

Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization



Serial No. N1686

NAFO/GC Doc. 89/4
(Revised)

ELEVENTH ANNUAL MEETING - SEPTEMBER 1989

Report of the General Council

Tuesday, 12 September - 1025-1210
Thursday, 14 September - 1725-1830
Friday, 15 September - 0940-1010
Friday, 15 September - 1045-1055
Friday, 15 September - 1210-1225

1. The Chairman, Mr. F. Hartung (GDR), received the Vice-President of the European Commission, Mr. Manuel Marin, in charge of Cooperation and Fisheries, and accompanied him from outside the meeting room to the Chairman's table at the head of the room.

The Chairman, after opening the meeting at the Albert Borschette Conference Centre at 1025, introduced and welcomed Mr. Marin and all participants (see Appendix 1).

The EEC Vice-President in a brief but meaningful address (see Appendix 2) stressed that the European Community was firmly committed to the principles of conservation and rational management of the living marine resources.

He pointed out that, in order to resolve the difference of views which had been dividing NAFO in recent years, the EEC was preparing to reduce significantly the autonomous cod quota in 2J3KL, and others within levels supported by actual catches and in line with conservation policy.

He revealed that the inspection vessel "Eastella" had just begun inspection duties in the Regulatory Area where she would be active for the next six weeks.

He closed by underlining that in the world of international fisheries consensus was essential.

After the applause had ceased, the President thanked the speaker, Mr. Marin, and accompanied and saluted him at the door.

2. The Chairman then returned to the chair and read an opening statement (see Appendix 3).
3. The delegate of Canada thanked the Chairman for his comments and asked for a break of 15 minutes. That was agreed and after the break, the meeting was reconvened at 1105.
4. The delegate of Canada thanked the Vice-President of the EEC for his declarations. He thought that it was encouraging to hear that the EEC was committed to conservation and management of fisheries resources. Canada certainly agreed in the need for cooperation and conservation.

In Canada's view NAFO had been hampered by the procedures of the last 4 years. The harmful results of those procedures could be seen in the poor state of stocks, especially of flatfish and 3NO cod. Quota reductions in 2J3KL cod were being maintained by respecting the moratorium in 3L cod, in the Regulatory Area.

The EEC quota had been reduced from 84,000 tons to some 58,400 tons which was a value still very much off the limits recommended by NAFO's advice. Canada's delegation had understood that new fishing levels would be established in accordance with catch levels. However such a criterion could be, and most of the time would be, in disregard of the proffered scientific advice.

It was therefore important that, in spite of all possible improved attitudes of other Contracting Parties, Canada should underline, as it was doing, its serious concerns relating to the state of the main stocks in the Regulatory Area. (See Appendix 4)

5. The Chairman changing to item 2 of the Agenda proposed the time honoured nomination of the Executive Secretary as the Rapporteur. That was adopted.
6. The Chairman proposed the adoption of the Agenda. The Executive Secretary intervened to clarify that a letter from the Chairman of the Scientific Council had informed him that the Scientific Council had not yet considered the subdivision of Subarea 5ze and therefore agenda item 9 as proposed in the Provisional Agenda should be deleted. That was agreed. (See Appendix 5)
7. Coming to the Admission of Observers the General Council welcomed the presence of observers from Mexico and USA who have been admitted as observers on a permanent basis.
8. The Chairman then introduced document GF/9-178 which explained the request of Greenpeace, applying for observer status. He proposed that Heads of Delegation meet at 1500 in the same room to discuss the reply to that request. That was agreed.
9. The Chairman then proposed that Publicity would be handled as usual and it was so decided.

10. Coming to Agenda item 6, Current Threats to Conservation in the Regulatory Area, the delegate of Canada, although confirming his concerns relating to fishing by non-member countries, thought it would be too early to discuss that matter and consequently asked that the Council should let STACTIC discuss that matter and also allow time for the Fisheries Commission to comment on it before it was dealt with. That was agreed.
11. Referring to Agenda item 7, Review of legal principles and systematics of quota allocations in the presence of catches by non-member countries, the delegate of the EEC pointed out that he felt it was too soon to discuss that matter and that STACTIC should be given an opportunity to report on the activity of non-Contracting Parties within the Regulatory Area. He stated that his delegation had the perception that the volume of catch in that category had been much increased recently.
- It was agreed that Review, together with item 6, should be discussed later on Friday, 15 September 1989.
12. Coming to item 8 of the Agenda, the delegate of Canada explained that the problem of the fishery limits in 3Ps had led to a bilateral agreement between Canada and France, and, as a consequence, that subject was no longer of any concern to the Scientific Council. Consequently he would propose that it could be dropped from the discussion.
- Since there were no interest or comments from anybody else, the Chairman felt that there was no reason to continue studying that subject or study whether the Convention should be changed.
13. The delegate of the EEC agreed with Canada that the problem had been solved. The EEC would however like to restate that it should be obvious that advice could be given on the Scientific Council's own initiative.
- The Chairman reaffirmed that he was glad not to continue discussing that question.
- The delegate of Japan approved that solution, which was taken.
14. Under agenda item 10, Approval of Proceeding of 10th Annual Meeting, the Chairman called the attention of the meeting to Note 3 to the Provisional Agenda, and requested the approval of the Proceedings.
15. The Rule of Procedure, which would be adopted in relation to agenda item 10 was explained in the referred Note 3 and by the Executive Secretary.
16. It was agreed that the period for final approval would be limited to 90 days and that voting for approval of the new Rule should take place at the next meeting.
17. Review of Membership and all items in the Agenda up to and including Item 19 were referred to STACFAD.
18. Everyone present at the meeting was advised that the cocktail reception offered by the EEC would take place in the lobby, Thursday at 1830.
19. The meeting was terminated at 1210 so that consultations could take place well before 1500, when the heads of delegations would be able to meet in the room for meetings of General Council.
20. The Chairman, Mr. F. Hartung (GDR), opened the meeting by advising the Council that meanwhile the Executive Secretary had telephoned "Greenpeace" and had informed them, in the exact terms agreed by every member present at the meeting, that the Council regretted that it was not possible to give a favourable reply to their request to be an observer at the 11th Annual Meeting of the Organization. Mr. James Carr of "Greenpeace" thanked the Executive Secretary and the subject was now closed.
21. The Chairman introduced then again the discussion of items 6 and 7 of the Agenda. The fact was that a Working Group had not yet been established and it was necessary to take a decision.
22. The delegate of the EEC recognized the problem and thought that a Working Group was indeed necessary. They had first thought that perhaps the proper body to act could or should be the Fisheries Commission. However a more thorough analysis of the problem led to the conclusion that the General Council was the proper body to deal with such a basic subject and give options on how to address that serious threat. The EEC had elaborated the text of a proposal which would be distributed immediately.
23. The observer from Mexico, Madame R. Rosado, Director General of International Fishing Affairs, was given the floor in order to make a statement on the position of Mexico regarding international cooperation in fisheries and the possible incorporation in NAFO. (See Appendix 6)
- In that intervention a new important Convention signed by Ecuador, El Salvador, Mexico, Nicaragua and Peru, creating the "Oriental Pacific Tuna Organization" was mentioned.
24. The Chairman thanked the observer from Mexico and hoped that some time soon Mexico would be welcomed as a partner in NAFO.

The delegate of the EEC also gave thanks for the Mexican delegation for its statement. He found its attitude most encouraging and had praise for its presence at the NAFO meetings sharing the problems and preoccupations of the Contracting Parties. Certainly the transformation into new Contracting Parties from the present fishing non-members would demand some sacrifices from the old Contracting Parties. The EEC was ready to cooperate as it was obvious that such problems could only be solved by cooperation never by confrontation.

The EEC proposal on the Working Group which would study the problem was being circulated then. It was a step taken to get well acquainted with it. (See Appendix 7)

The delegate of Cuba wished to express its delight in being able to receive one day soon in NAFO its sister Republic of Mexico.

25. The delegate of Canada expressed its thanks for having the presence of Mexico at so many NAFO meetings already in a real spirit of cooperation. He wished to thank also the EEC in the belief that its attitude and proposal would mean that the EEC would revert to accept NAFO agreed quotas and even when necessary give part of those quotas.

He wish to affirm Canada's interest in participating in the Working Group.

26. The delegate of Canada proposed that the Working Group should be chaired by Mr. O. Muniz from Cuba.

The delegate of the EEC seconded this nomination.

27. The delegate of Denmark stated that Denmark would wish to participate in the Working Group. He would like to know when would the Group start its work.

The delegate of the EEC stated that the work should start as soon as possible. Some necessary decisions to take might be political and in his view the group would not want to start so late as the day before the opening of the coming Annual Meeting. Diplomatic steps would have to be taken presumably relative to the governments of the countries now fishing in the Regulatory Area of NAFO without belonging to NAFO.

The EEC was ready to help with as many experts as necessary.

The delegate of Canada agreed with the position of the EEC. He thought that Mr. Muniz as Chairman should contact everybody interested.

The delegate of the USSR declared that the USSR would be represented in the Working Group.

The delegate of the EEC suggested that the Executive Secretary should address himself to all Contracting Parties and ask them immediately to agree on a date for the Working Group to meet in Halifax, maybe as soon as possible in January.

