-	-	-	375	2,250
4. European Economic Community	-	14,750	1,200	-	350	510	300	-	375	N.S. <sup>5</sup>
5. Faroe Islands	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6. German Democratic Republic	-	-	-	850	-	-	-	-	-	-
7. Iceland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8. Japan	-	-	400	-	-	-	-	-	1,400	2,250
9. Norway	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4,500	-
10. Poland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	450	1,000
11. Romania	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	500
12. USSR	-	4,780	13,850	10,900	1,000	-	-	1,950	7,500	5,000
13. Others	-	1,400	100	150	500	75	70	50	0	5,000
14. Special Reservation <sup>2</sup>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
15. Total Allowable Catch	0	40,000	20,000	25,000	2,000	40,000	15,000	5,000	15,000	150,000 <sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Quotas are in metric tons.

<sup>2</sup> There are no Special Reservations for 1987.

<sup>3</sup> The opening date for the squid (Illex) fishery is 1 July.

<sup>4</sup> Any quota listed for squid may be increased by a transfer from any "coastal state" as defined in Article 1, para 3 of the NAFO 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.

<sup>5</sup> Not specified because the allocations 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.

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

Resolution proposal concerning the invitation of  
non-Member Governments to Annual Meetings of the  
Organization

The General Council

Noting that the regulatory measures adopted by the Fisheries Commission are based on the assumption that only fishing by member countries be conducted in the Regulatory Area,

Noting that fishing by non-Member countries therefore constitutes a danger to the rational management of the Regulatory Area,

Noting that fishing by non-Member countries in the Regulatory Area has become a significant factor in the exploitation of the resources but that statistics on many of these activities are not available to the Scientific Council thereby adversely effecting the ability of the Scientific Council to provide the necessary advice,

Noting Rule 1.2 of the Rules of Procedure, of the General Council and of the Fisheries Commission,  
Requests the Executive Secretary to notify, as appropriate, non-Member governments of the state of the stocks of the Regulatory Area and of the regulatory measures adopted by the Fisheries Commission, requesting those governments to comply with those measures,

Requests the Executive Secretary to invite, on behalf of the General Council, non-Member governments and any international organization to be represented at the Annual Meetings of the Organization based on the following criteria:

- non-Member governments and international organizations which were admitted to the previous Annual Meeting
- non-Member governments whose vessels have been fishing in the Regulatory Area since the previous Annual Meeting
- other non-Member governments and international organizations as agreed by the General Council.

APPENDIX VI

Draft Provisional  
Report of the Standing Committee on  
Finance and Administration (STACFAD)

Monday, 14 September 1987, 1400-1600 hrs  
Wednesday, 16 September 1987, 0900-1000 hrs  
Thursday, 17 September 1987, 0800-0930 hrs

1. The acting Chairman of STACFAD, Ms. Diana Pethick (Canada), called the meeting to order and welcomed all delegations to the Ninth Annual NAFO Meeting.

2. Appointment of Rapporteur

The Executive Secretary was appointed Rapporteur to prepare the first draft.

3. Adoption of Agenda

The Provisional Agenda, as circulated, was adopted (Annex 1). The Executive Secretary noted that the future location of the NAFO headquarters would need to be discussed at an appropriate point on the Agenda due to the possible financial implications of any move.

4. Review of Membership

The enlargement of the EEC membership was noted. Bulgaria, Romania and Iceland were not present at the Annual Meeting.

Attendance at STACFAD by delegates from the following Contracting Parties was noted: Canada, Cuba, Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland), European Economic Community (EEC), Japan, Norway, USSR; and observers from the U.S.A. and the Executive Secretary. (Annex 2)

4. Auditor's Report

The Chairperson called the attention of the Committee to the fact that the Report was accompanied by a note from the Auditors on the scope of the 1987 audit (Annex 3) and also by GC Doc. 87/1. STACFAD recommended to the General Council that the Auditor's Report for 1986 be approved, including the document outlining the proposed scope of the 1987 audit.

6. Amendment to Financial Regulation

The Committee considered the amendment to Rule 3.3 of the Financial Regulations and agreed to recom-  
mend its adoption.

7. Executive Secretary's Pension Fund

A document (STACFAD Working Paper 87/3) was introduced by the Executive Secretary in which he accepted the fixed percentage offered last year. The Committee agreed that it finalized the subject.

