REPORT OF THE 28th ANNUAL MEETING OF THE
NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES COMMISSION

9-13 NOVEMBER 2009

VOLUME I – REPORT
1 Welcome address by the President and opening statements.

The President opened the meeting at 10:20 am on Monday 9 November. He welcomed delegations from Contracting Parties, and observers from non-Contracting Parties, International Governmental Organisations (IGOs) and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs). A list of participants is attached as Annex A. He made an opening statement (Annex B). He asked the Secretariat to present practical and security matters.

The representatives of the Contracting Parties the EU, Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), Iceland, Norway and the Russian Federation made opening statements (Annex C). The President thanked Contracting Parties for the contributions, which he felt had set the tone of the meeting.


The IGO observer OSPAR made opening statements (Annex E).

The observers from Seas at Risk and WWF made a common opening statement and the observer from PEW Foundation made an opening statement (Annex F).

2 Adoption of the agenda and appointment of rapporteur

The President asked if there were any contributions under any other business. The Norwegian representative asked whether those Parties that had not ratified the Convention amendments could report on progress in this matter and this was agreed. The Norwegian representative asked about the timetable and the President said that he would like to discuss the timetable at the first meeting of Heads of Delegations.

The agenda (Annex G) was then adopted and the Secretariat was appointed rapporteur.

3 Establishment and arrangements for the Finance and Administration Committee, and other groups

The President wanted the following Groups to start work:

The Finance and Administration Committee, FAC - Chair Andrew Thomson
PECMAS – Chair, Snorri Palmason, Norway.
4 Report by the Advisory Committee of ICES

The President called the Meeting to order on Tuesday at 10:14 am and invited the representative of ICES to introduce the ICES advice for 2010.

Dr Carl O’Brien, Vice-chair of ACOM, introduced the ICES advice. His presentation is on the NEAFC website. He described the ICES advisory process in general, especially the system of expert groups, review groups, groups drafting the advisory text and final decisions in ACOM. He stressed that even if this was time consuming it would be possible and worth considering whether the advice could be delivered earlier as required by managers. He informed about forthcoming benchmark studies which involve some deep sea stocks of interest to NEAFC. Norwegian Spring Spawning (Atlanto-Scandian) herring was benchmarked last year and mackerel was benchmarked in 2007. The development of a management plan for S. mentella in the Irminger Sea has been postponed until 2010. He reviewed the process leading to a changes in the perception of the stock structure of the Irminger Sea S. mentella (three stocks, deep pelagic, shallow pelagic and Iceland slope). He stressed that there was consensus on the science in ACOM, but not on the management. ICES has pledged to review the situation if Russia submits any new data.

The representative of the Russian Federation commented on the ICES presentation with respect to redfish in the Irminger Sea. The position of Russian scientists on the stock structure was unanimous. They do not agree with the ICES conclusion on biology and management. The question of stock structure is still open. Russian scientists have circulated two documents which repeat the points they made earlier in ICES (AM2009/23 and 29).

ICES pointed out that there was agreement in ACOM that there were three stocks. The Russian data had been taken into account and this was more a question of how to use the biological advice in management.

The PEW Foundation asked about the advice on deep sea fisheries and closures on the Hatton and Rockall Banks and on move on rules and thresholds.

The EU representative thanked ICES for the presentation. He was interested to hear whether the Russian Federation considered the statement by ICES correct that the disagreement was not on biology, but on management. He stressed the need to consider moving forward the time of the advice.

ICES explained the basis of the statement that there was consensus in ACOM on the science, but not the management. He informed that the ICES meeting calendar adopted for 2010 did not foresee the delivery of advice being brought forward. The EU representative indicated that it would greatly help if the advice was available in late September, giving more time for the involvement of stakeholders and other Parties.

There were no further comments. The President stressed that all Parties agreed that it would be helpful to bring forward the advice without compromising its quality.

The President invited the Secretariat to introduce the report as the Chair of the Group was not present. On behalf of the Chair, Mr João Neves made a summary of the report AM2009/05. The basic conclusion is that the reporting of uptake of quotas is not satisfactory for monitoring.

He described the establishment of the Group and listed the reasons for changing the system. One of the problems is that reporting is regulated by the Scheme of Control and Enforcement rather than by a specific recommendation on statistics under Article 9 of the NEAFC Convention.1

The monthly catch reporting by the statistical offices of the Contracting Parties is at present by species and ICES statistical divisions or subdivisions. What is really needed is reporting by regulated fish stocks. This is the main change in the proposed reorganisation of reporting. If the proposed reporting system is adopted, there will be some consequential changes in Article 10 of the Scheme.

The President thanked Mr Neves for the report. There were no comments. The Icelandic representative thanked the Working Group for the good work done. She noted that the dates of entry into force, 1 January 2011, were still in brackets. She proposed that the brackets be deleted. This was agreed and the recommendation was then adopted as amended.

6 Statistics on quota uptake and vessel activity

a) Compilation of catch statistics for 2008

AM2009/62 rev 2, final catch figures for 2008 and provisional figures for 2009 was tabled by the Secretariat. The Norwegian representative found it quite unacceptable that the statistics arrived on the last day of the meeting. He urged the Secretariat to have statistics ready at the start of the meeting. He felt that if the Secretariat cannot get the necessary information they should raise it with HODs. The Icelandic representative echoed that sentiment and urged the Secretariat to sort this out with Contracting Parties before the next Annual Meeting. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) agreed. She was not confident that the statistics were accurate.

She proposed that the final statistics for 2009 should be sent to the Secretariat not later than 1 July 2010 and should be sent back to Contracting Parties within 10 days. We must have a process by next year that ensures we have a full set of catch data ready for the Annual Meeting. As pointed out by the Icelandic representative, this is not least the responsibility of Contracting Parties to ensure that the data is available.

1 ARTICLES 9

1. The Commission may by a qualified majority make recommendations providing for the collection of statistical information relating to fisheries conducted beyond areas under the jurisdiction of Contracting Parties.

2. The Commission may also make recommendations providing for the collection of statistical information relating to fisheries conducted within an area under the jurisdiction of a Contracting Party, provided that the recommendation receives the affirmative vote of that Contracting Party.
The EU representative agreed with many of the sentiments expressed. He felt it was rather unusual that an RFMO does not have historical statistics which are as accurate as other organisations. There is a responsibility on the vessel, on the Contracting Party and on the Secretariat. If there is a problem along the line from the vessel, to FMCs and the Secretariat it is very important that contact is made with the flag state. The Secretariat should be more proactive and get data ready for the Coastal States meetings.

The Icelandic representative drew attention to some possible inaccuracies in the tables with respect to mackerel. The Secretariat checked this and issued a revised table on mackerel. The EU representative noted that they had not looked carefully at the figures, so they would not like to be involved in a detailed discussion of the figures here or give the figures any formal endorsement at this stage. The important thing is to start afresh and compile data in a comprehensive way. The President agreed. It was not the appropriate place to discuss detailed data and he closed the item.

7 Report from PECMAS
The President invited the Chair of PECMAS, Mr Snorri Pálmason, Norway, to introduce the report of PECMAS (AM2009/19). The Chair highlighted the main issues of substance:

- Threshold and move-on rules, which he saw as work in progress and with possibilities for amendments as more advice is received from ICES.
- A best practice for surveys of VMEs manual is under discussion between ICES and NEAFC.
- The advice from ICES and PECMAS supported that everything should be done to make advice from ICES available earlier.
- With respect to area management, PECMAS had discussed an EU proposal for extending closures on the Hatton Bank Area, AM2009/13. PECMAS sent the proposal to PECCOE for comment on the control and enforcement issues involved.
- Two more Parties have sent data on fisheries according to the bottom fishing regulation and this led to some changes in the outline of existing fishing areas.
- PECMAS proposes that the OSPAR Secretariat is invited in the capacity of an observer to dedicated parts of PECMAS meetings, AM2009/10

He stated that only one meeting of PECMAS was necessary annually and it should take place after all advice had been received from ICES.

The Chair drew attention to discussion in PECMAS about the experiences from the first three years of the Committee. One member did not like to get involved in political considerations in PECMAS; others thought it may be productive to have a sense of the political situation. PECMAS asked the Commission for advice on this matter. Finally he raised the question of whether it would be more efficient to arrange for a presentation of the advice of ICES in advance of the Coastal State negotiations.

The President thanked the Chair. He asked for comments on the Report and drew attention to the concrete proposals in AM2009/10, 11, 12 and 13. There were no comments and he saw that as an appreciation of the work done by PECMAS.
The President opened document AM2009/11 for comments. The paper informs about changes in existing fishing areas as a result of additional information from Contracting Parties. The EU representative noted that data are still arriving, for example recently from Portugal, and data from France are underway. He proposed a flexible approach when merging these data with what we have already. The President stressed that NEAFC would like to have a picture of fishing activity that is as complete as possible.

The draft recommendation on changing threshold levels in AM2009/12 was adopted.

The President then went on to AM2009/10 proposing that the OSPAR Secretariat is invited to become observers in PECMAS.

The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) thanked the Chair and expressed appreciation of the dedicated work of PECMAS. With respect to the proposal, she would like to have more time to discuss the general relationship with OSPAR, taking into account the note from the NEAFC and OSPAR Secretariats on how to make the MoU operational. The President kept the item open for a decision at a later stage.

The Report was then adopted and the President thanked the Chair for the important contribution to the smooth running of NEAFC business. He also thanked the PECMAS members for their dedicated work.

The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) considered it was appropriate to have an update on work underway in OSPAR (under agenda item 15) before dealing in more detail with developments in practical cooperation. She referred in particular to the OSPAR Quality Status Report and proposals for extensive MPAs in the High Seas. She could, however, support the PECMAS proposal.

The President accepted the procedural point and asked if Parties could accept the PECMAS proposal. The proposal was adopted.

The EU representative asked if the timetable for PECMAS work at this meeting with the request for advice from ICES could be clarified in order to allow better planning. The Chair of PECMAS explained two requests had been discussed in two meetings and one additional meeting was needed. He noted that the preparation of the request seemed to involve more than biology.

The EU representative thought that the organisation should reflect on the work of PECMAS. He had noted diversity in representation and almost verbatim reports without much synthesis. PECMAS may need more focus. He noted that PECCOE appeared to be more focused. The President welcomed the EU comment. He noted that the Chair has already paved the way for this discussion and called for advice from the Commission. He urged other Parties to comment. The Chair of PECMAS welcomed guidance.

The President summed up that it was important to review processes and offer guidance from the Commission. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) noted
that focus in PECMAS seemed very much to be on area management. She was not prepared to give guidance now, but may have some comments under item 10 h.

**8 Request for scientific advice**
The draft request for advice was introduced by the Chair of PECMAS, AM2009/71. The President pointed out that there was a word missing on page 6; it should read “significant” adverse impacts.

The representative of the Russian Federation could not accept a reference to redfish stocks (in plural) and suggested the reference be taken out. This was agreed. The representative of the Russian Federation suggested tidying up the format of the request and this was agreed.

Adopted as amended by consensus

**9 Reports from Working Groups and Coastal State discussions on management measures for 2010**

a) **Pelagic Sebastes mentella in the Irminger Sea**
The Icelandic representative reported that Coastal States had met in May and September and also invited fishing states. On both occasions it had not been possible for the important fishing party - the Russian Federation - to participate. On 8-9 October there had been discussions between Coastal States and all fishing Parties. She noted that there were no updated statistics available on the catches inside and outside the “box”. Progress was to a large extent blocked because of the disagreement about the ICES advice.

The President advised that consultation should continue in an attempt to reach an agreement.

The EU representative reminded that they earlier stated that the management of this stock is not satisfactory, the main stumbling block being the lack of allocations. Although understanding the rationale behind the ICES advice it did not make it easier to reach agreement on allocations. There was a strong need to bring robust management into place.

The President summed up that those consultations had to continue making it possible to take decisions later in the week.

b) **Pelagic Sebastes mentella in ICES Sub-areas I and II in the Regulatory Area**
The Norwegian representative reported that they had met with the Faroe Islands, Iceland and the Russian Federation in mid-October. The ICES advice for 2010 was discussed, but the advice was as earlier that no direct fishery should take place and bycatch be kept at a minimum. This was reflected in the Norwegian draft recommendation AM2009/22. He felt that consultations had to continue. The EU representative thanked the Norwegian representative and expressed concern for the management of this stock. The present TAC is too high and the EU will propose a lower TAC. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) asked why this stock was not included in the ICES presentation this morning. ICES apologised – it was an oversight. He asked for a clear list of which stock NEAFC wanted included in the ICES
presentation. The President noted that the Norwegian representative had informed that the advice was unchanged.

The President summed up that consultations had to continue.

c) Blue whiting
The Norwegian representative informed that Coastal States had met with a delegation from the Russian Federation in mid-October. The Coastal States agreed on a TAC of 540,000 tonnes, following ICES advice; this is an 8.5% reduction compared to 2008. The Coastal States and the Russian Federation also proposed setting up a NEAFC Working Group to collate information on the distribution of all life stages of the stock, AM2009/35. The representative of the Russian Federation indicated that they wanted to take up some issues with the Coastal States before NEAFC proceeded to a decision.

d) Norwegian spring spawning (Atlanto-Scandian) herring
The representative of the Faroe Islands reported the Coastal States had met in October and they had agreed on a 10% reduction in TAC, 1,483,000 tonnes, and unchanged allocations, as well as the continuation of the long term management of this stock. A draft recommendation had been tabled as AM2009/27.

e) Mackerel
The EU reported that the three Coastal States met in Ireland in the week 26-30 October. The advice from ICES was discussed, in particular the estimates of catches as high as over 800,000 tonnes in 2009. There is an agreed management plan. The discussions did not reach any conclusion. Iceland had declined an invitation as observers to the Coastal States meeting. The huge increase in catches in the Icelandic EEZ contributed to the high catch estimates. The Coastal States will continue consultations in Edinburgh in the week starting 23 November. He stressed the commitment to reach a sustainable solution.