After the consultation, the Executive Secretary should take the initiative and have the Chairman set a date which would be communicated to all Contracting Parties.

28. The Chairman of the General Council asked Mr. Muniz if he could accept the position of Chairman of the Working Group. Mr. O. Muniz, from the Cuban delegation, accepted the position.

The Chairman of the General Council concluded that the matter was thus settled and he hoped that the Working Group would have results by the middle of the year.

29. Passing on to item 11 of the Agenda, the Chairman informed that he had written to Romania but never received a reply. The report of STACFAD would also give information on that matter.

The delegate of the USSR informed the meeting that the USSR had written to the Deputy Minister of Food and Industry but also obtained no reply. The Chairman decided to postpone the study of the implications of the matter to the approval of the report of STACFAD and that was agreed.

30. The delegate of Canada asked the Chairman to maintain open item 6 of the Agenda because Canada had a further intervention to make on that item.

The Chairman agreed to leave the final discussion of item 6 to Friday.

31. The Chairman of STACFAD, called to present its Report, informed that he was in a position to present the first ten points of that Report. He explained very clearly and systematically all those points and all were approved as proposed.

Referring to the Relocation of Headquarters he stated that he himself had had occasion to visit the new headquarters and confirm that they were splendidly situated and intelligently designed. The Executive Secretary reported the names of the Canadian personalities that had helped in solving many of the problems of the move and installation.

The Council on a motion from the EEC decided to make known in the present Report its appreciation of the gift of those installations and its thanks for the help given.

The Chairman, leaving for the next session the final approval of the Report of STACFAD, adjourned the meeting at 1830.

32. The Chairman, Mr. F. Hartung (GDR), opened the meeting, on Friday, 15 September, at 0940, by giving the floor to Mr. M. Ibbotson, Chairman of STACFAD, in order for him to conclude the presentation of the Report of STACFAD.

The Chairman of STACFAD informed that the first 10 items of his report were all approved by STACFAD as they had already been presented at the previous session of the General Council.

Proceeding with the Budget for 1990, he pointed out that, including a special expenditure of \$31,000 due to the replacement, as planned, of the Executive Secretary, the Committee had approved, after a careful analysis of every item, a total budget of \$871,500 which represented an increase of 9 1/2% over the approved budget for 1989.

Due to the financial difficulties of several of the Contracting Parties, STACFAD had agreed to recommend a reduction of 1 1/2% which would bring the budget to \$858,500, in the understanding that the Executive Secretary would be free to determine the means to attain it.

However it was understood that no special meetings would be authorized outside the Dartmouth headquarters.

As to item 12 of the STACFAD agenda, the budget for 1991 was noted as a projection to be revised and approved next year.

It was then suggested that the place for the next meetings in 1990, 1991 and 1992 would be Halifax or Dartmouth unless different timely invitations would be received meanwhile.

For the timing of the 1991 meeting there were two alternatives because there was difficulty in obtaining one course acceptable to all Contracting Parties.

The procedure to be followed for the selection of the new Executive Secretary had been fully agreed by the STACFAD members and was presented for adoption.

The General Council adopted all recommendations and the report of STACFAD except that, since it did not find it possible to arrive at a speedy agreement regarding the date for the meeting in 1991, it agreed to leave that matter for final decision in 1990, if no other occasion presented itself before that date. (See Appendix 8)

The delegate of Canada proposed a motion of gratitude to the Chairman and Committee of STACFAD, which was seconded by the delegate of the EEC and approved.

The Chairman of STACFAD thanked the General Council for the approval of the STACFAD Report and its motion of encouragement and expressed his tribute for the first class work and effort of the Executive Secretary and all the personnel of the Secretariat. This was supported by the General Council.

33. The Chairman of the General Council invited the Council to proceed to the election of officers.

The delegate of Canada proposed Mr. K. Hoydal (Denmark in respect of the Faroes and Greenland), for the position of Chairman, that was seconded by Norway and then supported by all delegates present.

Mr. Hoydal accepted his election and thanked the Council for the trust they were showing him.

Coming to the election of Vice-Chairman, the Council elected Mr. E. Oltuski (Cuba), who was proposed by Canada, seconded by Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland) and then supported by all delegates present.

Mr. Oltuski thanked the Council for the gesture of electing him, but he stated that the responsibilities of his position in the Cuban government back home made it very difficult for him to accept the position for which he had been elected and therefore he was forced to accept, subject to his Government ratification, which would be communicated or withdrawn in due time. This was noted.

34. The Chairman of the Council invited the discussion of Other Business but none was forthcoming.
35. As to the Press Statement the Chairman declared that it would be dealt with in the traditional manner. (See Appendix 9)
36. With the conclusion that item 6 of the Agenda was still outstanding, the Chairman adjourned the session at 1010.
37. At 1045 the Chairman called the meeting to order, so that the delegate of Canada would introduce a project of Resolution on the importance of accord and collaboration in matters of management and conservation.
38. The delegate of the EEC requested that the session be adjourned in order that every Contracting Party could study thoroughly the proposed Resolution.
39. That was agreed and the Chairman adjourned at 1055 and again called the meeting to order at 1210.
40. The delegate of the EEC requested that a vote be taken on the proposed Resolution. At the end of the voting he would explain his vote.

41. The delegate of Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland) stated that in his view the proposed Resolution addressed only one of the major problems involved and not all the problems. He would like to mention, among those not addressed but of great importance: (a) the problem of the relationship with non-member countries fishing in the Regulatory Area (b) the application of the Articles of the modern Law of the Sea to the activities of every country, member and non-member, while in the Regulatory Area.

He felt that there was a possibility to solve all problems and that every member should strive to find that possibility. His remarks should not however be taken to mean that Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland) would have difficulty in supporting the proposed Resolution. Denmark (in respect of the Faroes and Greenland) would support it in the light of what had been said and in the hope of progress in all relationships.

42. As nobody was opposed to voting, the Chairman proceeded to the vote. Every Contracting Party present voted in favour with the exception of the EEC which abstained. The Resolution was thus adopted by 9 votes in favour and one abstention. (See Appendix 10).
43. The delegate of the EEC proceeded then to explain his vote. The EEC regretted that it found loopholes in the Resolution just adopted. To balance the aims of obtaining optimum utilization, rational management and conservation was always very difficult and, in his opinion, answers had not yet been found which would meet the legitimate aspirations of every Contracting Party. Thus for the moment the EEC judged more adequate to abstain.
44. As no other delegation wished to intervene, the Chairman, before closing the meeting, thanked the EEC for the arrangements and excellent meeting facilities provided and the pleasant hospitality. He also thanked all delegations, the Fisheries Commission and the Scientific Council, all subsidiary bodies and all Rapporteurs for the work done, the Executive Secretary and the Secretariat for the supportive work which contributed much for the success of the meeting. Many problems were still to be solved in the future. He then wished luck to his successor, Mr. Hoydal, and everybody a safe journey home.

After thanks were given to the Chairman by Mr. Hoydal and by the delegates of the EEC and of Canada, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 1225.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS-11th ANNUAL MEETINGGENERAL COUNCILBULGARIA

Head of Delegation: P. Kolarov
Institute of Fisheries
Boul. Chervenoarmeisky 4
9000 Varna

Representative

P. Kolarov (see address above)

CANADA

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

Representatives

P. Meyboom (see address above)
G. Etchegary, 33 Pippy Place, St. John's, Newfoundland

Advisers

B. Applebaum, Director-General, International Directorate, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
J. S. Beckett, Fisheries Research Branch, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent Street, 12th Floor, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
R. Belliveau, Deputy Director, Fisheries Trade Policy Div., Dept. of External Affairs, 125 Sussex Drive, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0G2
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
W. Bruce, Task Force on Northern Cod, P. O. Box 13454, St. John's, Newfoundland
R. Cashin, P. O. Box 10, St. John's, Newfoundland
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
J. Corcoran, P. O. Box 10, St. John's, Newfoundland
E. B. Dunne, Director General, Newfoundland Region, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1
D. Gill, International Directorate, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
J. E. Hache, Regional Director General, Scotia Fundy Region, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 550, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 2S7
O. Jalbert, Dept. of External Affairs, 125 Promenade Sussex, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0G2
G. Landry, Assistant to the Minister, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
J. E. H. LeGare, Sous Ministre Adjoint, 459 Mansfield St., Fredericton, New Brunswick E3 3A1
R. Lemieux, Assistant Deputy Minister, Fisheries-Quebec, 200 Ch. Ste Fole, Quebec G1R 4X6
D. A. MacLean, Deputy Minister, Nova Scotia Dept. of Fisheries, P. O. Box 2223, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 3C4
T. MacDonald, Deputy Head of Mission, Canadian Mission to the European Communities, Ave. de Tervuren, 2, 1040 Brussels
P. McGuinness, 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 1415, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
E. Mundell, Officer, International Directorate, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent Street, 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
V. Rabinovitch, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
D. Rivard, Fisheries Research Br., Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6
K. Roeske, Counsellor (Fisheries), Canadian Mission to the European Communities, Ave. de Tervuren, 2, 1040 Brussels, Belgium
M. J. Starr, Communications Officer, External Affairs and International Trade Canada, 125 Sussex Dr., Ottawa, Ontario K1R 5R5