8. Staff Rules and Cost Implications

No comments had been received on the subject from Contracting Parties during the year.

However, the Executive Secretary acknowledged receipt of a document from Canada contained in STACFAD Working Paper 87/1 which was a new proposal of Staff Rules without any citation to the sources from which each article was proposed.

After discussion, the Committee reaffirmed its earlier decision of the need to have staff rules for NAFO along the lines of similar international fisheries commissions. The Executive Secretary offered to provide all Contracting Parties with a comparison, including cost estimates, of the two proposals for staff rules, the work to be completed by the end of February, 1988, if possible, and no later than the end of March, 1988. Following examination by Contracting Parties, it was intended that comments should be provided to the Secretariat. In order to provide a recommendation to the General Council at the next Annual Meeting, STACFAD agreed to recommend to the General Council that a Contracting Party be asked to provide guidance and foster progress of the work during the following twelve months. It was agreed that the most appropriate Contracting Party to undertake that task would be the host country for the next Annual Meeting.



In light of these comments, a special meeting of STACFAD, assisted by appropriate experts, might be required in order to provide an agreed set of staff rules for the consideration of the General Council next year.

STACFAD requested that the Executive Secretary provide a working document for its information, outlining the existing job description of position titles. Such descriptions would be aligned to the classifications, which would be defined, as provided in STACFAD Doc. 87/4.

In response to a query by the delegate of Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland), the Committee noted that, pending the adoption of new staff rules, the staff was covered by the general employment principles of the Canadian Public Service employee contracts and by the fact that the provisions granted in 1985 to non-Canadians employed in the Secretariat continued to apply.

9. Administrative Report and Financial Statements (See GC Doc. 87/5)

The Executive Secretary provided a detailed review of the activities of the Organization in 1986 and drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that approximately 14% of the budget for 1987 was still owing by some Contracting Parties as follows:

Bulgaria	\$ 15,273.87
Cuba	21,102.52
EEC	16,340.01 (balance outstanding)
Romania	15,273.97
USSR	<u>47,997.98</u>
	\$ 115,988.35

The Committee adopted the Administrative Report and financial statements.

10. Accumulated Surplus Account

The Executive Secretary advised the Committee that due to the outstanding liabilities caused by non-payment of dues, and the action taken last year to write-off the Romanian debt, the minimum balance of the surplus account (\$75,000) would have to be seriously reviewed in future in order to avoid NAFO being unable to meet its commitments. STACFAD took note of that.

The delegation of Canada suggested that Contracting Parties should be pressed for payment and informed of how serious the situation would become if no action ensued. It was suggested by the Executive Secretary that STACFAD might wish to recommend to the General Council that Contracting Parties accept that NAFO start charging interest on overdue payments and that such a measure should be initiated not as a penalty but as an ordinary operational charge. Some delegates felt that such an action could bring other difficulties and that at least it should be accompanied by the payment of interest by NAFO on advance payments by Contracting Parties. The issue was not pursued.

11. Budget Estimates to the Fiscal Year Ending December, 1988 (Annex 4) and Effect on the Communications and Contractual Services of a 10% Reduction

The budget proposed for 1988 represented a 2% increase over last year's budget. Following a detailed analysis and review, STACFAD recommended that the budget be adopted.

STACFAD members addressed the following items of particular concern and interest:

- If, as a result of the pending change in the staff, a non-Canadian member filled the position of Assistant Executive Secretary, no provisions had been inserted in the budget for the relocation and applicable extra benefits. That would require additional funding.
- The Committee agreed with the conclusion expressed in Working Paper 87/2 that it was unwise to consider any reduction in the amount provided for Other Contractual Services.
- The Committee noted the announced increase in the cost of the Audit, currently conducted by the Auditor General of Canada, which precluded any reduction of that item. The cost had increased by over 300% over the last three years, without a detailed explanation being given by the auditor. The Committee wished to express its concern about such a large increase for a relatively simple audit which had been conducted by the auditors on a yearly basis. The Executive Secretary was asked to solicit comparative costs from well-reputed, long-established Chartered Accountant firms. Those replies should be communicated to the Chairperson and all members of STACFAD, to provide information for the General Council at the next Annual Meeting.