The Icelandic representative informed that she could not accept being invited as an observer. According to UNCLOS and UNFA Iceland is a Coastal State. Iceland was only invited as an observer for the last day of a week long meeting in October. Iceland will establish national catch levels. This had been announced by the Icelandic Minister of Fisheries. She noted that overfishing was also a result of the allocations of Southern and Northern mackerel components. The Norwegian representative pointed out that the Icelandic measures did not limit the fishery, The Norwegian representative saw this as an unregulated fishery and Iceland should not be expected to be invited as a non-cooperating Coastal State. The EU representative agreed with the Norwegian representative that the Icelandic measures led to an open fishery. It was extremely damaging to the stock to have this kind of Olympic fishing. Iceland is in danger of undoing all the good work done with respect to this stock. The Icelandic representative rejected the suggestion that the Icelandic fishery was an open fishery. Responsibility to manage this stock rested with all Parties. The representative of the Russian Federation asked about the national Icelandic quota in 2009. The Icelandic representative informed that it was 112,000 tonnes. The EU representative pointed out that if all Parties set quotas based on the fishery in the previous year there would not be many stocks left. The President urged Parties to continue consultation.
f) **Rockall haddock**
The EU representative informed that there had been progress in two meetings between Russia and the EU. Important scientific work had been done by both sides. Russia and the EU had not reached consensus on a more comprehensive management framework, but hoped to reach that next year and would then come back to NEAFC.


g) **Deep-sea fisheries**
There had not been any meeting with respect to these stocks and the advice was a repetition of the advice from last year. The EU representative requested that this item was kept open.


h) **Area management**
The President drew attention to the proposals from PECMAS.


10 **Recommendations of management measures for 2010 for:**

a) **Pelagic Sebastes mentella in the Irminger Sea**
The Icelandic representative wished to make a statement. The President would have liked to see more consultation before any statements. The Norwegian representative thought an Icelandic statement would be useful. The Icelandic representative thanked ICES for the very clear advice. The Icelandic representative considered that management should be based on that advice. This calls for change. The present management measures did not work and the catches were too high. There were problems with the reporting of catches from Contracting Parties and this had to be dealt with. Monitoring had to improve and it is unsatisfactory that catch figures are not up to date.

The EU representative noted that it is normal practice that management measures are accompanied by appropriate control measures. In the present situation there is agreement on the total uptake, but individual national quotas lead to totals that are too high. The very complicated monitoring system does not make sense before a proper management system is in place.

The Icelandic representative introduced AM2009/69, a proposal by the representatives of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), Iceland and the Russian Federation. She noted that it had not been possible to reach agreement following the ICES advice. There was work to do to reach a more satisfactory solution next year and get out of the current deadlock. In order to avoid further delays, this was a compromise attempting to have management in place for next year. It is very similar to last year’s measure with some amendments and there are some additions to improve control and surveillance. These additions are not an extra burden on fishing vessels or Contracting Parties. It is important that issues of monitoring the quota uptake are handled in an open and transparent way. She was convinced that the additions improved the situation, compared to this year.

The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) agreed with the Icelandic representative that this proposal was less than satisfactory, but having a measure in place for next year will give more time to reach a more long lasting solution for the responsible management of this valuable stock. She noted that it was important that the Russian Federation supported the measures.
The EU representative had carefully studied the proposal. For an outsider this may look like a solution. For those who know a little more about the background for this document, it is a mirage giving the impression that something is managed, but the process followed allows each party to set its own quotas and continue fishing as in recent years; in fact it is not a NEAFC management measure. Since 1996 the EU has not attempted at any stage to change its share or TAC. It has abided by that whilst others have not. The EU has shown a responsible attitude. The EU representative would be prepared to go along with carrying over the 2009 measures, but would not support changes which cosmetically dress up the situation and add additional obligations such as total catch for each vessel. New inventions are introduced for a fishery that is not even managed. For other NEAFC fisheries, which are managed, there are no similar measures. The EU reiterated that the EU could accept a continuation of the 2009 measures to allow the Coastal States to get their act together. They have pressed for new scientific advice, but there has not been any proposal from their side taking into account new advice. The EU will not seek to increase its share and will continue to report according to the 2009 arrangements. There is no justification for further embellishing an instrument that has little credibility.

The representative of the Russian Federation expressed support for the proposal. The Norwegian representative shared the concerns expressed by the EU, but saw the necessity of having a measure in place. He noted with concern that catch statistics showed that catches had increased considerably.

The EU called for a vote on the matter. Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), Iceland, Norway and the Russian Federation voted in favour. The EU representative abstained. The proposal was carried (Annex H).

b) Pelagic Sebastes mentella in ICES Sub-areas I and II in the Regulatory Area
The EU representative introduced AM2009/42. It proposes a further reduction in the TAC corresponding to a 40 % reduction over two years. The fishery period is extended. He saw the proposal as a possible compromise.

The Norwegian representative reminded the meeting that he had already introduced AM2009/22 rev 1. He continued to be surprised and disappointed that Parties were not ready to follow clear ICES advice. He felt it strange that the EU representative was so supportive following ICES advice in other instances, but not in this fishery. The falling catch rates this year were a concern and seemed to undo 15 years of protection work in Norwegian waters. He admitted that some measure was better than nothing, but a reduction of 3000 tonnes in the TAC in 2010 was in effect a tripling of the catches this year. The extension of the catch period was also a bad move. The Icelandic representative supported the Norwegian proposal. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) could not support the Norwegian proposal and thanked the EU representative for bringing forward their proposal. She regretted that the ICES advice had not been presented. She found that there were indications in the ICES report that the stock was not in such a bad state. The representative of the Russian Federation supported the EU proposal, but suggested that the TAC could be higher. The Norwegian representative read out the ICES advice for 2010. He asked how the President wanted to handle this proposal. The President proposed that no
decision be made now and that further consultations took place. A vote would be the last resort. The Norwegian representative accepted this as the only alternative.

There were two proposals for this fishery, AM2009/22 rev., 1 a proposal from Norway and 42 rev 1., a proposal from Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), the EU and the Russian Federation. The Norwegian representative indicated that he withdrew 22 rev 1. Consultations had showed that it was not possible to reach an agreement on the Norwegian proposal. He wanted to include a statement in the report from the Annual meeting. “Norway pointed out that ICES reports that the redfish stocks in ICES Sub-areas I and II are depleted and may be in danger of collapse. The ICES advice it that targeted fishery should not be permitted to continue. Norway regrets that, in spite of this clear advice, other Contracting Parties ignore it and refuse to act responsibly and thus severely threaten the rebuilding of this stock.” Iceland associated itself with the Norwegian statement. The Norwegian representative demanded a vote.

The EU, the Russian Federation and Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), voted in favour, Iceland and Norway abstained. The proposal carried. (Annex H).

c) Blue whiting
The President asked for comments on AM2009/21 rev. The Norwegian representative informed that there had been an amendment to the original Coastal States’ draft allowing quota transfer for non-Coastal States. The proposal was adopted by consensus.

He drew attention to AM2009/35, a proposal to establish a Working Group to compile information on the distribution of all life stages of Blue Whiting. The EU representative highlighted the main issues involved. The Coastal States felt that this should be a NEAFC Working Group. Timing is important because of the variable migration patterns. The WG will report not later than 1 March 2011. The Norwegian representative asked who will set up the Group. The Secretariat will ask the Contracting Parties to nominate members of the Group.

The recommendation was then adopted by consensus. (Annex H).

d) Norwegian spring spawning (Atlanto-Scandian) herring
The Icelandic representative introduced the draft recommendation, AM2009/27. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) informed that, due to a divergence of views in the delegation of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), it could not join the consensus. The Recommendation was then adopted with 4 Parties supporting and one abstaining. (Annex H).

e) Mackerel
The President reminded that it was clear that it would not be possible to reach agreement on management at this meeting. The Coastal States will meet in Edinburgh later in November and hopefully make progress so a proposal can be placed before NEAFC.

The President concluded that there will be no recommendation for management measures at this meeting and closed the item.
f) **Rockall haddock**
AM2009/58 rev 1. rolls over the present arrangement with the Haddock box. The proposal was adopted by consensus without comments. (Annex H).

g) **Deep-sea fisheries**
The EU representative referred to AM2009/54 and the debate last year on orange roughy. He admitted that the EU had not managed this resource well in the own jurisdiction. He described the biological features that made this species so vulnerable. The EU will have a zero TAC for all its fleet in its own waters and in the high seas in place for 2010. He could not defend pursuing this fishery. He pointed out that there is no impact assessment or data from the fishery.

The President enquired about the repetition of the same paragraph in the preamble and the operational part. The EU representative answered that this was editorial.

The Norwegian representative felt the eloquent arguments from the EU representative would have been useful in the case of redfish I and II. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) would not try to be either eloquent or clever, but was surprised that the EU representative reiterated his proposal from last year. She proposed that no decision was made now, because she would table her own proposal shortly. The President urged the representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) to table its proposal as soon as possible allowing consultations so a solution can be reached that all can live with.

AM2009/64 on behalf of all Contracting Parties proposes a roll-over of the effort limitation in deep-sea fisheries, which has been in place for some years. The President corrected one mistake - 2010 to 2012 in the operative paragraph. The recommendations were then adopted as amended by consensus. (Annex H).

In AM2009/54 the EU proposes a prohibition of all directed fishery for orange roughy. In AM2009/63 Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) proposes a ban in ICES subareas V, VI and VII, and an allocation of 150 tonnes to each Contracting Party in other parts of the Regulatory Area.

The EU representative recalled his comment on this issue earlier. The scientific advice is quite clear, as are the conservation concerns. That is why the EU strongly recommends a fishing ban for orange roughy in the Regulatory Area. There is a credibility issue around this particular resource, which must be faced by the organisation.

The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) introduced AM2009/63, which is similar to a proposal tabled last year. Last year no measure was agreed and only the general effort regulation for deep sea fisheries applied. The proposal took into account the scientific advice from ICES and recognised the difference in stock status in the area where fishing is proposed compared to other areas. The data used in the ICES advice were from the areas most heavily fished. The proposal has some explanatory information on the Faroese fishery this year. She described the Faroese single vessel operation based on knowledge and skills in very distant waters. Although no NEAFC measure was agreed for 2009 the limitation proposed was included in the fishing licence for 2009. The measure now proposed is for 2010 and 2011. ICES expected to
give new advice on deep sea fisheries next year, but the data sampled hitherto will probably not have much effect on the assessments next year. The sampling programme in cooperation between the Faroese Fisheries Institute and the vessel operators will provide data for this fishery. She said one of the main contentions is that a fishing ban will make it impossible to get any data for assessments. It will also remove special skills in the North Atlantic, which would be regrettable. She put forward the proposal and hoped Contracting Parties show support for this specialised fishery and allow the possibility of continuing to collect data on this species.

The EU representative noted that if all Parties used their allocation it would allow a fishery of 750 tonnes. Even a catch of 150 tonnes is too much. He noted with concern the low catch figure of 60 tonnes this year, which probably means that there is nothing left. It stretched the bounds of credibility that NEAFC would adopt measures designed for one vessel and wondered whether other fishing possibilities of a more sustainable nature were not open to this vessel. He noted that special skills were found in Australia, New Zealand and South Africa and in EU member states when they damaged this resource. He was worried that NEAFC developed management measures based on a very low number of vessels without taking into account the international obligations of the organisation. He saw no reassuring rationale in the document - there was no reference to impact assessment for this resource. He asked if the Secretariat had received any scientific information from this fishery. The Secretariat informed that it had not received anything. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) informed that the data have been sent directly to ICES.

The Norwegian representative noted that last year he had voted in such a way that no measure was agreed. This year he would try to secure a measure. Norwegian vessels will not be allowed to fish for this species. The Icelandic representative echoed the concern expressed by Norway. She abstained last year but would support the proposal by Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) this year. The representative of the Russian Federation supported the proposal. In light of the information, the Norwegian representative indicated that he was going to support the proposal by Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), as this had a chance of being adopted. In doing so, he rejected the suggestion from the EU representative that not supporting a proposal from one Contracting Party showed a lack of will to cooperate.

The President called for a vote on the EU proposal, AM2009/54. EU voted in favour, Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) and the Russian Federation voted against, Iceland and the Norway abstained. The proposal was not carried.

He then called for a vote on the proposal of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), AM2009/ 63. Norway, the Russian Federation, Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) and Iceland voted in favour. The EU voted against. The proposal was carried. (Annex H).

1) Management measures for spurdog (Squalus acanthias)

AM2009/43 proposed a roll over for the 2009 measure for spurdog. The EU representative introduced the proposal, which was in line with the EU elasmobranch action plan and aimed at protecting spurdog in the high seas. The Norwegian representative supported the proposal and noted the ICES advice on elasmobranchs, which was in line with the advice for redfish in I and II.
The proposal was adopted by consensus (Annex H).