- R. Stirling, President, Seafood Producers Association of Nova Scotia, Box 991, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia B2Y 3Z6
- D. Tobin, Director General, Atlantic Operations, 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
- D. Vardy, Deputy Minister, Government of Newfoundland, P. O. Box 243, Topsail, Newfoundland
- F. Way, Assistant Deputy Minister, Intergovernmental Affairs, Government of Newfoundland, JGA Secretariat, 5th Floor, Confederation Bldg., St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5T7
- R. Wells, Fisheries Research Br., Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1
- E. Wiseman, Director, Atlantic International Directorate, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, 200 Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6

CUBA

Head of Delegation: E. Oltuski
 Vice-Minister de la Peche
 Republique de Cuba
 Ministerio de la Industria Pesquera
 Barlovento
 Sta Fe, Havana

Representatives

- E. Oltuski (see address above)
- O. Muniz, c/o Pickford and Black Ltd, P. O. Box 1117, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada B3J 2X1
- I. M. Behmaras, Ministerio de la Industria Pesquera, Barlovento, Sta Fe, Municipio Playa, Ciudad, Havana

Advisers

- J. Alvarez Portela, Conseiller Commercial et Economique, Ambassade de Cuba, Ave Princesse Paola 12A, 1180 Brussels

DENMARK (in respect of Faroes and Greenland)

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

Representatives

- E. Lemche (see address above)
- J. Olsen, Foroyalandsstyri, P. O. Box 64, FR-110, Torshavn, Faroe Islands

Alternates

- S. Adersen, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Asiatisk Plads 2, DK-1448, Copenhagen, Denmark
- K. Hoydal, Foroya Landsstyri, P. O. Box 87, FR 110, Torshavn, Faroe Islands
- K. Lokkegaard, Gronlands Hjemmestyre, Sjaeleboderne 2, DK 1122 Copenhagen, Denmark

Advisers

- A. Olafsson, Udenrigsministeriet, Asiatisk Plads 2, DK-1448, Kobenhavn K, Denmark
- M. Olsen, Joensen & Olsen, FR-700, Klaksvik, Faroe Islands
- Sv. Aa. Horsted, Gronlands Fiskeri Undersogelser, Tagensvej 135, DK-2200, Kobenhavn N, Denmark
- H. Lassen, Gronlands Fiskeri Undersogelser, Tagensvej 135, 1, DK-2200, Kobenhavn N, Denmark

EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY (EEC)

Head of Delegation: R. deMiguel, Director
 Directorate General for Fisheries
 Commission of the European Communities
 200 Rue de la Loi
 B1049 Brussels

Representatives

- R. deMiguel (see address above)
- M. J. Ibbotson, Room 428, Nobel House, Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, Smith Square, London SW1P 3HX

Alternates

- H. Schmiegelow, Commission of the European Communities, 200 Rue de la Loi, 1049 Brussels
 J. Spencer, Commission of the European Communities, 200 Rue de la Loi, 1049 Brussels

Advisers

- J. Pearson, Director, Directorate General for Fisheries, Commission of the European Communities, 200 Rue de la Loi, B-1049 Brussels
 P. F. Hillenkamp, Principal Administrator, Commission of the European Communities, 200 Rue de la Loi, 1049 Brussels
 F. Benda, Head of Monitoring and Inspection, Commission of the European Communities, Rue de la Loi 200, 1049 Brussels
 R. Noe, Directorate General for Fisheries, Commission of the European Communities, 200 Rue de la Loi, B 1049 Brussels
 M. Newman, Administrator-Inspection and Control, Commission of the European Communities, 200 Rue de la Loi, 1049 Brussels
 H. deLange, Directorate-General for External Relations, Head of Division, Commission of the European Communities, 200 Rue de la Loi, B-1049 Brussels
 T. Abadia, Directorate-General for External Relations, Principal Administrator, 200 Rue de la Loi, Berl-3 77A, Brussels
 D. J. Dunkley, Admin. Assistant, Commission of the European Communities, Rue de la Loi 200, 1049 Brussels
 A. H. Thomson, Directorate-General for External Relations, Commission of the European Communities, 200 Rue de la Loi, 1049 Brussels
 D. Piney, Direction des Peches, Ministere de la Mer, 3 Place de Fontenoy, 75700 Paris, France
 A. Bette, Head of Division, Secretariat General of the Council of the European Communities, 170, Rue de la Loi, B-1048 Brussels
 S. Kristensen, Principal Administrator, Secretariat General of the Council of the European Communities, 170, rue de la Loi, B-1048 Brussels
 J. Carbery, Legal Advisor, Council of the European Communities, 170 Rue de la Loi, 1048 Brussels
 R. Gordejuela Aguilar, Presidente ANAVAR, Puerto Pesquero, Edificio cooperativa, Vigo, Spain
 B. Amoroso, Representation Permanente Italienne aupres CEE, 74 Rue de la Loi, 1040 Brussels, Belgium
 M. I. Aragon, Secretaria General de Pesca Maritima, Jose Ortega y Gasset, 57, 28006 Madrid, Spain
 A. Avila de Melo, Instituto Nacional de Investigacao das Pescas, Av. Brasilia, Alges Praia, 1400 Lisbon
 J. Bertrand, IFREMER, BP 4240, 97500 St. Pierre et Miquelon
 P. Bradhering, Bundesministerium fur Ernahrung, Landwirtschaft und Forsten, Rochusstr. 1, D-5300 Bonn 1, Federal Republic of Germany
 E. P. de Brito, Director General for Fisheries, Av. Brasilia, DOCA Pesca, 1400 Lisbon, Portugal
 C. Soto Calvo, Deputy Director, Secretaria General de Pesca Maritima, Jose Ortega y Gasset, 57, 28006 Madrid, Spain
 H. P. Cornus, Institut fur Seefischerel, Palmallee 9, 2000 Hamburg 50, Federal Republic of Germany
 M. Cunha, Av. da Republica 32-3-Esq, 1000 Lisbon, Portugal
 P. Garcia Donoro, General Director of International Fisheries Relations, Secretaria General Pesca Maitima, Ortega y Gasset, 57, Madrid, Spain
 Y. Doutriaux, Representation Permanente de la France aupres de la CEE, 69 rue Ducale, 1000 Brussels
 A. H. Eraso, President AGARBA, Orillamar, Vigo Pontevedra, Spain
 J. Fontan, General Manager ASPE (Spanish Fishing Companies Assoc.), c/Policarpo, Sanz 1, OF 501, Vigo 36202, Spain
 R. Foth, Permanent Representation of Germany to the EEC, 64 rue Royale, 1000 Brussels
 G. P. Gandaras, Instituto Investigaciones Marinas, Muelle de Bouzas, Vigo, Spain
 P. Garo, Ministere de la Mer, 3 Place de Fontenoy, 75700 Paris, France
 P. Giannella, Directeur des Rapports Internationaux de la Peche, Ministere de la Marine Marchande, Viale Asia, Rome, Italy
 M. L. Godinho, Instituto Nacional de Investigacao das Pescas, Av. Brasilia, Alges Praia, 140 Lisbon, Portugal
 H. Gonzalez Garcia, ANAVAR & AGARBA, Edificio Vendedores, Oficina 1-6, Puerto Pesquero, Vigo, Spain
 I. Alvarez-Gortari, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 117 Principe de Vergara, Madrid, Spain
 P. de Grand Ry, Representation permanente de la Belgique aupres des Communautés europeennes, rue Belliard, 62, B-1040 Brussels
 J. Herrero, Fishing Counsellor of Spanish Permanent Representation, Boulevard du Regent 52, Brussels
 E. Hutchinson, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Ireland to the EEC, Ave. Galilee No. 5, bte 22, Brussels 1030
 B. W. Jones, Fisheries Laboratory, Lowestoft, Suffolk, NR33 0HT, United Kingdom
 G. F. Kingston, Senior Assistant, Economic & Commercial Affairs, Delegation of the Commission of the EEC, 350 Sparks St., Suite 1110, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1R 7S8
 R. Lucana, Counsellor Permanent Representation Portugal, Rue Marie Therese No. 11, 1040 Brussels
 A. Martin, Vice-Presidente de ARBAC, Esnabide 10, Pasajes de San Pedro 20.110 (Guipuzcoa), Spain
 J. L. Mesequer, Secretario General, Asociacion de Empresas de Pesca de Bacado, Especies Afines y Asociadas (ARBAC), Enrique Larreta, 10-Madrid, 28036 Spain
 J. Messtorff, Institut fur Seefischerel Fischkal, D-2850 Bremerhaven, Federal Republic of Germany
 W. J. Muschkeit, Verband der Deutschen, Hochseefischerel, 285 Bremerhaven, Lengstr., Federal Rep. of Germany
 A. J. Parres, Union des Armateurs a la Peche, 59 Rue des Mathurins, F-75008 Paris, France
 C. Real, Camellas 50, Vigo, Spain
 M. Roitmann, Fisheries Counsellor, Danish EEC-Representation, 73 Rue D'Arlon, B-1040 Brussels
 O. Samsing, Counsellor, Danish EEC-Representation, 73 Rue D'Arlon, B-1040 Brussels
 C. Tomnay, Room 425, Nobel House, 17 Smith Square, London SW1P 3HX United Kingdom
 M. Vaes, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries of the Netherlands, Bezuidenhoutsweg 73, 's Gravenhage, Netherlands
 A. Vazquez, Instituto Investigaciones Marinas, Muelle de Bouzas, Vigo, Spain
 R. Weatherston, R., Room 509, DAFS, Pentland House, Edinburgh, Scotland