- There appeared to be some margin in the amount provided for Communications, but with a further postage increase expected and given the difficulties of forecasting the volume of mailings, it was agreed to recommend the proposed budget figure.

The issue of the move of the NAFO headquarters was likely to cause a ripple effect through the 1988 budget in additional costs for meetings and transportation. STACFAD agreed to recommend to the General Council a resolution seeking some firm assurances from the Government of Canada to provide appropriate space for an important international fisheries organization such as NAFO and in addition to ensure the provision of adequate meeting space for its meetings of scientists and other working groups. In the 1988 budget the new costs associated with the move would be \$ 19,000. However, if such a move did not take place that amount would be saved and the proposed budget reduced accordingly. STACFAD therefore recommended that the General Council adopt the following resolution for transmission to the Government of Canada:

"The General Council of NAFO wishes to put on record its appreciation to the Government of Canada for the provision of free accommodation and auxiliary services for the NAFO Headquarters and would respectfully request that in the event that the NAFO Secretariat is required to vacate its present accommodation in the Bedford Institute of Oceanography, in any new accommodation it is essential to include a meeting room large enough to accommodate the Scientific Council meetings."

Finally, the delegate of the EEC requested that in the future, the Secretariat present the budget estimates with an indication of the percentage change over the preceding year. STACFAD agreed.

11. Budget Forecast for 1989 (Annex 5)

STACFAD noted that that document would be reviewed in detail at next year's meeting.

12. The billing date for the fiscal year ending 31 December 1988 was agreed as 15 February 1988. For a preliminary calculation of billing see Annex 6.

13. Date and Place of 1988, 1989 and 1990 Annual Meetings

STACFAD noted the kind invitation of the Government of Canada to host the 1988 annual meeting in Ottawa. The location of the 1989 annual meeting was expected to be Halifax/Dartmouth area.

The dates to be as follows:

1988	General Council	Monday, 12 September - Friday, 16 September
	Fisheries Commission	Monday, 12 September - Friday, 16 September
	Scientific Council	Wednesday, 07 September - Friday, 16 September
1989	Scientific Council	September 06 - 15
	Fisheries Commission	September 11 - 15
	General Council	September 11 - 15
1990	Scientific Council	September 05 - 14
	Fisheries Commission	September 10 - 14
	General Council	September 10 - 14

14. The meeting of STACFAD was adjourned.

Ninth Annual Meeting of NAFO  
Halifax, Nova Scotia, 14-18 Sep 87

Standing Committee on Finance and Administration (STACFAD)

Agenda

1. Opening by the Chairperson, Ms. D. Pethick (Canada)
2. Appointment of Rapporteur
3. Adoption of Agenda
4. Review of Membership
5. Auditor's Report
6. Amendment to Rule 3.3 of Financial Regulations (See Note 3 to General Council Draft Provisional Agenda)
7. Executive Secretary's pension fund (See GC Doc. 86/4, Rev. Items 29 and 30)
8. Discussion and approval of proposal of NAFO Staff Rules (See GC Doc. 86/4, Rev., page 23, item 7)
9. Administration Report and Financial Statements for 1987 (to 31 July)
10. Review of Accumulated Surplus Account
11. Employees employment conditions and classification and salary ranges
12. Effect on the Communications and Contractual Services items of a hypothetical 10% reduction on 1988 budgeted figure
13. Budget Estimate for the fiscal year ending 31 December 1988
14. Budget Forecast for the fiscal year ending 31 December 1989
15. Billing date for the fiscal year ending 31 December 1988 (15 February 1988)
16. Date and Place of 1988, 1989 and 1990 Annual Meetings
17. Other Business
18. Adjournment

Standing Committee on  
Finance and Administration (STACFAD)

List of Participants

14 September 1987

Canada	- D. E. Pethick (Chairperson) L. Forand
Cuba	- E. Fabregas B. Garcia Moreno
Denmark (in respect of the Faroes & Greenland)	- J. S. Søndergaard J. M. D. Paulsen
European Economic Community (EEC)	- V. Groebner M. J. Ibbotson
Japan	- M. Morimoto T. Iwado J. Toyama
Norway	- P. Gullestad
Poland	- J. Zygmanski
USSR	- V. Fedorenko
<u>Observers</u>	
USA	- S. Tinkham C. Terpak-Malm

NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES ORGANIZATION  
REPORT TO THE GENERAL COUNCIL

INTRODUCTION

This audit plan is for the use of the Office of the Auditor General, the Secretariat and the General Council for purposes of documenting the arrangements for the audit of the financial statements of Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO) for the year ending December 31, 1987. It provides a basis for discussion of the scope of the 1987 audit of the financial statements and the approach and reports that we consider necessary in the performance of our responsibilities as auditors of NAFO.