2) Area management

The EU representative introduced a proposal on the extension of the closures on the Mid-Atlantic Ridge, MAR, to protect vulnerable marine ecosystems from significant adverse impacts in the NEAFC Regulatory Area, AM2009/56. He referred to the ICES advice from 2008 calling for coordination between NEAFC and OSPAR. He thought it important that NEAFC sent a signal that it was ready to amend the closures.

The Norwegian representative noted that after the meeting in March the EU representative had sent out a press release indicating that the EU would continue to work with other NEAFC Parties on extending the MAR closures. He had not been approached by the EU representative on this matter. This paper was precisely the same as that presented by the EU in March, without any new supporting material. He stressed that Norwegian legislation did not accept a reversal of the burden of proof. He suggested that the proposal was sent to PECMAS for due process.

The EU representative again referred to the ICES advice. He doubted the value of sending the proposal to PECMAS, but could accept that ICES was involved. He had to be true to his own interpretation of UNGA, but accepted that other Parties had other views. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) supported the comments by the Norwegian representative. There had not been prior consultations and due process cannot be the choice of individual Parties. NEAFC has established clear procedures for handling area management proposals. The Commission should clearly indicate to PECMAS how the proposal should be handled, including involving ICES. She would like to see PECMAS discuss the objective of proposals for area closures.

The Norwegian representative questioned the reference to ICES advice. He saw the effective closures by NEAFC of large areas as the real response to UNGA 61/105. Ninety nine per cent of the large part of the Regulatory Area south of Iceland is effectively closed to normal commercial fishery under the bottom fishing regulations.

The Icelandic representative referred to the full discussion in March. She did not recollect that the advice from ICES clearly supported the EU proposal.

The EU representative felt that the meeting of HODs in March had produced a good result, but the process did not stop there. The Community wants to move at a faster pace than other Parties. The objective was simply to implement UNGA resolution 61/105. He asked if PECMAS could deal with the proposal at this meeting.

The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) did not think the EU really recognised the differences in opinion on the UNGA resolution. She did not accept that there was a need for an ongoing process of closing more areas. Scientific evidence may even open up areas. The Norwegian representative did not think that we could wait for OSPAR for coordination.
The President did not recommend a vote on the proposal now. He asked if the logical step was to send the proposal to PECMAS. The EU representative pointed out that PECMAS would not meet until the autumn, but of course PECMAS could look at this proposal now. He called for some reflection in delegations. The Norwegian representative suggested that PECMAS formulated the request for advice on this proposal at this meeting. The Icelandic representative drew attention to the protection of VMEs in new fishing areas. This gave NEAFC time to consider matters properly.

It was agreed to ask PECMAS to include the proposal in the request for advice to ICES at this meeting. The EU representative noted that other Parties seem to prefer to consult with ICES. He was confident that ICES would support the proposal. He could go along with consulting ICES, even if this delayed a decision by one year. This was agreed.

The Icelandic representative introduced AM2009/16, which proposes a closure of the blue ling spawning area south of the Icelandic EEZ. The EU representative supported the proposal in AM2009/16, closing a blue ling spawning area south of the Icelandic EEZ, but he thought there was a need to clear up the text which was a mixture of legal jargon and description. The Icelandic representative would tidy up the text and the proposal as amended was adopted by consensus.

The EU representative introduced AM2009/67. The document brings together positions on all closures in the Hatton Bank – Rockall area and extends the closures on the Hatton Bank following ICES advice. The Norwegian representative was – as always - willing to follow the ICES advice. The proposal was adopted by consensus.

With respect to AM2009/52, a proposal to protect vulnerable marine habitats on the Rockall Bank, the representative of the Russian Federation described the problems with the ICES advice on this closure but under the circumstances he was willing to withdraw the proposal at this point and send it to PECCOE for comments on controlling and enforcing the proposed closure.

AM2009/70 was introduced by the representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland). Basically it is a catch-all for discussions on area management. This is dealt with by PECMAS, but this is a way to lift more general discussions to another forum involving NAFO and OSPAR. The idea is to give a mandate to the Working Group on the Future of NEAFC to set up a process evaluating what has to be done and to look for a way forward. WGFUT will report not later than 1 February. The proposal was adopted by consensus (Annex H).

The EU representative noted for the interest of observers that there are wide differences in view in NEAFC on management as shown by the decision on orange roughy which has no scientific basis. He thanked the representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) and the Icelandic representative for developing this idea and a way forward. This was not a decision but it was an avenue to pursue. The Icelandic representative considered organising a discussion on these issues important.

The representative of the Russian Federation expressed concern about the situation with respect to management measures for the mackerel fishery. NEAFC Parties should agree on measures that secure the total TAC is not exceeded, which is precisely what the Russian Federation is doing.

The President invited the Chair of PECCOE, Mr Martin Newman, the EU, to present the reports of PECCOE and AGDC, AM2009/04, 14 and 16.

The Chair did not go through the reports in detail, but rather focussed on the issues of substance. There were 4 recommendations but they did not introduce radical changes. There had been a very frank discussion on reporting from vessels to FMCs and the Secretariat from the redfish fishery in the Irminger Sea. This reporting has not been satisfactory and it was concluded that the Secretariat could play a more active role in monitoring reporting. He noted that, if the proposal from the Statistics Working Group for changes in monthly catch reporting was adopted, a change in Article 10 of the Scheme was necessary. PECCOE could take care of that at its next meeting.

The Committee had discussed electronic logbooks. The EU and Norway are about to introduce electronic logbooks from next year. The EU reported on the use of VMS data to control and monitor fishing in the vicinity of areas closed to fishery. This work had been undertaken by the Irish and the Scottish inspection services. The conclusion was that it was feasible to control area closures. This conclusion was used as basis for an informed response to PECMAS on the possibility of controlling the proposed Hatton Bank closures. Iceland plans to submit a similar report next year on experience from the fishery for redfish in the Irminger Sea.

Next year the Port State Control system will be reviewed in the light of the EU IUU regulations and the FAO Port State Control System to avoid inconsistencies and duplication.

PECCOE reviewed applications from Canada, Japan, New Zealand and Belize for cooperative non-Contracting Party status, and proposes that their status be renewed.

There was a presentation from FAO on the Global Record of Fishing Vessels. There was general support in PECCOE for the FAO project and for NEAFC to participate in a pilot experiment. The need for a Unique Vessel Identifier, UVI, was identified and FAO proposes using IMO numbers. The EU has its own UVIs and is not ready to establish a new system, but has suggested ways to solve this problem.

AM2009/37 is a proposal for cleaning up the B-list. It has been possible to verify that a number of vessels have been scrapped or sunk. There is a formal proposal from the Russian Federation to take off NIKOLAY CHUDOTVORETS. PECCOE had not had a chance to discuss the proposal.

The President asked for comments on the report and the proposals. The representative of the Russian Federation presented AM2009/36 concerning NIKOLAY CHUDOTVORETS. The vessel received the Russian flag in 2007 (previously being flagged to Honduras). It was bought by a company that deals with ship repair, not fishing, and the new owners have no connection with the earlier owners. There is a wish from a Vladivostok Fisheries College to acquire the vessel for training its students. There is already an agreement between the college and the present owners. Referring to Article 44.4 of the Scheme, the representative of the Russian Federation requested the
Commission to remove the vessel from the B-list. The Norwegian representative was not ready to make a decision on NIKOLAY CHUDOTVORETS and the President suggested that no decision be made on the B-list now as there may be a need to go back to PECCOE, but he would give time for consultations.

The Chair of PECCOE introduced the AGDC report. Two main issues had been discussed: the Global Record of Fishing Vessels and digitalisation of the PSC forms. The Secretariat has made good progress on electronic forms. This gives much more flexibility and moves the system into the modern era of telecommunication.

The two reports were formally adopted.

The Norwegian representative asked when discards would be discussed. The President suggested that this was dealt with under Agenda 12 a. The Icelandic representative expressed appreciation of the work done by the Statistics Working Group. She stressed the importance of good reporting and noted the problems in the redfish fishery in the Irminger Sea. The implementation of all reporting requirements was paramount for the credibility of NEAFC. The EU representative drew attention to point 12 in the agreed management measures for Irminger Sea redfish. He thought that this offered a mechanism for mitigating some of the problems raised by the Icelandic representative. He made this comment irrespective of his general position that the redfish management system in the Irminger Sea was grossly deficient.

The President thanked the Chair and stressed the importance to NEAFC of the efficient work in PECCOE.

12 The NEAFC Scheme of Control and Enforcement

a) Implementation of the Scheme

The Norwegian representative asked about two proposals from Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) which had been circulated to all delegations, but not formally tabled. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) explained that one proposal was on increasing the reporting frequency, the other more editorial. They will be tabled soon and Parties will consult on them.

The Norwegian representative introduced AM2009/18 on discards. He referred to consultations with the Faroe Islands and the EU. The Norwegian representative considered that discards are very destructive for all fish stocks. The aim must be to ban discards in all NEAFC fisheries. The EU representative confirmed that the discussions with other Parties on mackerel and herring had been very productive and agreed with the thrust of the proposal, but much was work in progress. He wanted paragraph 2.d deleted from the proposal and he could not accept the scope. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) thanked the Norwegian representative and supported the proposal. The representative of the Russian Federation had discussed the proposal at an earlier meeting and had supported it in principle. The actual proposal could not be supported because of the need to better specify some technical implications. The
President understood that the EU representative and hopefully also the representative of the Russian Federation were willing to discuss the Norwegian text.

The Norwegian representative introduced his proposal, AM2009/53, on mandating PECCOE to look into the implications for the Scheme of the FAO port state control instrument. The EU representative seconded and referred to his earlier remarks that the EU will make proposals for changes to the Scheme next year in view of the EU IUU regulations.

The recommendation was adopted by consensus. (Annex H).

The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) introduced AM2009/50 which proposed a consolidation of management measures currently in force. The EU representative found the objective very worthwhile. He cautioned, based on experiences from other RFMOs that this could be very time consuming. The legal status of the edited versions had in some instances been brought into doubt. He proposed that Secretariat did the editorial job and presented it to PECCOE.

The President summed up that this should not become a very time consuming exercise for PECCOE and the Secretariat should draft the edited version and present it to PECCOE. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) stressed this was simply to pull things together; there was no intention to rewrite text.

The EU representative suggested that the obligations of the Secretariat could be inserted into the proposal. It was agreed to insert the text: “on the basis of a working document prepared by the Secretariat” into the proposal. The proposal was then adopted by consensus. (Annex H).

The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) reminded that they had circulated AM2009/51 on increasing the reporting frequency of position messages from 2 hours to 1 hour. They had not had any feedback. The President had the impression that the proposal was not ready for decision. The EU representative suggested that the representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) introduced the proposal. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) introduced the proposal.

The EU representative informed that their own provisions allow 2 hours frequency where polling is possible. Where polling is not possible the frequency is one hour.

The Icelandic representative supported the proposal. The EU representative was not convinced of the benefit of it. He had not seen any reports on the use of VMS data, for example from the redfish fisheries. He asked how the Secretariat used this data. The Secretariat informed that the data are received and stored in the NEAFC database. The information on the positions of vessels is available to NEAFC inspection platforms 24/7 all year round, making it possible to plan inspections efficiently. VMS data have been made available to scientists under a protocol with ICES. The addition on some elements to the records will greatly enhance the use of the data for scientific purposes. The EU representative still doubted the added value of increasing the reporting frequency, but would not oppose the proposal. The proposal was then adopted by consensus (Annex H).
The EU representative introduced AM2009/57 on discards. The Norwegian representative noted that he had presented AM2009/18 on the same issue earlier and consulted with other Parties on finding a consensus text. The representative of the Russian Federation was disappointed with the EU proposal but had had fruitful discussions with Norway. The President hoped that this meant that it would be possible to agree on a proposal.

The Norwegian representative introduced AM 2009/18. Their first proposal included a number of technical measures from another agreement. During consultations it became clear that some Parties had not participated in that process. After consultation the current version is a proposal by Norway, Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), Iceland and the Russian Federation.

The EU representative recognised that discards represent a major waste of resources and affect the rebuilding of stocks and the basis of science. The EU position is to minimise discards and a discard ban is considered in the discussions on the revision of the Common Fisheries Policy. The Coastal States for mackerel agreed on specific measures for herring and mackerel from 1 July 2010. They also agreed to submit this measure to NEAFC. The other proposal does not follow the EU process. Even if it is surprising that this proposal is forced through now, the EU will continue to cooperate.

The Icelandic representative informed that they have a ban on discards and found the proposal appropriate. The Norwegian representative appreciated that the EU is slowly moving in the same direction as the other Parties. The Norwegian representative found that a ban on discards was much more forceful than a proposal on high grading. There is no need to limit NEAFC to something some Parties have agreed in another context.

The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) thanked the Norwegian representative for putting the initiative forward and adapting it in the context of NEAFC, not the Coastal States. The request to PECCOE to look into the technical issues is a pragmatic approach and sent a strong signal to ban discards. The EU asked whether the proposal should not enter into force immediately. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) said it was silent on this. The President assumed that the proposal would follow the procedures set out in the Convention. The EU representative asked for clarification. The Norwegian representative indicated that the intention was to follow the procedure in Article 12 as usual.