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

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

Representatives

F. Hartung (see address above)
 K. Plagemann, Head of Department, International Relations, Fischimpex Rostock, 251 Rostock 5, An der Jagerbak 1

Advisers

W. Mahnke, Head of Department, Institut für Hochseefischerei Rostock, 251 Rostock 5, An der Jagerbak 1
 M. Monch, Adviser, Fischimpex Rostock, 251 Rostock 5, An der Jagerbak 1

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)

Alternate

M. Morimoto, Oceanic Fisheries Dept., Fisheries Agency, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, 1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo

Advisers

Y. Aoki, Fishery Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100
 S. Fukuda, Marine Strategic Planning & Development Dept., Nippon Suisan Kaisha, Ltd., 6-2 Otomachi 2-Chome, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo
 Y. Minagawa, Taiyo Fishery Ltd., 1-2 Chome, Otomachi, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo
 T. Mori, Foreign Affairs Div., Oceanic Fisheries Dept., Fisheries Agency, 1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo
 K. Uozumi, Far Seas Fisheries Research Laboratory, 5-7-1 Orido, Shimizu City
 T. Yamashita, First Secretary, Japanese Mission to the EEC, Av. des Arts 58, 1040 Brussels
 M. Yoshida, Japan Deep Sea Trawlers Association, 6F Kasuda Bldg., 3-6 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)

Advisers

L. Skjong, 6050 Valderoy
 D. Stai, Norwegian Mission to the EEC, 17 Rue Archimede, B-1040 Brussels

POLAND

Head of Delegation: J. L. Kleniewski
 Chief, Fishery Division
 Ministry of Transport, Shipping and Communications
 Dept. of Intl. Cooperation
 ul. Chalubinskiego 4/6
 00-950 Warsaw

Representatives

J. L. Kleniewski (see address above)
 J. Stremlau, 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)

Alternate

L. Shepel, Ministry of Fisheries, 12 Rozhdestvensky Boul., Moscow K-31

Advisers

V. Fedorenko, Representative of the USSR in Canada on Fisheries, 2074 Robie St., Apt. 2202, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada B3K 5L3
Y. Riazantsev, All-Union Research Institute of Marine Fisheries and Oceanography (VNIRO), 17 V. Krasnoselskaya, Moscow B-140
V. A. Rikhter, Atlantic Research Institute of Marine Fisheries and Oceanography (Atlantnizo), 5 Dmitry Donskoy Street, Kaliningrad, 236000
V. Solodovnik, Ministry of Fisheries, 12 Rozhdestvensky Boul., Moscow K-31
V. Tsoukalov, Ministry of Fisheries, 12 Rozhdestvensky Boul., Moscow K-31

OBSERVERSMEXICO

D. Luna Corona, Director de Politicas y Acuerdas Persqueros Internacionales, Av. Alvaro Obregon 269-8, Mexico 06100 DF
M. R. Rosado, Director General of International Fishing Affairs, Ministry of Fisheries, Av. Alvaro Obregon 269-8, Mexico 06100 DF

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

K. S. Brown, First Secretary, US Mission to the European Communities, 40, Blvd. du Regent, Brussels
W. H. Gibbons-Fly, Foreign Affairs Specialist, Office of International Affairs, NOAA Fisheries, 1335 East-West Hwy, Rm 7228, Silver Spring MD 20011 USA

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

SECRETARIAT ASSISTANCE

M. deHarlez, Commission of the European Communities, 200 Rue de la Loi, B-1049, Brussels

APPENDIX 2

ELEVENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NORTHWEST
ATLANTIC FISHERIES ORGANIZATION
BRUSSELS, 11-15 SEPTEMBER 1989

Opening Address to the General Council

by

Mr. Manuel Marin,
Vice-President of the European Commission

Mr. Chairman, Executive Secretary, Distinguished Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen.

It is a great honour for the European Community to host this meeting of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization for the first time since its establishment in 1979.

I am personally very pleased to welcome you to Brussels for this Annual Meeting of the first international fisheries organization to which the Community as such became a Contracting Party.

I should like to state first of all that the European Community is firmly committed to the principles of conservation and rational management of living marine resources.

NAFO waters form part of the high seas, and we all have an obligation to protect and preserve world resources, as well as the environment.

My priority as European Commissioner responsible for fisheries policy is to implement these principles, with concrete measures, in EC waters as well as in all those areas where the Community fleet is active.

The conservation and rational utilization of stocks in the Northwest Atlantic can only be achieved through international cooperation.

Therefore, we believe that the single most important issue facing this Annual Meeting is to resolve the differences of views which have characterized the deliberations of NAFO over recent years.

The EC is determined to address these differences in a spirit of cooperation and compromise. To illustrate this goodwill, allow me to dwell on two outstanding measures that we have recently adopted in the fields of resource management and inspection.

First, in the light of scientific information made available early this year, the EEC was confronted by a delicate decision concerning the significant reduction of the autonomous cod quota of one of the most sensitive areas covered by the Convention (2J13K1).

May I underline that this decision has not been easy. Such an important reduction has had a great commercial, economic and social cost for EC fishermen and fishing regions.

Yet, difficult as it may be, I assure you that we are willing to enact similar measures, every time that concern for a specific stock is supported by adequate scientific information.

We attach great importance to increasing cooperation between Parties on improving our knowledge of fish stocks.

It is obvious from reading the Scientific Council Report that scientific information could and should be increased.

This is the only rational way to conduct serious discussions on our management policy for the future.

Scientific research will be equally important for the future of our marine resources. This is why I intend to stimulate research cooperation, firstly between the EC Member States, and then on an international level.

NAFO Contracting Parties must join their efforts in order to increase and share the knowledge about the reality of fish stocks.

We must thus adapt to reality through better information.

In this perspective, it is my personal intention to establish EC fishing levels for all species, from now on, within the levels according to actual catches and in line with conservation policy.

The second measure I want to mention concerns inspection.

We believe that NAFO objectives can be attained only if all Parties ensure the respect of agreed NAFO management measures.

Consequently, since the entry into force of the Joint International Inspection Scheme, the EC has carried out two inspection patrols of an extended duration.

Furthermore, I am pleased to inform the Council that the inspection vessel "Estrella", chartered by the European Commission, has just entered the Regulatory Area. Over the next six weeks, this vessel will be fulfilling inspection duties.

I can assure you that, in the interests of the conservation of fisheries resources, the Community will continue to show its commitment to avoid any infringements, through concrete actions.

I should like to conclude by underlining that, in order to be effective, measures adopted by NAFO must necessarily recognize the interests of all Parties concerned.

The effect of these measures does not depend solely on their content, but also on the backing they enjoy from the members of the Organization.

It is therefore essential that the necessary compromises are worked out among ourselves so that the final measures adopted can be respected by all Contracting Parties.

I am sure you will agree with me that consensus is essential.

I wish you a productive and useful meeting, and a pleasant stay in Brussels.

Opening Address

by

F. Hartung, Chairman of the General Council

Honourable Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is a great honour for me to welcome you once again to the 11th Annual Meeting of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization. This 11th Annual Meeting takes place here in Brussels, a city with great historical tradition and future. Following an invitation of the delegation of the European Community, excellent working conditions have been provided for the successful course of our meeting. In the name of all delegates I would like to thank once again the EEC for the invitation extended to us and the facilities made available.

As we stated already at the 10th Annual Meeting we have to overcome in our Organization one of the most difficult periods since its establishment in 1980. In spite of the most intensive efforts we have not been able yet to solve difficult issues facing our Organization. This is deplorable and therefore, for constructive results cooperation of all member countries aimed at solutions meeting the interests of all members is required during our discussions. The situation of fish stocks in the Convention Area demands actions to be taken soon, actions to be shared and carried out by all member countries.

In many talks I had with delegates I came to the conviction that all are aware of the complicated situations the fish stocks are in the Convention Area and that in accordance with the objectives of our Organization we have a great responsibility as far as the conservation of the stocks and their reasonable exploitation on a scientific basis are concerned. The sacrifices to be made by all are big, taking into consideration the interests of each sovereign member country and ensuring mutually fair treatment and support. The sacrifices can be kept however, in our opinion, within acceptable limits. The decisions taken by our Organization affect the living conditions of many people in the fishing communities of the coastal state especially but also of the member countries of our Organization. These decisions have in many cases a deep repercussion as far as the different economic objectives of the member countries are concerned.

Since this is so and since the fishery stocks are limited it is very difficult to take decisions which meet the interests of all. But there is no alternative. Either we are in a position to reach decisions in our Organization concerning the management of the fisheries which are supported by all member countries or in a couple of years there is not any more "raison d'etre" for our Organization - with far more traumatic effects on the lives of people who have to earn their living by fishing in the Convention Area. I think none of us would like to be accused, now or in the years to come by future generations, of not having been able to find a reasonable solution in spite of many difficulties or of having failed in this situation. Life has shown that solutions in conflict situations are always compromises. I say this here and now because I hope that we will be able to make serious progress involving the difficult problems facing our Organization. Our decisions should also be an incentive for non-members fishing in the Convention Area to join our Organization. That means we have to take decisions aimed at opening the door for accession of these states to NAFO.