An important step in this procedure is the review of this plan by the General Council.

The audit plan will be subject to change as new developments occur and as the results of our audit procedures are evaluated.

AUDIT SCOPE

Our audit will be carried out in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards. It is designed to enable us to render, without qualification as to scope, an opinion on the financial statements of NAFO in accordance with the requirements of the International Convention on Future Multilateral Cooperation in the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries (Part I, Article XVI, Paragraph 10) and the Financial Regulations for the Organization (Part II, Section D). Assuming a typical unqualified auditor's report on the financial statements of the Organization, the Auditor General will state that, in his opinion, the financial statements present fairly the financial position of the Organization as at December 31, 1987 and the results of its operations and the changes in its financial position for the year then ended in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles applied on a basis consistent with that of the preceding year. Further, in accordance with Part II, Section D Paragraph 7.1 of the Financial Regulations of the Organization, the Auditor General is required to express an opinion on whether the transactions that have come to his notice are, in all significant respects, within certain specified "authorities" (refer to Appendix B).

The scope of our audit will include a review, evaluation and testing of the significant systems of internal accounting control to the extent considered necessary to establish a basis for reliance thereon in determining the nature, extent and timing of auditing procedures necessary to support our report. Such review and procedures are not specifically designed to enable us to determine all weaknesses which may exist in the systems or to express an opinion exclusively on internal accounting control.

In conducting our audit, we are aware of the possibility that fraud may exist and that, as a result, financial statements may be misstated. We recognize that fraud, if sufficiently material, may affect our opinion on the financial statements and we, therefore, give consideration to this possibility in planning and conducting our examination. However, our examination is not primarily or specifically designed, and cannot be relied upon, to disclose defalcations and other irregularities, although their discovery may result in some cases.

#### AUDIT APPROACH

We have completed an initial planning survey which provided us with a current understanding of the organization and its financial policies, key audit areas, organizational structure and accounting applications. With this information, we have developed an initial audit plan. As the plan is developed and refined, we will continue to discuss it in general terms with management to ensure that all areas of concern have been appropriately dealt with.

In carrying out our audit, internal control questionnaires and audit programmes are used such that evidence in respect of specific financial statement assertions and audit requirements for each account balance or operation are fulfilled as effectively and efficiently as possible. As indicated earlier, the accounting systems and related internal controls are reviewed and, where necessary, tested for compliance.

With a sound understanding of the organization and our evaluation of internal accounting controls, our audit work on balances at December 31, 1987 will emphasize areas of high dollar value and relative audit risk. Similarly, our review of the results of operations for the year then ended will be from a business perspective, stressing the reasonableness and impact of factors affecting relationships among account balances and fluctuations relative to budget and past performance.

Planned audit visits are as outlined in Appendix A.

#### AUDIT TEAM

The Auditor General of Canada is appointed the auditor of the Organization pursuant to Part 1, Article XVI Paragraph 10 of the International Convention on Future Multilateral Cooperation in the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries and is available for consultation on significant accounting or auditing issues. The audit will be directed by Paul Ward, C.A. (Assistant Auditor General) and Brian Pearce, C.A. (Principal, Atlantic Region). Rick Lewis, C.A. (Supervisor) and Jay Cussons (Field senior) are assigned to lead the audit team.

## MAJOR AUDIT AREAS

The major audit areas are summarized as follows:

- Assets and liabilities
- Contributions from contracting parties
- Salaries and employee benefits
- Other expenditures

Our examination of these areas will comprise appropriately tailored procedures.

## AUDIT RISKS

Accounting systems and procedures have been in place for some years and the staff is fully aware of their responsibilities. Audit risk is considered moderate.