The Norwegian representative asked when the EU expected its proposal to enter into force. The EU representative said they were committed to having the measures in place by 1 July 2010.

The EU representative suggested that a vote was taken on AM2009/18 rev 1. The Russian Federation, Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), Iceland, Norway voted in favour. The EU representative abstained. The proposal was carried (Annex H).

The EU representative referred to his earlier statement as a rationale for abstention.
A vote was taken on AM2009/57. Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) abstained, Iceland, Norway and the Russian Federation voted against. The EU voted in favour. The proposal was not carried.

The EU representative thought that the rationale of RFMOs was cooperation. Parties know very well the state of the debate on discards in the EU so it was difficult to understand why the issue was forced. He was very surprised that Parties that had agreed to measures voted against it.

b) Possible adoption of proposals from PECCOE

The Chair of PECCOE indicated that PECCOE can act quite quickly on the removal of NIKOLAY CHUDOTVORETS if required.

He introduced AM2009/38, recommendation by PECCOE to amend the Scheme – Article 9 which opens up for the use of electronic logbooks instead of paper logbooks. Norway and the EU are introducing these logbooks next year. The Chair introduced AM 2009/39, recommendation by PECCOE to amend the Scheme – Article 23 and AM 2009/40, recommendation by PECCOE to amend the Scheme – Article 20. This matter was originally raised by the representative of the Russian Federation and made small but important changes in the Port State Control System clarifying the scope. There were no comments and the recommendations were adopted (Annex H).

The EU representative took the opportunity to make other Parties aware of the incoming EU IUU regulations. The discussion with other Parties to ensure the flow of legitimate trade is not impaired had been very fruitful. The EU representative will propose some changes to the Port State Control system in line with the new regulation. The EU intended to continue to play an important role in further developing the NEAFC Port State Control System. The Norwegian representative thanked the EU representative and drew attention to the signing of the FAO port state system. He saw a need to mandate PECCOE to look at the implications for the NEAFC Scheme of the FAO Scheme. The President asked Norway to prepare a specific proposal.

Following a proposal from PECMAS, it is suggested that the recording of depth becomes mandatory if a NEAFC management measure requires this. There had been discussions on lists of gears. Rather than giving an exhaustive list of gears, it should just be a general application and reference to gear deleted. The Norwegian representative agreed with the deletion of the sentence. It was agreed to adopt the recommendation as amended (Annex H).

The Norwegian representative drew attention to AM2009/46 which sets up terms of reference to PECCOE to look into the use of electronic logbooks. The Norwegian representative had had consultations with all Parties. The Norwegian proposal was adopted.

AM2009/66 – a proposal to ask PECCOE to examine the control aspects of a proposed closure on NW Rockall Bank was accepted by consensus without comment.

c) Possible adoption of proposals from the Advisory Group on Data Communications

Nothing proposed.
d) A and B-lists of IUU vessels
AM2009/37 rev 2. is the new B-list and it was agreed by consensus. The vessel NIKOLAY CHUDOVORETS had, on the recommendation of PECCOE, been removed from the list so the Russian proposal in AM2009/36 was withdrawn.

e) Cooperating non-Contracting Party Status for the Bahamas and Panama
The cooperative status of Belize, Canada, New Zealand and Japan was renewed. The Cook Islands have been informed that PECCOE has to look at their application, which came too late to be considered at their October meeting.

13 The NEAFC Fisheries Status Report
The Commission took note of the NEAFC Fishery Status Report, recommended by the 2006 NEAFC Performance Review Panel, which had been released on World Ocean Day, 8 June 2009, and distributed widely. It had been used as part of the basic material in drafting the fisheries chapter of the OSPAR Quality Status Report due in 2010.

14 Relationships with other Regional Fisheries Management Organisations
a) Observer reports
The Norwegian representative noted that the report from SEAFO by the EU was outstanding. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) drew attention to the report from Norway on NAMMCO. The concern of the North Atlantic Countries over the EU import ban on seal products is reflected in the report. Seals have a significant impact on fish stocks. Responsible fisheries management must take into account all components of the marine ecosystem including seal stocks, both as predators and as a resource. This is an equally relevant issue of concern for NEAFC as for other fisheries management organisations. The Norwegian and the Icelandic representatives echoed the comments of the representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland).

The same countries will act as observers as last year.
- NAFO - Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)
- ICES - The Icelandic representative
- NAMMCO – The Norwegian representative
- Pollock in the Bering Sea – Russian Federation
- SEAFO - EU.

The Norwegian representative volunteered to cover ICCAT and the EU representative NASCO.
b) Regional Fishery Bodies Secretariats Network, RSN-2, 9-10 March HQ FAO

c) Report of the Sixth Meeting of North Atlantic Regional Fisheries Management Organisations, NARFMOs

The Secretariat noted that it had become more difficult to get the NARFMOs together and suggested that the need for contact has diminished because the Secretariats met in the Regional Fishery Body Secretariats Network, RSN, which meets biennially in connection with the FAO COFI meetings. The Norwegian representative suggested that it should suffice that the NARFMOs met in the RSN. This was agreed

d) Other contacts

Nothing to report.

15 Reports from international developments in fisheries management and integration of fisheries and environmental policies

a) Development of cooperation with OSPAR under the MoU
   i. OSPAR Management Group (MAQ) for the Quality Status Report, QSR
   ii. OSPAR fisheries chapter of QSR drafting Group

b) FAO
   i. FAO Correspondence Group Global Record of Fishing Vessels
   ii. FAO Port State Measures
   iii. FAO COFI

c) UN meetings and initiatives
   i. The eighth round of informal consultations of States Parties to the United Nations Fish Stocks Agreement (ICSP-8). 16/19 March UN HQ
   ii. ICP 10 17-19 June HQ UN

d) MCAP-MICC meeting, 3-4 May ICES HQ, Copenhagen

e) FAO FIRMS fisheries fact sheet development, 11-14 May, HQ FAO

f) EU Inspector Meeting, 17-18 May, Bamio, Spain

g) OECD Workshop on the economics of rebuilding fisheries 22-21 May Rhode Island

h) Nordic Conference on efficient fisheries management 26-27 August, Reykjavik

i) CITES SG Workshop meeting Introduction from the Sea 14-16 September, Geneva

j) IFLOS symposium on Fish Stocks and IUU fishing, 26 September, Hamburg

k) International Arctic Fisheries Symposium, 19-21 October, Anchorage Alaska

l) Inter-RAC Conference - “Decision-Making within a reformed Common Fisheries Policy”

The Secretary made a presentation, which can be found with the documents for the meeting on the NEAFC website.

The President proposed that the presentation was made available so that delegates would have the possibility of getting more information.

The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) thanked the Secretary for the useful overview. She drew attention to the Copenhagen Climate Conference (UNFCCC COP15) in December, where the Faroe Islands will host an official side event focussing on climate and the oceans. She also mentioned that under Denmark’s chairmanship of the Nordic Council in 2010, the Faroe Islands was taking the lead to focus on oceans and would be chairing the Nordic senior officials committee on fisheries. Activities will include a
special focus on pelagic fisheries in the Northeast Atlantic, as well as plans for a high level conference on oceans issues in Tórshavn in early October 2010.

Matthew Gianni of the PEW Environment Group commented on the IPSO report he had co-authored with Dr Alex David Rogers, on the implementation of UN Resolution 61/105 on the Management of Deep-Sea fisheries on the High Seas. He stressed that this was a provisional report. He read out some statements from the report which he had co-authored. He expressed concern over the management of deep sea fisheries and the move on rules and that only VME with sponges and coral are dealt with. The President considered it strange that the bottom fishing regulation was not mentioned in the report at all.

16 Election of President and Vice Presidents for the years 2010 -2012
The President wanted to deal with the election of the President for the years 2010 – 2012. The Icelandic representative was pleased to nominate Sergey Belikov; this was seconded by the representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), the EU representative and the Norwegian representative.

The President elect made the following statement:

President, distinguished Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen
I’d like to express my gratitude to the Contracting Parties for electing me President of NEAFC. I’ve been participating in NEAFC for a decade already and I shall try to use my experience to ensure the smooth work of the Commission and continuity of its goals and procedures. I believe that, through a concerted effort by all of us we shall promote NEAFC as an efficient and transparent organization. I shall try to do my best in this position and I’m looking forward to an effective and fruitful cooperation.

The President said that he felt that NEAFC now was in safe hands.

The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) had the pleasure of nominating Johán H. Williams, Norway, and Andrew H. Thomson, EU, as first and second vice-president of NEAFC respectively, seconded by the Icelandic representative, the representative of the Russian Federation and the EU representative. Their term starts on 1 January 2010.

17 Finance and Administration Committee
a) Report on the Secretariat’s activities during the year
b) Audited accounts for the year ended 31 December 2008 and preliminary statements for 2009 (August inclusive)
c) Draft budget for 2010 and draft budget estimate for 2011
d) Review of annual contributions from Contracting Parties with reference to Article 17.4 c) of the Convention
e) Any other business
The Chair of FAC, Mr Andrew Thomson, EU, introduced the report. The FAC had met twice and the documentation is found in AM2009/68. He noted that the organisation is able to meet all its commitments.

He requested the Commission to consider which clause of Article 17.4 should be applied. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) proposed applying Article 17.4.(c). It was agreed by consensus to make the derogation.

The other recommendations made by the FAC were adopted.

The EU representative thanked the FAC for its good work. He also thanked the Secretariat for its relentless pursuit of the administrators of Kaupthing, Singer and Friedlander Bank which he felt would get results. He also thanked the Secretariat for its support to his delegation. The President also thanked the Chair and his Committee.

18 Arrangements for future meetings
   a) Annual Meetings 8 – 12 November 2010 and 7-11 November 2011
   b) Meetings in subsidiary bodies of NEAFC
A calendar was distributed and will form the basis for the timing of meetings.

19 Press statements and other reports of the Commission’s activities
The EU representative expressed the wish that the press release would be extremely factual and that it was circulated to HODs before release. HODs would have until close of business on 16 November for comments. This was agreed.

20 Any other business
The Norwegian representative asked other Parties about ratification of the amendments of the Convention. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) informed that the process had been completed in Greenland and was almost complete in the Faroe Islands. It does not go through the Danish Parliament and the bill of ratification will go to the Faroese Parliament in a matter of weeks. The Icelandic representative informed that the ratification process started this autumn. It is expected that a bill will go before the Icelandic parliament early next year. The representative of the Russian Federation expects the process to be concluded next year. The EU and Norway have concluded ratification.

21 Closure of the 27th Annual Meeting
The President thanked everybody whilst regretting that not all he had hoped for had been achieved.

The EU representative expressed his appreciation of the President’s effective and impartial leadership of the organisation during his term of office. He would in every way he could also support the next President. The Norwegian representative seconded this and noted that Parties did
not always get what they wanted. This is the way the organisation works and is not a lack of will to cooperate. The representative of the Russian Federation thanked the President.

The President closed the 28th Annual Meeting and wished everybody a safe journey home.
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President Stefán Ásmundsson’s Opening Statement at the 28th Annual Meeting of NEAFC

Let me start by noting the increasing public interest in fisheries management of the high seas and more specifically the environmental impact of fisheries. This increased attention should be welcomed, as it demonstrates that it is not only ourselves who think that we have important work to do. This week's meeting will deal with important issues and we will hopefully be able to look back and conclude that it was a fruitful meeting.

The importance of collective measures through regional fisheries management organisations and arrangements has been stressed. The UNFA Review Conference in May 2006 proposed means of strengthening the mandates and measures of RFMOs. Those of relevance to NEAFC are:

1. Modern approaches to fisheries management, relying on best scientific information, the precautionary and ecosystem approach and strengthening of the mandates of the of the RFMOs;
2. Strengthening and enhancing cooperation between existing and developing regional organisations;
3. Addressing participatory rights;
4. Ensuring that non-Contracting Parties respect regional measures;
5. Transparency;
6. Undergoing performance review;
7. Strengthening monitoring, control and enforcement.

Without hesitation I can state that in the last three years NEAFC has got its act together on all counts. NEAFC has systematically adapted requirements in international law and instruments and developed effective management tools.

The protection of the deep-sea ecosystem has attracted a lot of interest in recent years. Following calls from the UN General Assembly, NEAFC’s Contracting Parties have been active participants in the process within FAO drafting International Guidelines for the Management of Deep-sea Fisheries in the High Seas. This work was not finalised until late August 2008, but NEAFC now has in place the regulations for bottom fishing activities which provide adequate tools to protect Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems to the extent agreed by the international fisheries community. These regulation have been supplemented with large areas in the NEAFC Regulatory Area closed to all bottom fishing.

NEAFC is still in the forefront of the important battle against free riders, usually termed as Illegal, Unregulated and Unreported fishing activity. The NEAFC black-lists continue to have a strong impact. This is seen in the curbing of activity of vessels on the list and applications from non-Contracting Parties for cooperative status. Four non-Contracting Parties - Japan, Canada, New Zealand and Belize - have indicated that they want their status to continue next year. Applications from the Bahamas and Panama have been considered for some time. NAFO, SEAFO and NEAFC have established a common Atlantic IUU list whereby vessels on the lists of one party are placed on the lists of the others. NEAFC has proposed having the same arrangement with CCAMLR, but no answer has been received yet. NEAFC shares its IUU list with all other Regional Fisheries bodies through the Regional Fisheries Bodies Secretariat Network. The Secretariat has participated actively in FAO’s...
work to establish a Legally-Binding Instrument on Port State Measures to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate IUU Fishing and the creation of a Global Record

A Memorandum of Understanding with our environmental sister organisation in the North East Atlantic, OSPAR, was signed in late September 2008. This opens up for a free flow of information between NEAFC and OSPAR, highlighting other human activities that may affect the marine environment, spatial planning and cooperation to enhance knowledge and understanding the abundance and distribution of fish and other marine species populations, in order to better protect them.