The compelling need exists to convert our unregulated fishery into a regulated one or all measures taken in the field of stock assessment are a farce.

Thank you very much for your attention and I think now we should go through our Agenda.

APPENDIX 4

OPENING STATEMENT TO NAFO GENERAL COUNCIL
 BY THE HEAD OF THE CANADIAN DELEGATION, DR. PETER MEYBOOM
 BRUSSELS, SEPTEMBER 12, 1989

Mr. President and fellow delegates to the Eleventh Annual Meeting of NAFO, I want to begin by thanking the European Community for the very effective and comfortable arrangements and facilities they have provided as hosts for the Eleventh Annual Meeting of NAFO. I am sure these arrangements and facilities will contribute significantly to the conduct of our discussions over the next several days.

I listened most attentively to the opening address of our host, the EC Commissioner for Fisheries, Mr. Manuel Marin. His words were encouraging in many respects. I welcome the European Community's statement that it is committed to the conservation and rational management of the fishery resources in the NAFO Area. We take this as an indication that Mr. Marin has in mind new EC initiatives aimed at implementing its responsibilities as a member of NAFO to the fishery resources managed by the Organization and to the legitimate interests of all Contracting Parties.

Mr. Marin has referred to the need for cooperation and consultation among all Contracting Parties in coming to decisions on the management and conservation of the NAFO stocks. Mr. Marin has stated that NAFO decisions must reflect the interests of all concerned. We agree with that.

However, we as the representatives of the NAFO Contracting Parties, must not lose sight of the fact that the present NAFO conservation and management framework is already the result of a fundamental compromise developed during the time the NAFO Convention was being negotiated. It is a complex and multifaceted compromise rooted in the ICNAF negotiations that preceded the establishment of NAFO.

I am sorry to have to repeat this; but, in our view NAFO has been hampered in implementing this compromise and accomplishing its objectives over the last four years. The results are clear to see: fish stocks managed by NAFO are going down alarmingly; especially the flatfish stocks and 3NO cod, which now provide quotas to NAFO members at levels far below their potential yield.

May I briefly comment on two specific items mentioned by Mr. Marin: The quota reduction in 2J3KL and the general principle that is being advocated to govern quota setting.

On 2J3KL, NAFO agreed last year after intensive debate and much soul searching to continue the moratorium on cod fishing in 3L. In other words: the NAFO quota was zero.

The quota that was subsequently unilaterally set by the EC was 84,000 tonnes. When scientific advice in Canada made it clear that the 2J3KL stock was at a seriously low level, the EC reduced the autonomous quota to 58,400 tonnes as mentioned by Commissioner Marin. In our view that quota was still in disagreement with the NAFO decision of zero and had no conservation effect whatsoever. We will have more to say about that when we discuss 3L later this week.

As for the governing principle proposed by Mr. Marin that "fishing levels be established according to actual catches" that is not - in our view - in line with conservation policy. NAFO has always adopted the view that fishing levels be established on the basis of scientific advice. Canada will continue to advocate that position.

As for compromise, we all know, that NAFO has always made compromises, but always within guiding principles that have kept the Organization focused on conservation and optimum utilization. The one major exception to application of these guiding principles was, as indicated, 3M cod, and we know the result of our compromise in that case. Without guiding principles, such as NAFO has followed since its inception, there will be, over the long term, fewer fish, less stability from one year to the next, and marginal productivity. The EC's use of the objection procedure has de facto implemented something different from the NAFO regime. The unfortunate results must reconfirm NAFO's resolve to maintain a conservative management approach.

NAFO succeeded in the past because it adhered firmly, year after year, to a guiding management strategy and because the Contracting Parties cooperated and shared together both the constraints and the benefits. It was a practical approach. It could work again. It must work again if viable fisheries in the NAFO Regulatory Area are to return. We hope that the underlying message in Mr. Marin's statement is that the Community plans to return to the NAFO conservation framework it fully supported until September 1985, and that this is what we will learn from Community actions and statements during this meeting.

However, as I said at the beginning of my comments Mr. Marin's words were encouraging in many respects, and we hope that the underlying message of his statement will lead to agreement and better mutual understanding.

Eleventh Annual Meeting of NAFO
Albert Borschette Conference Centre, Brussels
6-15 September 1989

General Council Agenda

OPENING PROCEDURES

1. Opening by Chairman, F. Hartung (CDR)
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. 88/7, Revised, items 8, 27 to 33 and GC Doc. 88/8)
7. Review of legal principles and systematics of quota allocations in the presence of catches by non-member countries (See GC Doc. 88/7, Revised, items 10 to 15 and 34)
8. Interpretation requested by the Scientific Council of Article VII.1 of the Convention (See GC Doc. 88/7, Revised, items 16, 17 and 35 to 39)

ADMINISTRATION

9. Approval of Proceedings of 10th Annual Meeting, September 1988 (See GC Doc. 88/7, Revised, item 19)
10. Review of Membership
 - a) General Council
 - b) Fisheries Commission
11. Administrative Report
12. Selection of New Executive Secretary - Formulation of Procedure and Timetable
13. Election of Officers - Chairman and Vice-Chairman

FINANCE

14. Auditor's Report
15. Relocation of NAFO Headquarters
16. Meeting of the Pension Society
17. Review of Meeting Dates and Date of Annual Meeting
18. Report of STACFAD

CLOSING PROCEDURES

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

APPENDIX 6

Statement of the Mexican Observer Delegation to the
Eleventh Annual Meeting of the Northwest Atlantic
Fisheries Organization, Brussels, September 1989

Since 1984, Mexico has attended as an observer at the Annual Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO) Meetings; this has allowed my Country to closely follow the development of the regulations of this scheme of resource administration and conservation.

The presence of my delegation at this Meeting bears witness to the genuineness of the Mexican Government's policy of maintaining ties of cooperation with this Organization and its Member Countries.

The new governmental administration, which assumed office nine months ago, has set out to attain social and economic objectives by means of an efficient utilization of fishing resources.

Thus, the national program for the development of fisheries and their resources for 1989-1994 proposes as one of its strategies the rational use of fishing resources in order to avoid their over-exploitation. The program also considers incorporation unexploited or scarcely utilized species and areas into commercial usage, based on the best scientific evidence available.

In the international context, we have promoted this strategy furthering and participating in international schemes for the regulation of species. On July 21st of this year, Ecuador, El Salvador, Mexico, Nicaragua, and Peru signed the Convention which created the Oriental Pacific Tuna Organization (Organizacion Atunera del Pacifico Oriental), which focuses on regulating the rational exploitation and conservation of the species in this area of the Pacific.

It is with the same positive outlook of cooperation with which we endorsed the above-mentioned Convention that we have now come to the Eleventh Annual Meeting of NAFO. We appreciate the steps taken by NAFO's Executive Secretary in order to invite Mexico to join the Organization; we are also encouraged by the expressions of interest and initiatives which have been presented by the Member Countries in this same regard.

We are conscious of these expressions and therefore reiterate our disposition to carry out the bilateral and multilateral consultations which will allow us to maintain our fishing presence in the Northwest Atlantic, guided by the principles set forth in the New Law of the Sea and in accordance with the aims pursued by NAFO.

Mexico's possible incorporation to NAFO is motivated by its conviction that a management scheme which attends to the realities of regulated fisheries must be permanently maintained. Mexico is interested in becoming part of a scheme of international cooperation where measures are taken and decisions are adopted in a concerted manner, and in which there is no place for allowing unilateral restrictive policies concerning the exploitation of fishing resources to prevail.

Mexico expects speedy progress of the consultations proposed in 1988 by the Chairman of the General Council to study and suggest means to further the incorporation of others states to NAFO, and of course will be ready to consider initiatives regarding catch quotas.

We are certain that the disposition shown by Mexico in the past, and reiterated by the present administration, to participate as an observer in this forum, and to contribute NAFO's objectives, will result in a more open approach towards dialogue and negotiation which our Country has sought during six years.

ELEVENTH ANNUAL MEETING - SEPTEMBER 1989

Proposal from the Delegation of the EEC
for the Establishment by the General Council
of a Working Group to examine the fishing activities
of Non-Contracting Parties

There has been a significant increase in the non-member activity within the Regulatory Area over the past five years. Information from inspections and sightings by vessels and aircraft of Contracting Parties show that the number of non-member vessels has increased from eleven vessels (11) in 1984 to forty-one (41) in 1988. This is approximately 20% of activity by all Contracting Parties.

Estimates on catches for non-member activity indicate that those vessels could have taken approximately 30,000 t of groundfish in 1988; this represents 30% of the total quotas allocated by NAFO to Contracting Parties.

Whereas the non-member activity is having an increasingly negative effect on both fishing opportunities for Contracting Parties and the various stocks affected.

It is resolved that a Working Group be established by the General Council of experts nominated by the Contracting Parties, to examine any possible options to address this serious threat to the objectives and goals of the Organization.

A full report of the Committee deliberations will be presented to the General Council at the next annual NAFO meeting.