## REPORTS

### Auditor's Report

Upon completion of the examination, we will issue our auditor's report on the financial statements. We will work closely with the Secretariat in reviewing and discussing the year-end financial statements and our report thereon.

It is our current expectation that the audit report on the 1987 financial statements will be substantially in the form shown in Appendix B.

### Management Letters

In the course of our audit we make recommendations to management for changes in procedures which we feel improve the system of internal accounting control relating to financial and reporting practices. We monitor the implementation of our recommendations to ensure that appropriate follow-up action has been taken.

The more significant of these recommendations and observations will be communicated to the General Council.

We believe in effective communication with our clients and, to achieve this objective, we communicate with management in several ways, such as:

- reporting to management on each phase of our audit, by making recommendations and observations on matters which we believe warrant attention; and

- by meeting periodically with senior officials in the financial and accounting areas, and with the General Council, if considered appropriate, so that all problems or questions on changes in accounting or financial reporting are dealt with fully and promptly. Such meetings help in minimizing "surprises".



Appendix A

NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES ORGANIZATION

SCHEDULE OF AUDITS

The following is the proposed schedule of our visits. This schedule may be subject to change and NAFO will be notified of any necessary changes.

1987 Fiscal

Interim and Year End

Jan/Feb. 1988

Appendix B

DRAFT AUDITOR'S REPORT

In the absence of unusual circumstances, the auditor's report will likely be as follows:

AUDITOR'S REPORT

To the Chairman and Members of the General Council  
Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization

I have examined the balance sheet of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization as at December 31, 1987 and the statements of revenue and expense, accumulated surplus and changes in financial position for the year then ended. My examination was made in accordance with Canadian generally accepted auditing standards, and accordingly included such tests and other procedures as I considered necessary in the circumstances.

In my opinion, these financial statements present fairly the financial position of the Organization as at December 31, 1987 and the results of its operations and the changes in its financial position for the year then ended in accordance with the accounting policies set out in Note 2 to the financial statements applied on a basis consistent with that of the preceding year.

I further report as required by Rule 7.1 of the Financial Regulations of the Organization that, in my opinion, the financial statements are in accord with the books and records of the Organization; the financial transactions reflected in the statements have, in all significant respects, been in accordance with the Financial Regulations for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization and the budgetary provisions; and the monies on deposit and on hand have been verified by certificate received directly from the Organization's depositories or by actual count.

D. Larry Meyers, F.C.A.  
Deputy Auditor General  
for the Auditor General of  
Canada

Ottawa, Canada  
,1988

NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES ORGANIZATION

Budget Estimate for 1988

	<u>Approved Budget Estimate for 1987</u>	<u>Preliminary Budget Estimate for 1988</u>	<u>Budget Estimate for 1988</u>
1. Personal Services			
(a) Salaries	\$ 456,000	\$ 470,000	\$ 470,000
(b) Superannuation and Annuities	59,000	55,000	55,000
(c) Additional Help	1,000	1,000	1,000
(d) Group Medical and Insurance Plans	17,000	20,000	20,000
(e) Termination Benefits	18,000	20,000	20,000
(f) Accrued Vacation Pay	15,000	15,000	15,000
2. Travel	10,000	5,000	5,000 <sup>1</sup>
3. Transportation	1,000	5,000	1,000
4. Moving Expenses	-		4,000 <sup>2</sup>
5. Communications	45,000	45,000	45,000
6. Publications	16,000	12,000	12,000
7. Other Contractual Services	45,000	45,000	45,000
8. Materials and Supplies	25,000	26,000	26,000
9. Equipment	5,000	5,000	5,000
10. Annual and Mid-Year Meetings	30,000	30,000	30,000 <sup>3</sup>
11. Computer Services	<u>30,000</u>	<u>32,000</u>	<u>32,000</u>
	<u>\$ 773,000</u>	<u>\$ 786,000</u>	<u>\$ 786,000</u>

<sup>1</sup> Home leave for Executive Secretary and attendance at meeting of Directors and Executive Secretaries of the six International Commissions, located in North America, re discussion of pension scheme for employees.

<sup>2</sup> If the NAFO Secretariat is asked to vacate present office accommodations in the Bedford Institute of Oceanography, this amount will be required for moving expenses. This amount will be removed from the budget if the Secretariat remains in the Bedford Institute of Oceanography or if the expenses of any move are paid by the Department of Public Works, Canada.