A proposal for draft terms of an Agreement of Co-operation between the International Maritime Organization (IMO) and the North East Atlantic Fisheries Commission (NEAFC) was received from IMO and circulated to Contracting Parties on 9 July 2008. The proposal was adopted by NEAFC last year and by the IMO Council 10-14 November 2008. IMO will finally decide on the draft at its Assembly Meeting in November 2009.

There has been contact between the Secretariats of NEAFC and the International Seabed Authority, ISA, discussing the possibility of a MoU between the two organizations.

I must mention the Port State Control System that entered into force, seamlessly, on 1 May 2007 and has operated without major problems since. All landings of frozen fish in foreign harbours have been monitored and 25% of these inspected. Documentation is available on the NEAFC website with full transparency for all Contracting Parties almost in real time. The system assists the importers and transporters in the seafood industry in certifying the legality of fish landings.

In spite of all this there has been a relentless onslaught on the performance of RFMO’s from a number of NGOs and their ability to bring into place robust and proper management for the high seas, compatible with what is achieved in the waters under national jurisdiction. There have been repeated calls for ever more detailed decisions being made at a global level, potentially giving a fisheries management role to the United Nations.

Let me quote a former President of NEAFC.

“I think all Contracting Parties of NEAFC will agree that cooperating through regional fisheries organisations, as set out in international law and instruments, is a more efficient way to reach the target of sustainable fisheries development than hijacking the General Assembly of the UN to manage fisheries. The point must be to strengthen and support regional arrangements and organisations, not diminishing their role.”

Allow me also to quote one of the NEAFC Contracting Parties at the 2005 UN General Assembly:

“It is the view of the Government of Iceland that the General Assembly should focus on specific issues that have global implications, and not on issues that fall within the purview of the sovereign rights of States or under the responsibility of Regional Fisheries Management Organizations. The General Assembly should address issues that are global in nature and can only be solved through global cooperation.”

RFMOs do not need to be controlled from the global level. Their conventions already give them mandates and tools to perform their jobs according to international law. They do not need an UNGA resolution to prescribe to them what they already are obliged to do and can be held to account for. For some fisheries related purposes, global co-operation and co-
ordination is useful. The FAO has been particularly important in that context. But gaps in international fisheries management should be met with a strengthening of the regional level where it is not strong enough rather than by micromanaging from a global level.

There is a problem with the representation of civil society. The stakeholders that will have to shoulder the consequences of any measures coming out of international discussions are more often than not absent from international meetings. It is quite difficult to involve stakeholders in global discussions for a number of reasons. Regional and local discussions have a better chance to reach the correct participatory balance in decision processes. The big international NGOs have a strong presence at international meetings, but as has been noted in other fora the connection between civil society and these large corporate NGOs can be quite weak.

PECCOE has routinely reviewed results of the various elements of the Scheme of Control and Enforcement, including the NEAFC IUU (Illegal, Unregulated, Unreported) A- and B-lists, the NEAFC Port Control System. NEAFC has particularly looked at the performance of vessel reporting under the Scheme of positions and catches and the FMCs. It has supported the re-organisation of the compilation of statistics on quota uptakes. PECCOE has evaluated inspections and the handling of infringements. The Committee has proposed that the cooperative non-Contracting Party Status of Belize, Canada, Japan and New Zealand is renewed. Applications from the Bahamas and Panama are still under consideration.

PECMAS has been particularly active in reviewing scientific advice and in area management, evaluating proposals for closing areas to fishery. It has also reviewed information from Contracting Parties on fishing activities in order to define existing and new fishing areas.

Let me end by noting that OECD has just published a report on the strengthening of Regional Fisheries Organisations. NEAFC is one of the 4 RFMOs used as case studies. The report describes in detail the modernising of NEAFC, which has taken place since 1995, the drivers and the success NEAFC has had in reaching agreement management frameworks for all straddling stocks and especially establishing robust monitoring, surveillance and control measures. At the same time it describes the particularly difficult issues as allocating the management of redfish fisheries and points out possible problems in the future. The tone of the study is however that NEAFC’s achievements since 1995 are considerable and NEAFC’s experience may contribute best practice for consideration by other regional fishery bodies.

I will now ask the NEAFC Secretariat to give some practical information.
Denmark in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland

As always, the Faroe Islands and Greenland are pleased to be attending the Annual Meeting of the Northeast Atlantic Fisheries Commission here at the headquarters in London.

We have a number of very substantial issues to resolve on some of the key stocks which this organisation is responsible for managing in international waters.

In recent years, NEAFC has been looked to more and more often as a model for regional fisheries cooperation. One example is the way in which we undertook our performance review in 2006, which is inspiring other regional organisations as a sensible and effective approach. Our approach to the listing of IUU vessels and associated port state measures have also been hailed as leading the way when it comes to having a real impact on illegal fisheries operations.

Our primary responsibility is to find effective ways to resolve the outstanding management issues for key stocks, both between the relevant coastal states and within this body. If we cannot achieve this together, with so few parties and coastal states around the table, then we not only jeopardise the future viability of the specific fisheries in question. We also seriously jeopardise the good name NEAFC has established internationally as a responsible and effective fisheries management body. As you all know, this can also have much broader ramifications in on-going discussions in the global context on the sustainable fisheries.

On a more positive note, our delegation welcomes the greater coordination of efforts between this organisation and our sister RFMO across the Atlantic, NAFO that we have seen develop in recent years - such us with the development of comprehensive measures for bottom fishing to protect VME’s, as well as control issues and coordination of our respective lists of IUU vessels. This coordination creates important regional synergies to strengthen our joint efforts to ensure sustainable fisheries, not least in standardising technical regulations to make them more efficient for all of us, administrators and vessel operators alike.

We look forward to constructive and productive discussions here this week that can help us move forward on the difficult - but vitally important - management issues we have before us.
Mr. President, distinguished Representatives and Observers,

Once again it gives me great pleasure to be here in London representing the European Community at the Annual Meeting of the North East Atlantic Fisheries Commission.

Mr. President, along with many other RFMOs, and particularly with our sister organisation, NAFO, NEAFC has continued work on implementing the provisions of the UN General Assembly Resolution 61/105. At the end of March, the Heads of Delegation met in London to consider concrete measures as part of this implementation. I recall that the Community welcomed this resolution when it was adopted in 2006 and we continue to fully support the aims of eradicating destructive fishing practices and thereby protecting vulnerable marine habitats. To this end, whilst we continue to seek to have an expansion of the current closed areas in the Mid-Atlantic Ridge and the Hatton Bank, we were very pleased with the progress already made at the March meeting. I know that PECMAS has also considered a possible revision to the thresholds for the encounter provisions for exploratory fishing in new areas. At this stage, I think we need to take on board the suggested levels adopted in NAFO in September but I believe there is more work to do; this will require further scientific input from ICES. I am sure that you will agree with me when I say that we need to ensure that we are implementing effectively the provisions of the UNGA resolution.

The issue of vulnerable marine ecosystems is just one of our priorities this week, but the Community has many other priorities, not least of which is to ensure the continued long-term sustainability of all the major stocks, where we have a direct interest. I am sure you understand that this means all the stocks regulated by NEAFC. We are determined to secure responsible fisheries and to ensure that the obligations we all have, without exception, towards guaranteeing the long-term conservation and sustainable exploitation of these living marine resources, are fulfilled. We all have a common responsibility for fisheries management and we need to recognise this. Whilst we have our own national boundaries, fish and the science surrounding them do not have such constraints. So this means that cooperation and common responsibility are fundamental to the future of fisheries.

Mr President, although the Coastal States have so far not reached agreement on an arrangement for the mackerel fisheries for 2010 in the North-East Atlantic, I am pleased to say that work will resume very shortly, at the invitation of the Community.

I am also pleased to see that for blue whiting and Atlanto-Scandian herring, the Coastal States did reach agreement, including access arrangements, on management measures for
2010. These measures are based upon sound management principles enshrined in the relevant long-term management plans adopted by all the Parties. We seek long-term and sustained stability for these stocks for the benefit and future of all our fishermen.

For redfish in the Irminger Sea and adjacent waters, the Community remains concerned at the way in which we, as NEAFC Parties, have been regulating the stock in recent years. The restrictions we have fixed seem to bear little resemblance to the reality of the stock situation. This year, ICES advises that there is more than one stock. This has complicated management objectives even more. The Community remains committed to working with the Coastal States as well as with the other NEAFC Contracting Parties, to agree upon the future long-term management of this stock. We are prepared to work both this week and in early 2010 to ensure that we can come to a common and satisfactory agreement on sustained management for this fishery.

For redfish occurring in the Norwegian Sea, we have established restricted fisheries in recent years, along with some targeted research. However, this is not the best way to manage a fishery and we are aware of the scientific advice. Nevertheless, as with the redfish in the Irminger Sea, there are indications that we can reach some common ground. We consider that there should be a reduction in the TAC for 2010.

With our joint interest in the haddock stock at Rockall, the Community and the Russian Federation have met twice this year in order to progress on formulating management measures for the stock. We have both recognised, most recently in Moscow, that we are not yet far enough on agreeing a common approach, but I would say that we have made progress in this direction. My delegation welcomes the continuation of the discussions with the Russian Federation in early 2010.

As you will no doubt be aware, the Community, along with Norway and the Faroe Islands, have been working during 2009 on addressing the key issue of discards. At a meeting in July, we agreed to work on banning slipping and high-grading practices, as well as other measures to diminish discards in the pelagic fisheries. With this in mind, these three Parties will be introducing a number of measures from 1 January 2010 in relation to mackerel, herring and horse mackerel. It is proposed that these measures be adopted by NEAFC; I understand that there is already a proposal on the table from Norway and I look forward to the discussion later this week. It is imperative in my view that we have a level playing field in respect of our approach to this issue.

One issue, which is of concern to me, is the catch data available to NEAFC. It is clear to me having attended many meetings in NEAFC and associated Coastal State meetings that we need to get a better handle on this data. I would also suggest that as part of this approach, we might examine how electronic logbooks could better be used by the Parties in future to ensure that such data is as current as possible. I am aware that a proposal is to be tabled by PECCOE for this Annual Meeting.

Mr. President, distinguished Representatives and Observers, colleagues, there is a full agenda ahead of us here this week, and this includes our attempts to resolve a number of issues relevant to the Coastal States, although these issues are not necessarily in the direct
timetable of NEAFC. However, I feel that these issues do form an integral part of the NEAFC process and must be considered if we are to have proper comprehensive fisheries management.

On behalf of the European Community Delegation, I would like to express my pleasure at being here in London, even if I sometimes feel that I should live here in view of all the other associated meetings we have in this building. I look forward to working with you this week, Mr. President, in this your last meeting as President. Of course, I also look forward to working with all others present this week and as usual, I trust that we can achieve substantial results to ensure the long-term future of the marine living resources in the North-East Atlantic.
Opening Statement by Iceland

Mr. President, distinguished delegates and observers

Iceland is pleased to be here in London attending this 28th Annual Meeting of the NEAFC Commission. As so often before, we have a number of important items on our agenda. For all of us, involved in the work of NEAFC, it has been satisfying to witness and take part in the positive progress and results made within NEAFC in recent years where NEAFC has taken the leading role and setting examples as a responsible Regional Fisheries Management Organisation. This reality however stresses the importance that we, together, share the responsibility we are entrusted with and we make every effort to stay on track.

In recent years we have succeeded in making considerable achievements in reaching agreements on management measures for the fisheries in the NEAFC Regulatory Area. The Atlanto-Scandian herring has for several years been managed in accordance to a management plan and in 2010 the fisheries of the blue whiting will be as well. However, there are outstanding issues like the redfish in the Irminger Sea and adjacent waters, were unfortunately there are fundamental differences among parties.

The protection of the deep-sea ecosystems and area management has attracted a lot of interest in recent years. Earlier this year NEAFC closed an area in the Charlie Gibbs fracture zone for bottom fishing to protect vulnerable marine ecosystems, an area of more than 330,000 km².

Within NEAFC we have managed to build up robust monitoring and control systems that make a valuable part of NEAFC’s operation. A fundamental aspect to live up to the standard of being a responsible Regional Fisheries Management Organization, is that we examine how well we are fulfilling the different obligations we have agreed to follow within the framework of NEAFC. In this regard, I refer specifically to our catch reporting requirements. This is of fundamental importance if we want to keep the lead as a responsible RFMO, as well as managing our fisheries in a truth worthy way, where the bases of our management are founded on setting total allowable catches and allocating them between different NEAFC parties. In Iceland’s view an increased transparency on methods on verifying and weighing of catches would be beneficial to our future work within NEAFC.