APPENDIX 8Draft Report of the Standing Committee on
Finance and Administration (STACFAD)

Monday, 11 September 1989: 1500-1800
 Tuesday, 12 September 1989: 0845-1000
 Tuesday, 12 September 1989: 1545-1830
 Wednesday, 12 September 1989: 0845-1300
 Wednesday, 12 September 1989: 1500-1745
 Thursday, 13 September 1989: 0900-1100
 Thursday, 13 September 1989: 1200-1315
 Thursday, 13 September 1989: 1730-1845

1. The Chairman of STACFAD, Mr. Martyn Ibbotson (EEC), opened the meeting by welcoming participants (Annex 1) to Brussels for the Eleventh Annual Meeting of NAFO.
2. Appointment of Rapporteur
 Mr. Charles Tomnay (EEC) was appointed Rapporteur.
3. Adoption of Agenda
 The provisional agenda, as circulated, was adopted (Annex 2) with, at the request of the General Council, the addition of Item 15, "Selection of New Executive Secretary - Formulation of Procedure and Timetable".
4. Review of Membership
 STACFAD reviewed the continuing difficulties created for the Organization due to the non-payment by Romania of her financial commitment for 1987, 1988 and 1989, then standing at \$46,082. That represented a direct financial imposition on all other Contracting Parties.
 STACFAD recalled that in 1986, the General Council accepted STACFAD's recommendation that Romania's outstanding debt, whilst still remaining the liability of that Contracting Party, would be met through the transfer of funds from the Accumulated Surplus Account over a two-year period. In the present circumstances STACFAD felt it inevitable to recommend to the General Council that a similar procedure would be necessary in 1989 and 1990.
5. Auditor's Report
 As a result of the decision taken by the General Council last year, the Executive Secretary appointed Deloitte, Haskins and Sells as auditors for the Organization as successors to the Auditor General of Canada and he expressed his satisfaction with the work and the subsequent report prepared by the new auditors. STACFAD recommended to General Council that the Auditor's Report for 1988 be approved.
6. Relocation of Headquarters
 The Executive Secretary confirmed that the relocation of headquarters was now completed and expressed his satisfaction with the new premises. He also expressed his gratitude to the authorities of the host country for the extensive help and organization afforded to NAFO during the move. STACFAD wished to draw to the attention of the General Council the satisfactory outcome of that exercise.
7. Meeting of the Pension Society
 The Executive Secretary provided background information to STACFAD on Note 7 to the General Council Agenda (CL 89/49). While STACFAD recognized that long term savings could be made by increasing repayments on the deficit over a shorter period of time, the budgetary implications effectively ruled out further consideration of that proposal at the time.
8. Discussion of Staff Rules and Cost Implications
 The Chairman reported on a series of informal contacts which he had undertaken with several Contracting Parties and with the Executive Secretary and his staff. On the basis of those contacts, STACFAD considered a number of questions which the Chairman had formulated.
 The discussion revealed that there existed considerable agreement on the broad approach to staff rules and on that basis the Chairman was invited to prepare an outline framework of a possible set of rules that could be considered further by the members of STACFAD. The Executive Secretary would be invited to elaborate that framework at an appropriate stage.
 Further details of the main considerations are at Annex 3. In particular STACFAD agreed that the process of devising staff rules should involve a dialogue with the current staff.
9. Review of Accumulated Surplus Account
 In accordance with the decision adopted by the General Council at the 10th Annual Meeting in 1988, STACFAD recommended that the minimum balance in the Accumulated Surplus Account should revert to \$75,000.

10. Administrative Report and Financial Statements for 1989 (to 31 July)

STACFAD took the opportunity to review the Administrative Report and Financial Statements (NAFO/GC Doc. 89/1). STACFAD drew to the attention of the General Council its concern at the increasing difficulties being created by delays in the provision of final catch statistics and associated matters and its intention to consider that issue in detail at the 12th Annual Meeting.

STACFAD recommended that, in future, the Secretariat include in the report the dates for re-election of the officers of the Organization.

11. Preliminary Budget Estimate for the fiscal year ending 31 December 1990

The Executive Secretary introduced the Budget Estimate for the year ending 31 December 1990. In doing so, he drew attention to the exceptional expenditure which would be incurred as a result of the appointment of a new Executive Secretary in 1990. STACFAD made a thorough and detailed analysis of all the elements of the budget, following which it was satisfied that the Budget Estimate detailed in Annex 4 was necessary to meet the commitments of NAFO. The total estimate, including the exceptional expenditure of \$31,000, was \$871,500, an increase of 9.5% over the approved budget for 1989.

However, STACFAD noted the concern of Contracting Parties that such an increase represented an unacceptable burden given the persistent requirement for budgetary constraint being exercised by all budgetary authorities. In that light, STACFAD agreed to recommend to General Council that the 1990 budget provision should be reduced by \$13,000 (1.5%) to \$858,500 and that the Executive Secretary should determine the means by which that reduction should be effected. Such budgetary restraint did not imply any criticism of the current functioning of the Secretariat. STACFAD recommended therefore a budget for 1990 of \$858,500.

Further, STACFAD recommended that, in view of the necessity for budgetary constraint, the Chairman of the Scientific Council should be invited in respect of special Scientific meetings to utilize the excellent meeting facilities provided at the NAFO Headquarters.

12. Preliminary Budget Forecast for the fiscal year ending 31 December 1991

STACFAD noted that the document (Annex 5) would be reviewed in detail at next year's meeting.

13. Billing date for the fiscal year ending 31 December 1990 (15 February 1990)

The proposed date of 15 February 1990 was agreed by STACFAD. The preliminary calculation of billing for Contracting Parties for 1990 is shown at Annex 6. Certain difficulties relating to the timing of payment of contributions by Contracting Parties were considered by STACFAD under Other Business (Item 16).

14. Time and Place of 1990, 1991 and 1992 Annual Meetings

1990	Scientific Council	5-14 September
	Fisheries Commission	10-14 September
	General Council	10-14 September
1991	Scientific Council	[2-6 or 9-13] September plus three additional days
	Fisheries Commission	[2-6 or 9-13] September
	General Council	[2-6 or 9-13] September
1992	Scientific Council	9-18 September
	Fisheries Commission	14-18 September
	General Council	14-18 September

STACFAD confirmed that the 12th Annual Meeting would take place in Halifax.

STACFAD discussed at length the dates of the 13th Annual Meeting in 1991. It was agreed that as an international organization NAFO should avoid dates which coincided with other international fisheries commitments of Contracting Parties. That effectively ruled out the last week in September and dates later than that. All other proposals for dates posed major problems for one or more Contracting Parties. Finally two alternative proposals for appropriate dates emerged which STACFAD agreed should be brought to the attention of the General Council for decision. The Executive Secretary emphasized the desirability of deciding on the dates at the current annual meeting if the 1991 meetings were to be held in the Halifax area. To postpone the decision under those circumstances could well involve difficulties of finding suitable accommodation which might only be resolved by finding additional funds.

15. Selection of the New Executive Secretary - Formulation of Procedure and Timetable

The General Council invited STACFAD to make recommendations formulating the appropriate procedures and timetable for the selection of a new Executive Secretary. STACFAD recommended that a Nominating Committee be established to report to the General Council at the next Annual Meeting its nomination for the post of Executive Secretary.

STACFAD proposed that the General Council adopt the suggestions set out in Annex 7. This covers the composition of the Nominating Committee, its timetable and procedures.

16. Other Business

Under this item, Canada, as the major financial contributor, drew to the attention of STACFAD certain difficulties it was experiencing due to the fact that its authorities operated under a different fiscal year from that used by NAFO. STACFAD had a preliminary discussion on the issue and it was agreed that Canada should be invited to formulate a proposal to address the problem for consideration at the 12th Annual Meeting.

17. Adjournment

Having adopted its report, the Chairman adjourned the deliberations of STACFAD.

NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES ORGANIZATION
11TH ANNUAL MEETING - SEPTEMBER 1989

STACFAD

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

<u>NAME</u>	<u>DELEGATION</u>
Debbie Gill	Canada
Orlando Muniz	Cuba
Marcos Behemaras	Cuba
Sven Adersen	Denmark (in respect of Faroes & Greenland)
Melo Cunha	EEC
Andrew Thomson	EEC
Martyn Ibbotson	EEC
Charles Tomnay	EEC
John Carbery	EEC
Klaus Plagemann	German Dem. Rep.
Takashi Mori	Japan
Yutaka Aoki	Japan
Peter Gullestad	Norway
Lars Skjong	Norway
Victor Solodovnik	USSR
Vladimir Fedorenko	USSR
Joaquim Cardoso	Executive Secretary
Hartle Champion	NAFO Secretariat

Annex 2

Eleventh Annual Meeting of NAFO
Albert Borschette Conference Centre, Brussels
6-15 September 1989

Standing Committee on Finance and Administration (STACFAD)

Agenda

1. Opening by Chairman, M. J. Ibbotson (EEC)
2. Appointment of Rapporteur
3. Adoption of Agenda
4. Review of Membership
5. Auditor's Report
6. Relocation of Headquarters
7. Meeting of the Pension Society
8. Discussion of Staff Rules and Cost Implications
9. Review of Accumulated Surplus Account
10. Administrative Report and Financial Statements for 1989 (to 31 July)
11. Preliminary Budget Estimate for the fiscal year ending 31 December 1990
12. Preliminary Budget Forecast for the fiscal year ending 31 December 1991
13. Billing date for the fiscal year ending 31 December 1990 (15 February 1990)
14. Time and Place of 1990, 1991 and 1992 Annual Meetings
15. Selection of New Executive Secretary - Formulation of Procedure and Timetable
16. Other Business
17. Adjournment

Agenda item 8: Staff Rules

MAIN CONCLUSIONS EMERGING FROM ISSUES POSED BY THE CHAIRMAN

1. IS THERE A NEED FOR STAFF RULES FOR NAFO?

STACFAD noted that neither NAFO, nor ICNAF, its predecessor has had staff rules. In practice this has not led to difficulties, nor as far as could be assessed to the disadvantage of the Organization. It was noted, however, that almost alone amongst similar international organizations NAFO had not formalized the relationship between the staff and the Organization by means of an agreed set of staff rules.