<sup>3</sup> An amount of \$ 15,000 is required for expenses relating to the 10th Annual Meeting, September 1988, to be held in Ottawa, Canada, and the Scientific Council Meeting to be held in June at the headquarters of the NAFO Secretariat. An additional \$ 15,000 has been budgeted for the expense of holding the Scientific Council Meeting (June 1988) in commercial space, should the NAFO Secretariat be asked to vacate present office accommodations in the Bedford Institute of Oceanography.

NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES ORGANIZATION

Budget Forecast 1989

1. Personal Services	
(a) Salaries	\$ 490,000
(b) Superannuation and Annuities	60,000
(c) Additional Help	1,000
(d) Group Medical and Insurance Plans	22,000
(e) Termination Benefits	20,000
(f) Accrued Vacation Pay	15,000
2. Travel	3,000
3. Transportation	1,000
4. Communications	45,000
5. Publications	14,000
6. Other Contractual Services	48,000 <sup>1</sup>
7. Materials and Supplies	27,000
8. Equipment	5,000
9. Annual and Mid-Year Meetings	32,000
10. Computer Services	32,000
	<u>\$ 815,000</u>

<sup>1</sup>Auditor General's fee for 1988 fiscal year audit to be increased from \$ 8,000 to \$ 11,000.

STATEMENT V

Preliminary calculation of billing for Contracting Parties against proposed estimate of \$786,000.00 for the 1988 financial year (based on 12 Contracting Parties to NAFO).

Budget estimate ..... \$ 786,000.00  
Deduct: Amount from Accumulated Surplus Account ..... \$ 183,207.00  
Funds required to meet 1988 Budget ..... \$ 602,793.00

60% of fund required = \$ 361,675.80  
10% of fund required = \$ 60,279.29  
30% of fund required = \$ 180,837.96

Contracting Parties	Nominal Catches for 1984	% of Total Catch in Convention Area	% of 60% of Canadian Funds	Coastal States 10%	\$ Canadian Funds	10% in Canadian Funds	30% Divided Equally Amongst Contracting Parties	Total Amount Due from Each Contracting Party (\$ Canadian Funds)
Bulgaria	-	-	-	-	-	-	15,069.83	15,069.83
Canada	994,606 <sup>a</sup>	70.7267	255,801.36	994,606	48,936.54	-	15,069.83	319,807.73
Cuba	23,339	1.6596	6,002.37	-	-	-	15,069.83	21,072.20
Denmark (Faroes & Gr.)	79,448 <sup>b</sup>	5.6496	20,433.24	79,448	3,909.11	-	15,069.83	39,412.18
EEC	151,086	10.7438	38,857.72	151,086	7,433.64	-	15,069.83	61,361.19
GDR	17,883	1.2717	4,599.43	-	-	-	15,069.83	19,669.26
Iceland	-	-	-	-	-	-	15,069.83	15,069.83
Japan	8,031	0.5711	2,065.53	-	-	-	15,069.83	17,135.36
Norway	2,042	0.1452	525.15	-	-	-	15,069.83	15,594.98
Poland	7,391	0.5256	1,900.97	-	-	-	15,069.83	16,970.80
Romania	-	-	-	-	-	-	15,069.83	15,069.83
USSR	122,440	8.7067	31,490.03	-	-	-	15,069.83	46,559.86
Total	1,406,266	100.0000	361,675.80	1,225,140	60,279.29	180,837.96		602,793.05

<sup>a</sup> Provisional statistics used when calculating 1985 nominal catches for Canada.

<sup>b</sup> Faroe Islands = 3,891; Greenland = 75,557

Resolution relating to the appointment of  
a new Assistant Executive Secretary of the  
Organization, adopted by the General Council  
on 18 September 1987

The General Council

Noting that the position of Assistant Executive Secretary of NAFO has become vacant and that candidates have been invited to submit their applications,

Noting Article XV.3 of the Convention,

Requests the Chairman of the Scientific Council to convene, in conjunction with the present Annual Meeting, a small advisory group to assist the Executive Secretary in assessing the scientific qualifications of the applicants in order for the Executive Secretary to appoint the new Assistant Executive Secretary taking into consideration the overall qualifications of the different applicants.