Mr. President, distinguished representatives and observers, once and again we have a full agenda and much important work ahead of us. On behalf of the Icelandic delegation I would like to express our privilege being here and hopefully we will be able to work with you all to achieve the real results we want and need for NEAFC for its continued success. In closing I wish us all a fruitful meeting.
OPENING STATEMENT

by Head of the Agency for Fisheries of the Russian Federation

28th Annual Meeting of the North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission
(NEAFC)

Mr. President, Distinguished Delegates, Observers, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am pleased on behalf of the Russian delegation, the Federal Agency for Fisheries and the Russian Federation which I represent in NEAFC, to greet all participants of the 28th Annual Meeting of the Commission.

To Russia this is an important forum to address challenges in managing the marine living resources in the Northeast Atlantic and to achieve equitable and fair agreements with other Contracting Parties to ensure optimum and responsible use of these resources and their sustainability.

At this meeting, as before, the Commission will review the scientific advice from ICES and make its recommendations for 2010 on the management measures for the main stocks in its Convention area: the
Irminger Sea beaked redfish, herring, mackerel, blue whiting, pelagic *Sebastes mentella* in ICES SA I and II, Rockall haddock, deep-sea species.

Russia is concerned that despite considerable effort contributed into the studies of the Irminger Sea redfish stock and a large array of data analysed over years scientists still unable to come to a common understanding of the structure of this stock. You all know, that the decision to advise on two stocks of pelagic redfish in the Irminger Sea this year instead of one stock was not unanimous among the Advisory Committee members.

In this respect it should be emphasized that Russia was one of the countries that discovered this stock, which has been successfully harvested for 25 years.

We would like to invite all Parties concerned to continue research on the structure of the pelagic *S.mentella* stock in the Irminger Sea in order to have the best scientific advice available to managers in due time.

We re-affirm our position that any new management regime for the redfish stock in the Irminger Sea and adjacent areas needs to rest on a solid scientific basis.

NEAFC has made a significant progress in protecting vulnerable marine ecosystems in recent years. The last example is a proposal for closing large
areas on the Mid-Atlantic Ridge adopted earlier this year. NEAFC demonstrated the leadership with the adoption of measures back in 2004 to prevent significant adverse impacts of bottom fisheries on vulnerable marine ecosystems. In general, our approach is that only those areas can be closed to bottom fishing, where the presence of VME has been confirmed by either research or fisheries.

I would also like to draw your attention to another important issue, which Russia puts high on the agenda, the issue of discards of fish. This issue was addressed in the UN General Assembly Resolutions on Sustainable Fisheries encouraging States and RFMOs to take actions to reduce and eliminate discards and to initiate a process within FAO to develop an International Plan of Action for Reducing Discards of Fish.

Last year NEAFC mandated PECCOE to examine means to minimize discards in the Regulatory Area, and to submit recommendations for appropriate measures. We are looking forward to PECCOE’s report on the issue and constructive discussions with other Contracting Parties aiming at putting in place effective and practical measures to reduce discards.

Mr. President, the delegation of the Russian Federation is looking forward to a very productive meeting and to working closely with you and all the Parties during this week.
Thank you for your attention.
OPENING STATEMENT BY THE DELEGATE OF BELIZE AT THE NEAFC’S ANNUAL MEETING
IN LONDON ON 9TH NOVEMBER 2009

Distinguished Delegates and representatives of Members of the Commission, Observers, representatives from non-governmental organizations and the Secretariat

On behalf of the Government of Belize we wish to thank the Commission for inviting us to participate in this important Meeting. As you are aware, we are Contracting Party of ICCAT, IOTC, IATTC, and a Cooperating non-Member of WCPFC. We are also engaged in the negotiation for the formation of SPRFMO. This is part of Belize’s overall policy of participation in all Regional Fisheries Management Organizations in which we have a presence.

Our involvement in NEAFC is currently limited to transshipment by our refrigerated cargo vessels. We hope to extend that involvement to fishing vessels as well. We have submitted all the required data relating to our transshipment activities in the NEAFC Regulatory area together with our application for renewal of our Cooperating non-Contracting Party Status. We look forward to our continued cooperation with NEAFC and its furtherance of its objectives. We reiterate our position that it is necessary for Flag States to remain responsible for monitoring transshipments at sea effected in EEZs in cooperation with the relevant Contracting Parties in whose EEZs the transshipments occur even though such transshipments are outside the scope of the NEAFC Scheme of Control and Enforcement because they are not conducted in the NEAFC Regulated area.

Belize is a small developing nation and we wish to maintain a meaningful participation in this important industry. In so doing, you may rest assured that we are totally committed to ensuring the effectiveness of NEAFC’s Conservation and Management Measures and maintaining excellent cooperation with all its Members.

We thank you once more for allowing us to participate at this Meeting.
Opening Statement by Canada

Mr. President, distinguished delegates, and observers

Canada would like to take this opportunity to thank you and the NEAFC Contracting Parties for allowing us to present this statement. We appreciate the kind invitation by the NEAFC Secretariat for Canada to participate as observers at the 28th Annual Meeting of the North East Atlantic Fisheries Commission.

Canada has attended NEAFC meetings in an observer capacity and has enjoyed the privileges associated with Cooperating Non-Contracting Party status for a number of years.

Canada would like to maintain the opportunity to pursue cooperation with NEAFC in a number of areas including fishing, transhipment and scientific research activities in the NEAFC Regulatory Area as well as general cooperation and support on monitoring, control and surveillance measures.

NEAFC has shown significant results in the battle against IUU fishing in the last two years through the adoption of effective tools including port State controls. This has been positive not only for the Northeast Atlantic but also the Northwest Atlantic.

We have seen a healthy cross fertilization of ideas between NEAFC and her sister organization - NAFO. This has been demonstrated by NEAFC and NAFO Parties in developing measures to protect vulnerable marine ecosystems pursuant to the UNGA Sustainable Fisheries Resolution.

It is our view that closer cooperation among States in the North Atlantic should continue and reinforce the momentum towards a more globally coordinated approach to combating illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing and to progress in the effective protection of VMEs.
Canada is continuing to consider the options for possible cooperative arrangements with NEAFC, with a view to fostering closer collaboration on fisheries issues in the North Atlantic.

Mr. President, we look forward to working constructively and cooperatively with all interested parties to this Commission.
Statement by the Cook Islands

Kia Orana Mr President & distinguished delegates

The Cook Islands would like to take this opportunity to thank the President for allowing us to deliver this statement to the Meeting and the NEAFC Secretariat for the invitation to be here in London as observers to this the 28th Annual Meeting of the North East Atlantic Fisheries Commission.

The Cook Islands is aware of the new requirement to confirm the nature of our intended co-operation with the Commission and advises delegates here present that the Cook Islands has now determined that it will reapply for Co-operating Non-contracting status under category “c”, “Scientific Research in the Regulatory Area”. This is particularly with reference to the Cook Islands’ involvement in Deep Sea Fisheries in the Southern Indian Ocean and as such it would be desirable to co-operate with states engaged in similar fisheries in the NEAFC Regulatory Area to better understand both the nature of stocks and the impact of fishing on the stocks themselves and the benthic environment. The Cook Islands will formally communicate this to the Secretariat before the end of the week.

It is noted with some concern though that the Cook Islands seems to have been singled out for inconsistent treatment in respect of our status and would urge the Commission to act with full transparency and consistency in the application of its rules.

The Cook Islands continues to believe that the most effective method of fisheries management is achieved only through negotiation, inclusion and cooperation with its DWFN partners. As such the Cook Islands applauds the recent initiatives promoted by member states to improve the transparency of the work of the Commission and encourages the further development of this. Additionally and as the Cook Islands has called for before, we would be pleased to see the Commission address the special needs of developing states when developing its rules.

Mr President, the Cook Islands’ wishes to reiterate its continued commitment to act with full transparency, co-operation and compliance with the spirit and requirements of the North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission and its Convention. We continue to take pride in our status as a Cooperating Non-Contracting Member and being able to participate in the work towards the management and conservation of the fisheries resources under the Commission’s competence.

In conclusion, Mr President, this delegation wishes to reiterate our appreciation to yourself and the assembled delegates for allowing us this opportunity to make our statement and to this end the Cook Islands looks forward to working constructively and co-operatively with all interested parties to this Commission in order to achieve its stated aims. We trust that deliberations now and in the future result in a fruitful and positive outcome for all.

Kia Manuia
Mr Chairman, distinguished delegates, ladies & gentleman. On behalf of my Government I would like to express our thanks to the Secretariat for inviting us to attend this meeting as observers. I would also like to thank the Secretary – Mr Hoydal – and his staff for their cooperation, advice and assistance in various matters.

I would like to thank the members of PECCOE for their attention to our submission for the removal of our ship ‘Aquamarine II’ ex-Cliff, from the IUU blacklists as under our flag it is under new ownership from that under which it was placed on the ‘lists’.

I can also confirm that we are working towards submitting an application for Co-operating non-contracting party status as a pre-cursor to further involvement with NEAFC and currently plan to make that application in early 2010. I would welcome talking to delegates from any NEAFC members who believe it would be mutually beneficial to discuss and/or assist us with our intended application.

Thank you again for allowing us to attend and I wish you every success with your deliberations.

Nigel E Smith
*International Registrar of Shipping & Seamen*
St. Kitts & Nevis Government

*SUBMITTED IN WRITING DUE TO ILLNESS OF INTENDED DELEGATE*

*Monday, 09 November 2009*
OPENING STATEMENT BY THE OSPAR COMMISSION

The OSPAR Commission is grateful for this opportunity to participate as an Observer to the 28th Annual Meeting of NEAFC.

We welcome efforts by the Executive Secretaries of our respective Commissions to find innovative ways to operationalise the Memorandum of Understanding we signed in 2008. To that end we hope the meeting will endorse the recommendation from PECMAS to allow the OSPAR Secretariat to attend relevant agenda items of future PECMAS meetings. As an organisation with observer status in OSPAR, NEAFC representation is already welcome at all OSPAR meetings. Furthermore, in this context, a Stakeholder Workshop that will consider technical aspects of surveillance and enforcement in remote marine areas, tentatively planned for March 2010, could represent a practical example of our cooperation.

We also continue to value input by NEAFC to the OSPAR Quality Status Report (QSR) 2010, including information from the NEAFC Fisheries Status Report 1998-2007. The QSR 2010 is currently the subject of a peer review by ICES and wider public e-consultation. OSPAR would very much appreciate the support of NEAFC to raise awareness of this e-consultation, details of which can be found on the OSPAR website (www.ospar.org).

Amongst other issues, OSPAR has sought ICES advice on a risk-based approach on effects of mariculture on populations of wild fish and on impacts of human activities (including fishing) on cold water corals and deep-sea sponge aggregations. Regarding the latter, both these species appear on the OSPAR List of Threatened and/or Declining Species and have been identified as priorities for protection.

Finally OSPAR would like to inform NEAFC Parties of the OSPAR Ministerial Meeting to take place in Bergen (Norway) on 20-24 September 2010. We consider that this will be a major Environmental Summit for the North-East Atlantic. As hosts for the Ministerial Meeing, Norway looks forward to inviting representation from NEAFC to that meeting.
Opening Statement: Pew Environment Group

28th Annual Meeting of NEAFC, 9-13 November 2009-11-08

We would like to thank the Chair of PECCOE and the Executive Secretary of NEAFC for providing the Pew Environment Group the opportunity to present the NEAFC specific findings of Pew’s port State performance research at the PECCOE meeting on 14 October. Pew’s port State performance is looking into the impact of port State measures on the operations of vessels that have been listed on the IUU vessel lists of 8 high seas RFMOs.

In contrast to other RFMO IUU vessel lists, the NEAFC list provides sufficient information to track the port movements of such vessels. The inclusion of reefers on the list and the denial of port access for IUU listed vessels have proven highly effective in combating IUU fishing is the convention area. At the same time, the research thus far has indicated that some countries who are parties to NEAFC have not fully implemented the port state measures adopted by NEAFC. We would also note that the regional nature of the measures allow IUU vessels to continue their operations in other ocean areas. In this regard, we would strongly encourage NEAFC parties to ratify the UN FAO Port State Measures Agreement to be adopted by the FAO Conference next week.

The research reemphasizes the urgent need for all RFMOs to coordinate their efforts against IUU fishing and mutually endorse their respective IUU vessel lists.

Pew looks forward to working together with NEAFC and its Contracting Parties to improve measures taken against IUU fishing. The findings of the Pew research have been published for public review, and we are happy to integrate any further information and comments from NEAFC Contracting Parties and others in preparation of the final report due to be published in the beginning of 2010.

On the issue of deep-sea fisheries, the Pew Environment Group would like to endorse the opening statement by Seas at Risk (SAR) on behalf of WWF and the Deep Sea Conservation Coalition (DSCC). We hope that NEAFC Contracting Parties will give serious consideration to the recommendations that SAR, WWF and the DSCC have put forward for this meeting contained in the Annex to SAR’s opening statement which has been distributed. While NEAFC has taken important steps to protect VMEs, much more needs to be done to fully implement the UN GA resolution 61/105. In this regard, the recommendations focus on impact assessments, closed areas and the management of deep-sea stocks for long-term sustainability. The recommendations are not new – we’ve put them forward at the last Annual Meeting of NEAFC and circulated them in advance of the HODS meeting in March of this year. We would note that the negotiations at the UN General Assembly on the Sustainable Fisheries resolution resume next week and the outcome of the meeting here this week in relation to the management of deep-sea fisheries will be of interest to all of the other countries involved in the UN GA negotiations.