It was generally felt that whilst there was no legal commitment to devise staff rules, that it was nonetheless legally desirable that they should exist. It was recognized that staff rules involve not only legal implications but also, potentially, financial implications. Whilst STACFAD noted that the views of the current staff as to the desirability of staff rules was an important aspect, it was also recognized that the views of Contracting Parties was an equally relevant consideration.

In light of the foregoing considerations, STACFAD agreed that it was desirable to consider further the implications of staff rules and the broad elements which such rules might embrace. STACFAD recognized that the final decision as to the necessity for staff rules and, if deemed appropriate, the details of such rules, would be a matter for final decision by the General Council.

2. WHAT IN PRACTICE CURRENTLY GOVERNS AND GUIDES EMPLOYMENT ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE STAFF OF THE SECRETARIAT?

STACFAD noted that NAFO as an organization did not have legally binding contracts with any of the staff appointed by the Executive Secretary. However the Executive Secretary was generally guided by the conditions laid down by the Public Service Alliance of Canada in establishing the working conditions of the staff. The conditions apply to certain categories of persons employed in government service in Canada: in the main NAFO staff undertake similar duties to these particular categories.

STACFAD noted that the current arrangements whilst not legally binding in the NAFO context had, to the extent that it was able to assess, generally worked to the satisfaction of the Organization, its staff and its host country.

3. SHOULD THE CURRENT STAFF BE CONSULTED ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF STAFF RULES AND IF SO, HOW?

STACFAD noted the unusual situation of determining staff rules when NAFO as an organization had already existed for a number of years. As a consequence, STACFAD agreed that the process of devising staff rules should involve a dialogue with the current staff.

It was further agreed that the Chairman of STACFAD should consider appropriate mechanisms for achieving this aim.

4. ONE FACET OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS IS THAT THEY RECRUIT STAFF BOTH INTERNATIONALLY AND FROM THE HOST COUNTRY. HOW SHOULD THIS BE RECOGNIZED IN THE STAFF RULES?

STACFAD noted that since NAFO is an international organization, a number of its staff should continue to be recruited internationally from the nationals of Contracting Parties. It was also recognized that in practice the majority of the staff of the Secretariat would continue to be recruited from the nationals of the host country, Canada.

STACFAD agreed that it would be appropriate for any staff rules to recognize that all staff would fall into one of two categories: those recruited internationally would be defined as being, for example, "internationally recruited category" or "professional category" whilst those recruited from the host country would be defined as being, for example, "locally recruited category" or "general services category". Naturally an internationally recruited officer could be a national of the host country.

STACFAD discussed at length the desirability or otherwise of defining in the staff rules the precise number and job titles of the officials in the "professional category". There were arguments both in favour and against such precision. STACFAD agreed that at this stage it was not in a position to decide either way on this.

5. IN PRACTICE NAFO PROBABLY APPLIES WORKING CONDITIONS SIMILAR TO THOSE FOR SIMILAR GRADES IN GOVERNMENT SERVICE IN ITS HOST COUNTRY. SHOULD SUCH RULES BE LIFTED AND FORM PART OF ANY NAFO SPECIFIC RULES, EITHER OVERTLY OR INDIRECTLY?

STACFAD agreed that in respect of the "locally recruited category" it would be appropriate for the Executive Secretary to continue to be guided by the conditions of service of similar grades in government service in the host country i.e. by the Public Service Alliance of Canada. The specifics of the origin of and the details of the guiding conditions would not be generally quoted. It might be necessary, however, to specify certain details e.g. public holidays of the host country.

In respect of the "internationally recruited category" local conditions would possibly not be appropriate, in which case consideration might be given to defining the detailed conditions of employment in individual bilateral contracts between the Organization and officials concerned. Given the likely small number of individuals falling into this category (currently 2) this approach might be preferable.

6. HOW DETAILED SHOULD THE RULES BE?

STACFAD favoured an approach which did not go into undue detail since this would both require the possibility of frequent amendment and detract from the flexibility accorded to the Executive Secretary which could be counter to the interest of the staff and the Organization. However it was felt that any rules should be sufficiently detailed as to adequately define the employment conditions and obligations of the Organization and staff to each other. STACFAD agreed that it would need further to consider this aspect.

7. DO STAFF RULES FOR A SIMILAR ORGANIZATION EXIST WHICH CAN BE LIFTED FOR NAFO, OR DO ELEMENTS CONSIDERED ABOVE PRECLUDE SUCH A POSSIBILITY?

STACFAD agreed that this was probably unlikely but the Chairman undertook to continue his quest for possibly suitable existing staff rules on which to base NAFO specific rules.

8. A NUMBER OF PROPOSALS HAVE BEEN TABLED FOR NAFO SPECIFIC RULES: CAN THESE BE DEVELOPED FURTHER?

See Conclusion

9. AT WHAT STAGE SHOULD THE COSTS OF POSSIBLE STAFF RULES BE ASSESSED?

STACFAD noted that any staff rules would have financial implications, though it was also recognized that these might be either neutral or minimal. STACFAD agreed that the cost implications would need to be fully reviewed and determined. This exercise would need to go along side the development of any detailed staff rules since General Council would need to be made fully aware of any cost implications at the same time that it gave its consideration to the adoption of any specific proposals for NAFO specific rules.

CONCLUSION

It was concluded by STACFAD that since there existed considerable agreement on the broad approach to staff rules that the Chairman should be invited to prepare an outline framework of a possible set of rules and that this should be circulated to members of STACFAD and to the Executive Secretary. The Executive Secretary would be invited to further elaborate the Chairman's framework in the light of the dialogue with staff (see 3. above), the comments of the members of STACFAD and the work already undertaken by himself and by Canada".

NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES ORGANIZATION
Budget Estimate for 1990

	Approved Budget for 1989	Preliminary Budget Forecast for 1990	Budget Estimate for 1990
1. Personal Services			
(a) Salaries	\$490,000	\$525,000	\$532,000
(b) Superannuation and Annuities	68,000	70,000	70,000
(c) Additional help	1,000	1,000	1,000
(d) Group Medical and Insurance Plans	20,000	22,000	22,000
(e) Termination Benefits	15,000	18,000	18,000
(f) Accrued Vacation Pay	10,000	12,000	5,000
2. Travel	3,000	3,000	9,000
3. Transportation	1,000	1,000	1,000
4. Communications	45,000	45,000	47,000
5. Publications	14,000	15,000	15,000
6. Other Contractual Services	42,000	42,000	37,500
7. Materials and Supplies	27,000	28,000	28,000
8. Equipment	5,000	5,000	5,000
9. Annual & Mid-Year Meetings	30,000	30,000	30,000
10. Computer Services	25,000	25,000	20,000
Total	\$796,000	\$842,000	\$840,500
11. Exceptional Expenditure			
(a) Salary Overlap for Incoming Ex. Secretary	-	-	6,000
(b) Removal and Travel Expenses of out-going and Incoming Ex. Secretary	-	-	25,000
Grand Total	\$796,000	\$842,000	\$871,500
Less 1.5% Budgetary Restraint			\$ 13,000
Adjusted Total			\$858,500

Annex 5

NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES ORGANIZATIONPreliminary Budget Forecast 1991

1.	Personal Services	
	(a) Salaries	\$ 550,000
	(b) Superannuation and Annuities	73,000
	(c) Additional Help	1,000
	(d) Group Medical and Insurance Plans	24,000
	(e) Termination Benefits	20,000
	(f) Accrued Vacation Pay	5,000
2.	Travel	5,000
3.	Transportation	1,000
4.	Communications	49,000
5.	Publications	15,000
6.	Other Contractual Services	39,500
7.	Materials and Supplies	29,000
8.	Equipment	5,000
9.	Annual and Mid-Year Meetings	30,000
10.	Computer Services	26,000
11.	Contingencies	-*
		<u>\$ 872,500</u>

* Possibly an amount will be required in 1991 related to the new Executive Secretary and at this time it is not possible to forecast an amount. This line item is included only to make the members of STACFAD aware of the situation.

STATEMENT V

Preliminary calculation of billing for Contracting Parties
against proposed estimate of \$858,500 for the 1990
financial year (based on 12 Contracting Parties to NAFO).