APPENDIX VIII

Statement of F. Hartung (GDR) on his Election  
to the Chairmanship of the General Council

Distinguished Delegates - Ladies and Gentlemen:

As a representative of the German Democratic Republic in the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization and on my behalf, I would like to thank you for the great honour of electing me Chairman of the General Council.

As you know, the German Democratic Republic, in the past as in the present, has always taken the standpoint that we have the duty to conserve and protect the fisheries resources on the basis of a rational management.

In carrying out my duties in NAFO, I understand that this is the main point, this is the highest task of this International Fisheries Organization.

For me it is clear that all member countries share this opinion in order to ensure a fishery in this region now and in the future. We all are interested in large, stable annual catches, with best economy for the fishermen.

This can only be achieved with the highest international cooperation between all member countries as sovereign states with equal rights in this area. NAFO is the international body designed to manage the resources outside the 200-mile zone. And NAFO has a high reputation. So the responsibility of all member states is very important indeed.

It seems to me that all member countries have to take effective steps so that decisions of this Organization form the basis of all fishery activities in this Area.

If not, then NAFO will cease to exist. And without NAFO, there will be no management of the stocks on a scientific basis and it all will end in outright overfishing which will destroy all possibilities for all countries, member and non-member, involved in the fishery.

Keeping in mind such a dreadful scenario, I am sure that we can solve the problems left for further discussion in this meeting. As the new Chairman of the General Council of NAFO I will try to do my best in the right way. You have placed a big burden on my shoulders: I am appealing to you for assistance.

Thank you very much.

Northwest Atlantic



Fisheries Organization

Serial No. N1417

NAFO/GC Doc. 87/10  
(Corrigendum)

NINTH ANNUAL MEETING - SEPTEMBER 1987

Report of the General Council

Please replace page 14 of GC Doc 87/10 (revised) with the attached Quota Table for 1988.

The EEC quota for 3M redfish should read 3,100 mt not 1,200 mt. This is because the previous 1,900 mt quota to Portugal must now be added to the normal 1,200 mt quota for EEC.





SCHEDULE I  
Quota Table 1 for 1988

Column I Contracting Party	II		III		IV		V		VI		VII		VIII		IX		X		XI	
	Cod	Div. 3M	Cod	Div. 3NO	Redfish	Div. 3M	Redfish	Div. 3LN	Redfish	American plaice	Div. 3M	American plaice	Div. 3LNO	Yellowtail	Div. 3LNO	Witch	Div. 3NO	Capelin	Div. 3NO	Squid (Illex) Subareas 3 + 4 364
1. Bulgaria	-	-	-	-	300	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	500
2. Canada	-	-	19,070	-	500	150	10,650	-	39,415	-	14,630	-	-	-	-	3,000	-	400	-	N.S. <sup>5</sup>
3. Cuba	-	-	-	-	1,750	-	2,450	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	375	-	2,250
4. European Economic Community	-	-	14,750	-	3,100	350	-	-	510	-	300	-	-	-	-	-	-	375	-	N.S. <sup>5</sup>
5. Faroe Islands (Denmark)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6. German Democratic Republic	-	-	-	-	-	-	850	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7. Iceland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8. Japan	-	-	-	-	400	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,400	-	2,250
9. Norway	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4,500	-	-
10. Poland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	450	-	1,000
11. Romania	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	500
12. USSR	-	-	4,780	-	13,850	1,000	10,900	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,950	-	7,500	-	5,000
13. Others	-	-	1,400	-	100	500	150	-	75	-	70	-	-	-	50	-	0	0	-	5,000
14. Special Reservation <sup>2</sup>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
15. Total Allowable Catch	0	0	40,000	0	20,000	2,000	25,000	0	40,000	15,000	5,000	150,000 <sup>6</sup>	15,000	15,000	5,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	150,000 <sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Quotas are in metric tons.

<sup>2</sup> There are no Special Reservations for 1987.

<sup>3</sup> The opening date for the squid (Illex) fishery is 1 July.

<sup>4</sup> Any quota listed for squid may be increased by a transfer from any "coastal state" as defined in Article 1, para 3 of the NAFO 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.

<sup>5</sup> Not specified because the allocations 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.

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