Norway, we would like to express support for the proposal from Norway on discards. We would urge all NEAFC Contracting Parties to give due consideration to the importance of this issue
Opening Statement

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Delegates and Observers,

Thank you for once again providing Seas At Risk with the opportunity to observe and address this meeting. I also deliver this statement on behalf of WWF and the Deep Sea Conservation Coalition.

We would like to congratulate NEAFC Contracting Parties on the significant achievements for the conservation of vulnerable marine ecosystems that have been made in this organisation. Some seven percent of NEAFC’s Regulatory Area is now closed to bottom fishing to protect fragile cold-water coral reefs and seamount communities from the imminent threat of destruction. However, although these measures protect a notable amount of highly valuable habitat in the region, extensive areas where such habitats occur or are likely to occur are currently still left open for destructive bottom fishing and those habitats may be lost for centuries if bottom fishing in these areas continues without protection measures. The same fate awaits a number of populations of deep-sea fish which ICES constantly advises to protect from over fishing and excessive by-catch. We are deliberately losing the very basis on which generations of future fishermen could live.

This 28th Annual Meeting of the NEAFC Commission is the first annual meeting after the 31st of December 2008 deadline set by the United Nations General Assembly Resolution 61/105 - the review of this resolution will conclude next week in New York. While NEAFC has taken significant steps to implement the obligations arising from the Resolution, we are deeply concerned about the organisation’s understanding that “current bottom fisheries practices in the NEAFC Regulatory Area do not have significant adverse impacts on VMEs” as stated in the response to the Secretary General of the UN. We would respectfully disagree as there is no scientific basis for making this assertion.

Paragraph 83 a of the Resolution commits NEAFC Contracting Parties to not authorize bottom fishing activities unless Environmental Impact Assessments show that these will not have significant adverse impact on vulnerable marine ecosystems or VMEs. We consider this provision to be the lynchpin of the Resolution, and we welcome the framework for EIAs NEAFC has agreed on. This requirement however, is currently only limited to areas with identified VMEs and areas outside the existing bottom fishing footprint. The underlying assumption is
that within the existing footprint there would be no vulnerable marine ecosystems other than those identified, and therefore no EIA would be necessary. The UNGA Resolution does not make this distinction, and there is no scientific ground to restrict the requirement of impact assessments, as no systematic analysis of the likely occurrence of VMEs throughout the NEAFC Regulatory Areas has been conducted. In fact, it is quite likely that VMEs occur within the existing bottom fishing footprint in areas not closed to bottom fishing. Therefore, we call on this meeting to extend the requirement of prior EIAs to all proposed bottom fishing activities in the NEAFC Regulatory Area. Proving that those are sustainable in a manner consistent with internationally agreed criteria would greatly improve the implementation of the UN Resolution and the public perception of the regulation of high seas fisheries.

Currently, apart from the closed areas, the only protection granted to vulnerable marine ecosystems inside the historic footprint is the encounter or move-on rule. The cornerstone of the rule, the encounter threshold levels, are set at levels which have no scientific scientific basis and which effectively render the rule meaningless in all but exceptional circumstances. Adopting threshold levels of more than 60 kg of live coral and/or 800 kg of live sponge as recommended to this meeting (by AM 2009/12) would mean that, at a hypothetical retention efficiency of one to ten percent, the destruction of 8,000 to 80,000 kg of sponges would not trigger any protective measures. This would not only result in significant further losses of habitat, but also be serious impediment to the recovery of these ecosystems. As ICES has been unable to provide advice on science-based threshold levels, and the rate of retention of certain cold water corals may well be in the range of zero to one percent, we recommend that any encounter of VME indicator species should trigger an interim closure of the area for bottom fishing.

The current approach also reveals a significant inconsistency in NEAFC’s framework for protecting vulnerable ecosystems: if we expect such extensive impacts on habitats inside the current footprint, why are no Impact Assessment required prior to allowing these activities?

The management of deep-sea fisheries for sustainability requires substantial improvement. For most deep-sea species and stocks taken as catch or bycatch in deep-sea fisheries in the NEAFC Regulatory Area, insufficient information is available to even determine the impact of fishing, much less what level of catch could be considered sustainable. Several species of deep-sea sharks taken in the mixed fisheries for deep-sea species are classified as endangered or critically endangered by IUCN. We would also note that in spite of the measures agreed by NEAFC beginning in 2004 to cap and then reduce fishing effort, the reported catch of deep-sea species has risen by approximately 350% between 2004 and 2007 and that EC fleets are responsible for 95% of the catch. ICES has called for a complete overhaul in the management of deep-sea fisheries and the NEAFC performance review identified this as one area where substantial improvement by NEAFC is required. We reiterate our recommendation that fisheries for deep-sea stocks in the NEAFC Regulatory Area should be prohibited until an assessment of the impact of fishing on the fish stocks, including stocks of by-catch species, be conducted and a determination made as to what level of fishing, if any, on these stocks is sustainable in the long-term and appropriate and enforceable catch limits are established accordingly.
Ladies and Gentlemen, despite our identification of need for significant improvements to NEAFC’s recommendation on bottom fishing activities, we not only acknowledge the difficulties in changing deep-sea fisheries to become sustainable and acknowledge the achievements made towards this end, but also welcome the further steps that have already been proposed, such as the recommendation from PECMAS to follow ICES’ advice and protect further areas on Hatton Bank from destruction. We wish to draw the meeting’s attention on a similar recommendation for areas on Rockall Bank.

We also welcome PECMAS’ proposal that OSPAR is offered observer status to PECMAS and are pleased to see the development of the cooperation between OSPAR and NEAFC.

We would further like to draw your attention to our detailed position statement.

Seas At Risk, WWF and the Deep Sea Conservation Coalition would like to wish you, Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Delegates and Observers, a very successful meeting.
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Recommendations for the meeting of the North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission

9-13 November 2009

This Annual Meeting of the NEAFC Commission is the first meeting after the 31st of December 2008 deadline set by the United Nations General Assembly Resolution 61/105 to adopt and implement measures to protect vulnerable marine ecosystems from significant adverse impact from bottom fishing. NEAFC is still in the process of implementing the Resolution’s obligations, and we acknowledge the difficult task this constitutes.

We welcome the very significant steps that have already been taken by NEAFC, particularly the large area closures which now constitute 7% of the NEAFC Regulatory Area.

At the same time we are deeply concerned about NEAFC stating that “[t]he conclusion of the preliminary assessment is that current bottom fisheries practices in the NEAFC Regulatory Area do not have significant adverse impacts on VMES.” We would respectfully disagree as there is no scientific basis for making this assertion.

Following are recommendations on how the North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission can better implement UN GA Resolution 61/105 meaningfully and “ensure the long-term conservation and optimum utilisation of the fishery resources”.

We have identified three priority areas of focus for the Annual Meeting of NEAFC this year:

- Assessments of whether individual bottom fishing activities would have significant adverse impacts
- The determination of whether bottom fishing activities would cause significant adverse impacts to the long-term sustainability of deep sea fish stocks
- The requirement to cease bottom fishing activities in areas where, in the course of fishing operations, vulnerable marine ecosystems are encountered

1. The Assessment of Whether Individual Bottom Fishing Activities Would Have Significant Adverse Impacts

Paragraph 83a of the UN GA resolution commits NEAFC Contracting Parties to the following actions by 31 December 2008:

“To assess, on the basis of the best available scientific information, whether individual bottom fishing activities would have significant adverse impacts on vulnerable marine ecosystems, and to ensure that if it is assessed that these activities would have significant adverse impacts, they are managed to prevent such impacts, or not authorized to proceed.”

1 Response of the North East Atlantic Fisheries Commission, NEAFC, to the Secretary-General of the UN on actions taken pursuant to paragraphs 83-84 of resolution 61/105
2 North East Atlantic Fisheries Commission “New” Convention.
In the submission by NEAFC to the Secretary General of the United Nations earlier this year in regard to the implementation of UN GA resolution 61/105, NEAFC stated that “Procedures for assessment have been brought into place and each Contracting Party is required to assess impacts for any proposed bottom fishing in 2009.” This is not the case.

It has been agreed at the 2008 Extraordinary Meeting⁴ that Environmental Impact Assessments would be required for bottom fisheries in new areas and for bottom fisheries on identified vulnerable marine ecosystems only.⁵ The underlying assumption is that within the existing footprint there would be no vulnerable marine ecosystem other than those identified, and therefore no EIA would be necessary. However, in the Norwegian proposal to the NEAFC March 2009 HODs meeting for area closures on the Mid Atlantic Ridge (HM 2009-03) it is stated that “the existence of fragile benthic macrofauna (corals, sponges etc.) on the MAR has been documented in several studies (Mortensen et al. 2008 and references therein), and it is a fair assumption that most hard-bottom areas of the hills and slopes have or are likely to have such fauna albeit in varying density.” The Norwegian proposal for area closures was based on ‘representativity’, rather than the occurrence of vulnerable marine ecosystems and significant impacts of bottom fisheries on these ecosystems as stipulated in UNGA resolution 61/105.

PECMAS has been requested to identify vulnerable marine ecosystems and map sites where these vulnerable marine ecosystem are known to occur or likely to occur. No systematic study on the occurrence or likeliness of occurrence of vulnerable marine ecosystems throughout the NEAFC Regulatory Area has been presented to NEAFC so far. NEAFC requests to ICES are restricted to the distribution of vulnerable marine ecosystems, not their likeliness. In the face of the current lack of data, this is inappropriate.

The protection of vulnerable marine ecosystems inside the existing bottom fishing areas would be granted through the Encounter provisions (EM 2008/20, Article 6.), which is not the case ⁶ (see 2).

**RECOMMENDATION:**

- NEAFC should request advice from ICES on the areas where vulnerable marine ecosystems **do not occur or are not likely to occur.** EIAs should be **required for authorizing proposed bottom fishing activities in all other areas** of the NEAFC Regulatory.

- If NEAFC decides **not** to request such advice, or if ICES cannot provide conclusive advice in this regard, **EIAs should be required as a precondition for authorising proposed bottom fishing activities in all areas** of the NEAFC Regulatory Area, to be consistent with UN GA resolution 61/105 Paragraph 83a.

- EIAs should be conducted **according to the UN FAO International Guidelines** for Deep-Sea Fisheries in the High Seas, particularly paragraphs 47, 42, and 17-20.

**2. The Requirement to Cease Bottom Fishing Activities in Areas Where, in the Course of Fishing Operations, Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems Are Encountered**

We do not agree with the approach taken by NAFO to revise the threshold levels at the Annual Meeting of NAFO as described in the report of the 28-29 September 2009 meeting of PECMAS (AM 2009/19). Specifically the PECMAS report states the following:

---

³ Response of the North East Atlantic Fisheries Commission, NEAFC, to the Secretary-General of the UN on actions taken pursuant to paragraphs 83-84 of resolution 61/105
⁴ Report of the Extraordinary Meeting of the North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission, 1 and 2 July 2008
⁵ EM 2008/20 final, Proposal for a NEAFC Recommendation on Bottom Fishing Activities in the NEAFC Regulatory Area
⁶ 9.3.2.4 NEAFC request on vulnerable marine ecosystems (VMEs) concerning move-on provisions and threshold values for key indicator species.
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“The NAFO Scientific Council used information from research vessels, Canadian and Spanish, based on 30 min tows. Research trawl indicators of high concentrations were calculated. This was the basis for proposals for closing areas with high concentrations. It was obvious that these indicators could not be used in commercial fishing. The figures were combined and scaled up to the size of the commercial trawl (twice as wide and tow time eight times the research tows). This gave estimates of 60 kilo of corals and 1200 of sponges. To be precautionary, the threshold for sponges was reduced to 800. It is a common view that most vulnerable areas in NAFO have been closed and together with the thresholds and move-on rules will reduce the probability of fishing in VMEs to very low levels.”

If this is an accurate description of the approach taken by NAFO then it would appear that the math is inexplicably incorrect in the case of corals. Using the formula as described in the PECMAS report would have resulted in a threshold level of 3.2 - 32kg of corals, not 60kg of corals.

More broadly, this is not a scientifically defensible approach as:

- no analysis appears to have been done regarding the extent to which corals, sponges and other VME indicator species are retained in commercial gear.
- no studies have been conducted to correlate the extent of the physical impact to VMEs with the quantities of VME indicator species observed in fishing gear.

ICES note two further difficulties, “the first being the implicit assumption that all species that might indicate the presence of a VME are equally likely to be retained in a fishing net and the second that these example taxa are the sole indicators of structural habitat VMEs”.

In conclusion, “ICES is not able to advise on science-based threshold levels [...]”.

The Bottom Fishery Impact Assessment submitted in December 2008 by New Zealand to the Science Working group of the South Pacific RFMO negotiations notes that commercial bottom trawl fishing gear is often not likely to retain much, if any, coral and/or other vulnerable bottom species impacted by bottom trawl gear and thus likely to be of limited value in assessing whether significant adverse impacts have occurred to VMEs.5

Further, adopting threshold levels of more than 60 kg of live coral and/or 800 kg of live sponge as recommended by AM 2009/12 would mean that a hypothetical retention efficiency of 1-10%9, the destruction of 8,000 to 80,000kg of sponges would not trigger any protective measures. This would not only result in significant further losses of habitat, but would also likely prevent these ecosystems from recovering.