Budget estimate	858,500
Deduct: Amount from Accumulated Surplus Account	165,872
Funds required to meet 1990 Budget	<u>692,628</u>

60% of funds required =	415,576.80
10% of funds required =	69,262.80
30% of funds required =	207,788.40

Contracting Parties	Nominal Catches for 1987	% of Total Catch in Convention Area	\$ Canadian Funds	% of 60% of Canadian Funds	Coastal States 10%	10% in \$ Canadian Funds	30% Divided Equally Amongst Contracting Parties	Total Amount Due from Each Contracting Party (\$ Canadian Funds)
Bulgaria	-	-	-	-	-	-	17,315.70	17,315.70
Canada ¹	1,032,093	68.11	283,049.35	1,032,093	63,770.26	-	364,135.31	364,135.31
Cuba	28,083	1.85	7,688.17	-	-	-	25,003.87	25,003.87
Denmark (Faroes & Gr.) ^{2,3}	88,873	5.87	24,394.36	88,873	5,492.54	-	47,202.60	47,202.60
EEC ⁴	183,236	12.09	50,243.24	-	-	-	67,538.94	67,538.94
GDR	27,418	1.81	7,521.94	-	-	-	24,837.64	24,837.64
Iceland	-	-	-	-	-	-	17,315.70	17,315.70
Japan	10,450	0.69	2,867.48	-	-	-	20,183.18	20,183.18
Norway	441	0.03	124.68	-	-	-	17,440.38	17,440.38
Poland	7,535	0.50	2,077.88	-	-	-	19,393.58	19,393.58
Romania	-	-	-	-	-	-	17,315.70	17,315.70
USSR	137,210	9.05	37,609.70	-	-	-	54,925.40	54,925.40
Total	1,515,339	100.00	415,576.80	1,120,966	69,262.80	207,788.40	692,628.00	692,628.00

¹Provisional Statistics used when calculating 1987 nominal catches.

²Faroe Islands = 3,599; Greenland = 85,274.

Annex 7

A. Proposed Procedure for Appointment of Representatives
to the Nominating Committee

1. In the first instance, it is proposed that the Nominating Committee should comprise three representatives of different Contracting Parties one to be drawn from each of the Chairmen or Vice-Chairmen of the General Council, the Scientific Council and the Fisheries Commission.
2. Other Contracting Parties may by communication with the Executive Secretary by the 31 October 1989 nominate one representative to serve on the Nominating Committee.
3. The Executive Secretary will assist the Nominating Committee in an advisory capacity but will have no voting rights.
4. The Chairman of the General Council will initiate the work of the Nominating Committee, thereafter, the Nominating Committee will appoint its own Chairman and Secretary in the manner which it deems most appropriate.
5. No Contracting Party will have more than one representative on the Nominating Committee.

B. Timetable and Procedures for the Nominating Committee

- 15 September -
8 December 1989: The Nominating Committee shall be established and shall appoint its Chairman and Secretary, after 31 October 1989 and, in any event, by 8 December 1989, in the manner which it deems most appropriate. The Executive Secretary will forward to the Committee by 8 December the specifications for the position and the general terms of employment and benefits.
- 9 December 1989 -
1 February 1990: The Nominating Committee shall consider and, where necessary, modify these to its satisfaction and transmit the final specification to the Executive Secretary.
- 2 February -
1 June 1990: The advertising of the position shall be the responsibility of the Contracting Parties. All applications and supporting data to be in the hands of the Executive Secretary by 1 June 1990.
- 2 June -
1 July 1990: The applications and supporting data shall then be forwarded immediately by the Executive Secretary to each member of the Nominating Committee.
- 2 July -
11 September 1990: The Nominating Committee will prepare and sign a report giving their opinion which shall include a recommendation on the suitability of the most appropriate nominee for the consideration of the General Council. In the light of the nominee's experience and qualifications the Nominating Committee will recommend the length of the most appropriate transition period which, in any case, shall not be less than two weeks and not more than six weeks. This report shall be presented to the General Council on the occasion of the 12th Annual Meeting.

NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES ORGANIZATION
ELEVENTH ANNUAL MEETING - SEPTEMBER 1989

Press Release

1. The Eleventh Annual Meeting of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO) was held in Brussels, Belgium, during 6-16 September 1989, under the chairmanship of Mr. F. Hartung (German Democratic Republic), President of NAFO. The sessions of the Scientific Council, the General Council and the Fisheries Commission and their Committees were all held at the Albert Borschette Centre.
2. Attending the meeting were delegates from the following Contracting Parties: Bulgaria, Canada, Cuba, Denmark (in respect of Faroes 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 J. S. Beckett (Canada), 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 6 to 8 September 1989, there was a Special Session of the Scientific Council on "Changes in Biomass, Production and Species Composition of the Fish Populations in the Northwest Atlantic Over the Last 30 Years, and Their Possible Causes", which involved 16 scientific contributions and was discussed among some 50 scientists.
5. On the basis of the scientific advice provided by the Scientific Council from its meeting in June 1989 and at the present meeting, agreement was reached by the Fisheries Commission, under the chairmanship of Mr. K. Yonezawa (Japan), on conservation and management measures for 1990, 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.
6. The Fisheries Commission agreed to continue the moratorium for 1990 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.
7. The General Council reviewed and approved the Organization's budget and accounts which had to provide for the extraordinary expenses resulting from the retirement of the present Executive Secretary, Capt. J. C. Esteves Cardoso and the selection, election and entitlement of a new Executive Secretary.
8. The General Council passed a Resolution proposed by Canada addressed to all Contracting Parties and approved by a large majority without any votes against, in which compliance with the NAFO management framework and NAFO decisions is called for.
9. The General Council decided to re-organize efficiently a Working Group which, under the chairmanship of Mr. Orlando Muniz (Cuba) and with the support of the Executive Secretary, should concert the efforts of all Contracting Parties into attracting into the Convention by suitable measures all non-Contracting Parties already active in fishing in the Regulatory Area. Such a Working Group is expected to be able to report to the General Council by the middle of 1990.
10. Several elections took place for *Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen* of the different bodies of the Organization and some subsidiary bodies, as follows:

Chairman of the General Council and President of the Organization	K. Hoydal (Denmark in respect of Faroes & Greenland)
Vice-Chairman of the General Council	E. Oltuski (Cuba)
Chairman of the Fisheries Commission	J. Zygmanski (Poland)
Vice-Chairman of the Fisheries Commission	G. Etchegary (Canada)
Chairman of the Scientific Council	B. Jones (EEC)
Vice-Chairman of the Scientific Council	V. P. Serebryakov (USSR)
Chairman of the Standing Committee on International Control (STACTIC)	O. Muniz (Cuba)

Chairman of the Standing Committee on
Research Coordination (STACREC)

W. Brodie (Canada)

Chairman of the Standing Committee on
Publications (STACPUB)

V. P. Serebryakov (USSR)

NAFO Secretariat
15 September 1989

J. C. Esteves Cardoso (Capt.)
Executive Secretary

SCHEDULE I
Quota Table¹ for 1990

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	American plaice	Div. 3M	American plaice	Div. 3LNO	Yellowtail	Div. 3LNO	Witch	Div. 3NO	Capelin	Div. 3NO	Squid (Illex)	Subareas 3+4 ^{3&4}
1. Bulgaria	-	-	-	-	750	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	500	-
2. Canada	-	-	8868	-	1250	10650	-	-	150	24538	-	4875	-	3000	-	800	-	800	N.S. ⁵	-
3. Cuba	-	-	-	-	4375	2450	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	750	-	750	2250	-
4. Denmark (Faroes & Greenland)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5. European Economic Community	-	-	6860	-	7750	-	-	-	350	317	100	-	-	-	-	-	750	-	N.S. ⁵	-
6. German Democratic Republic	-	-	-	-	-	850	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7. Iceland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8. Japan	-	-	-	-	1000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2800	-	2250	-
9. Norway	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9000	-	-	-
10. Poland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	900	-	1000	-
11. USSR	-	-	2221	-	34625	10900	-	-	1000	-	-	-	-	1950	-	15000	-	15000	5000	-
12. Others	-	-	651	-	250	150	-	-	500	45	25	-	50	-	-	-	-	-	5000	-
13. Special Reservation ²	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
14. Total Allowable Catch	0	0	18,600	0	50,000	25,000	0	2,000	24,900	5,000	30,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	30,000	130,000 ⁶				

¹Quotas are in metric tons.

²There are no Special Reservations for 1990.

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 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.

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.

APPENDIX 10ELEVENTH ANNUAL MEETING - SEPTEMBER 1989Resolution of the General Council
of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization

The General Council,

Recalling the obligations inscribed in the Law of the Sea Convention of 1982 as regards international cooperation to provide for the conservation and optimum utilization of the living resources of the sea;

Recalling that the NAFO Convention provides that the object of the Organization shall be to contribute through consultation and cooperation to the optimum utilization, rational management and conservation of the fishery resources of the NAFO Convention Area;

Noting that implementation of the NAFO Convention from the outset has been based on the principles of conformity with scientific advice and relative stability in the proportionate shares of the total catches of NAFO-managed stocks, subject to changes through decisions taken by NAFO.

Noting the commitment of all NAFO Contracting Parties to the principles of conservation and rational management of living marine resources;

Calls for compliance with the NAFO management framework in place since 1979, and compliance with NAFO decisions in order to provide for conservation and maintain the traditional spirit of cooperation and mutual understanding in the Organization.