**Recommendation:**

For all of these reasons, we recommend that any presence of VME species in fishing gear should trigger an immediate closure of an area until an Environmental Impact Assessment is conducted

3. **The Determination whether bottom fishing activities would cause significant adverse impacts to the long-term sustainability of deep sea fish stocks**

Paragraph 83b of the UN GA resolution commits NEAFC Contracting Parties to the following measure:

“To…determine whether bottom fishing activities would cause significant adverse impacts to... the long-term sustainability of deep sea fish stocks...”

---

7 9.3.2.4 NEAFC request on vulnerable marine ecosystems (VMEs) concerning move-on provisions and threshold values for key indicator species.
9 9.3.2.4 NEAFC request on vulnerable marine ecosystems (VMEs) concerning move-on provisions and threshold values for key indicator species.
The status of most species taken in deep-sea fisheries in the NEAFC Regulatory Area is not well known but generally recognized to be overexploited or depleted.\textsuperscript{10}

We would further note that a number of species taken in deep-sea fisheries in the area are recognized as vulnerable, endangered, or critically endangered by IUCN. These include the Leafscale gulper shark (\textit{Centrophorus squamosus}) and the Portuguese dogfish (\textit{Centroscymnus coelolepis}) both of which are targeted or taken as bycatch in a number of deep-sea fisheries in the NEAFC Regulatory Area. Both species are listed by IUCN as endangered in the Northeast Atlantic. ICES in 2006 advised that no target fisheries should be permitted for these species in the Northeast Atlantic until there are reliable estimates of stock productivity and that bycatch of these species in other fisheries should be prevented. ICES advised a similar approach to the deep-sea kitefin shark (\textit{Dalatias licha}). ICES also recommended that commercial fisheries taking deep-sea elasmobranchs along the Mid-Atlantic Ridge should not be allowed to proceed until a determination can be made as to the rate of exploitation that populations of these species in the area can sustain.\textsuperscript{11}

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Fisheries for deep-sea stocks should be prohibited until

- an assessment of the impact of fishing on the fish stocks, including stocks of bycatch species, be conducted according to the UN FAO International Guidelines for Deep-Sea Fisheries in the High Seas, particularly paragraphs 47, 42, and 17-20, and
- a determination made as to what level of fishing, if any, on these stocks is sustainable in the long-term and appropriate and enforceable catch limits are established accordingly.

**FURTHER RECOMMENDATIONS**

- We are pleased to see the recommendation from PECMAS to close the additional areas of the Hatton Bank to fishing gear which is likely to contact the seafloor, consistent with the advice from ICES\textsuperscript{12}.
- In light of the demonstrated immediate threat to the \textit{Lophelia pertusa} communities in the western portion of Rockall Bank, we recommend that the area be closed according to ICES’ 2007 advice, and be revised after new data have been published\textsuperscript{13}
- We are further pleased to see PECMAS proposing that OSPAR is offered observer status in PECMAS. We welcome the development of cooperation between NEAFC and OSPAR.
- We recommend that to avoid misunderstanding about the nature of ‘scientific’ fishing NEAFC adopts a protocol that complies with the intent of EM 2008/20.

---

For additional information, please contact:

Dr. Monica Verbeek – Seas at Risk  
Tel: +351 965 617 846; email: mverbeek@seas-at-risk.org


\textsuperscript{12} 9.3.2.2 NEAFC request regarding vulnerable habitats and deep-water species Vulnerable deep-water habitats in the NEAFC Regulatory Area. \textit{ICES Advice 2008, Book 9}

\textsuperscript{13} 9.3.2.1 NEAFC request to continue to provide all available new information on distribution of vulnerable habitats in the NEAFC Convention Area and fisheries activities in and in the vicinity of such habitats
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Matthew Gianni – Deep Sea Conservation Coalition
Tel: +31 646 168 899; email: matthewgianni@netscape.net

Christian Neumann – WWF
Tel: +49 40 530 200 128; email: christian.neumann@wwf.de
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21. **Closure of the 27th Annual Meeting**
1. Welcome address by the President and opening statements
   
   **Annotation:** The President will open the meeting on Monday 9 November 2009 at 10:00 hrs in the Council Meeting room on the ground floor of 22 Berners Street. Under this agenda item, delegations are invited to make opening statements.

2. Adoption of the agenda and appointment of rapporteur
   
   **Annotation:** The first draft of the agenda was circulated on 25 June 2009, HOD 09/52, for comments. No comments had been received by 14 August. This Draft Provisional Annotated Agenda was circulated on 24 August 2009, (Doc AM 2009/01).

3. Establishment and arrangements for the Finance and Administration Committee, and other groups
   
   **Annotation:** Meetings of the Finance and Administration Committee will be set up in consultation with the Chairman, Mr Andrew Thomson (EU). They will be scheduled so as not to clash with the plenary meetings of the Commission. A Briefing for the FAC, including the approved 2008 budget and anticipated accounts, draft budget for 2009 and draft budget estimate for 2010 will be circulated in September (Doc AM 2009/03).

   No other Groups are planning meetings at AM 2009.

4. Report by the Advisory Committee of ICES
   
   **Annotation:** As in recent years, it has been suggested that the representative of ACOM, ICES be asked to make his presentation under three headings:

   1) The general state of stocks in the NEAFC Convention Area dealt with by ACOM in the main fishing areas (NEAFC Areas I, II and III) (for information and comments);
   
   2) Specific problems in this year’s assessment and the effects of using the precautionary approach and introducing ecosystem concerns;
   
   3) Specific advice on fisheries with respect to:
      - a) Pelagic fishery for *Sebastes mentella* in the Irminger Sea
      - b) Blue whiting (combined stock).
      - c) Norwegian spring spawning (Atlanto-Scandian) herring
      - d) Mackerel (combined spawning components)
      - e) Rockall haddock
      - f) Deep-water fisheries
      - g) Closed areas
      - h) Pelagic *Sebastes mentella* in ICES Sub-areas I and II in the Regulatory Area

   The presentation by the Chairman of ACOM will be issued as a 2009 Annual Meeting document in November and included in the Report from the Annual Meeting.

   
   This has been issued as an Annual Meeting document, AM2009/05

6. Statistics on quota uptake and vessel activity
   
   **a)** Compilation of catch statistics for 2008
   
   These statistics have been compiled by the Working Group on Fisheries Statistics.
7. Report from PECMAS
Annotation: PECMAS met once on 28-30 September 2009. The report from that meeting will be presented by the Chair, Snorri Pálmason, Norway. The Report is AM2009/19

8. Request for scientific advice
Annotation: PECMAS will formulate the draft request for advice from ICES for 2010 at its meeting in September 2009. The Chair will report on this agenda item.

9. Reports from Working Groups and Coastal State discussions on management measures for 2010
Annotation:

Pelagic Sebastes mentella in the Irminger Sea
The three Coastal States (Greenland, the Faroe Islands and Iceland) met with fishery parties in London at NEAFC HQ 9-11 February to agree on management measures for 2009. They met in Copenhagen on 29 May and again 2-3 September, in London on 12 June and 5-9 October. The Convener will report from these meetings.

Pelagic Sebastes mentella in ICES Sub-areas I and II in the Regulatory Area
Annotation: The 2008 Annual Meeting agreed on an arrangement for the latter half of 2009 with an unallocated TAC of 10,500 tonnes within the period 15 August – 15 November 2009. Contracting Parties agreed to conduct scientific research restricted to a survey programme, organized by ICES, in accordance with Article 10 of the NEAFC Convention.

Blue whiting
The four Coastal States (the EU, the Faroe Islands, Iceland and Norway) will meet at NEAFC HQ 19-20 October. The Convener will report from these meetings under this item.

Norwegian spring spawning (Atlanto-Scandian) herring
The five Coastal States (the EU, the Faroe Islands, Iceland, Norway and the Russian Federation) will meet 22-23 October at NEAFC HQ. The Convener will report from these meetings under this item.

Mackerel
The EU, the Faroe Islands and Norway have met 3 times, at some meetings with fishery parties, 9-10 June, 29-30 June and once outside NEAFC. They will meet again 26-30 October in Cork, Ireland. The Convener will report from these meetings under this item.

Rockall haddock
If the EU and the Russian Federation have met, progress on this matter will be reported under this item.

Deep-sea species
Annotation: Fisheries for deep-sea species have been extensively discussed in relation to UNGA resolution 61/105 and FAO Technical Consultation on International Guidelines for the Management of Deep-Sea Fisheries in the High Seas.

Area Management
Response to the NEAFC request on new information on distribution of vulnerable habitats and fisheries activities has been received from ICES in June 2009. PECMAS will report on area management matters.

10. Recommendations of management measures for 2010 for:

Pelagic *Sebastes mentella* in the Irminger Sea

Annotation: The ICES advice in recent years has been as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Advice</th>
<th>TAC advised</th>
<th>TAC agreed</th>
<th>Estim. catches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>TAC not exceed current catch levels</td>
<td>119,000</td>
<td>119,000</td>
<td>161,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>TAC not exceed current catch levels</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>126,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Limit catch to 41,000 tonnes</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>73,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Catch less than 41,000 tonnes</td>
<td>&lt;41,000</td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>No fishery until clear indications of recovery of the stock</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Starting point for adaptive management strategy</td>
<td>(20,000)</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Starting point for adaptive management strategy</td>
<td>(20,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deep Pelagic stock (> 500 m)

Shallow Pelagic stock (< 500 m)

2010 Reducing fishing: Starting point for adaptive management strategy

This advice was updated in October of 2009 on the basis of new survey information and the results of an ICES/NAFO expert group that will review available information on stock identification in early 2009. For other requests concerning redfish - NEAFC request on potential management units for redfish in Irminger Sea, NEAFC request on the stock structure of *Sebastes mentella* and NEAFC request on timing and areas of larval extrusion of *Sebastes mentella* ICES responded in June 2009.

Response to the NEAFC request on potential elements for an adaptive management plan for redfish has been postponed until next year.

Pelagic *Sebastes mentella* in ICES Sub-areas I and II in the Regulatory Area

Annotation: ICES advice in recent years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Advice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>No directed fishery, by-catch at lowest possible level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>No directed fishery, by-catch at lowest possible level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>No directed trawl fishery and low by-catch limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>No directed trawl fishery and low by-catch limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>No directed trawl fishery and low by-catch limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>No directed trawl fishery and low by-catch limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Protection of juveniles, no directed trawl fishery and low by-catch limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Advice released June 2008 same as for 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Advice released June 2009 same as for 2009.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blue whiting

Annotation: The Coastal States - the EU, the Faroe Islands, Iceland and Norway - agreed in 2002 to implement a long-term management plan for the blue whiting stock, establishing a minimum level of spawning stock biomass (1,500,000 tonnes), restricting fishing to TACs consistent with a fishing mortality rate of less than 0.32, adaptation of fishery mortality levels if the spawning stock biomass falls below a level of 2,250,000 tonnes and restrictions on catches of juvenile blue whiting.
In November 2006 NEAFC took note of the Agreed Record of the Conclusion of Fisheries Consultations between the Faroe Islands, the European Community, Iceland and Norway on the Management of Blue Whiting in the North-East Atlantic in 2007 signed in Tórshavn on 27 October 2006. The arrangement foresees a staged reduction in catches by at least 100,000 tonnes annually over a number of years to reach the target for sustainable catches.

NEAFC in 2008 took note of the Agreed Record of Conclusion of Fisheries Consultations between the Faroe Islands, the European Community, Iceland and Norway on the Long-Term Management of Blue Whiting in the North-East Atlantic signed in London 4 July 2008. The operational parts of long term management plan are as follows:

3. As a priority, the long-term plan shall ensure with high probability that the size of the stock is maintained above 1.5 million tonnes (Blim).
4. The Parties shall aim to exploit the stock with a fishing mortality of 0.18 on relevant age groups as defined by ICES.
5. While fishing mortality exceeds that specified in paragraph 4, the Parties agree to establish the TAC consistent with annual [x%] reductions in fishing mortality until the fishing mortality established in paragraph 4 has been reached. For the purposes of this calculation, the fishing percentage mortality reduction should be calculated with respect to the year before the year in which the TAC is to be established. For this year, it shall be assumed that the relevant TAC constrains catches.
6. When the fishing mortality in paragraph 4 has been reached, the Parties agree to establish the TAC in each year in accordance with the following rules:
   • In the case that the spawning biomass is forecast to reach or exceed 2.5 million tonnes (SSB trigger level) on 1 January of the year for which the TAC is to be set, the TAC shall be fixed at the level consistent with the specified fishing mortality.
   • In the case that the spawning biomass is forecast to be less than 2.5 million tonnes on 1 January of the year for which the TAC is to be set (B), the TAC shall be fixed that is consistent with a fishing mortality given by:
     \[ F = \frac{0.05 + (B - 1.5)(0.18 - 0.05)}{(2.5 - 1.5)} \]
   • In the case that spawning biomass is forecast to be less than 1.5 million tonnes on 1 January of the year for which the TAC is to be set, the TAC will be fixed that is consistent with a fishing mortality given by F = 0.05.
7. When the fishing mortality rate on the stock is consistent with that established in paragraph 4 and the spawning stock size on 1 January of the year for which the TAC is to be set is forecast to exceed 2.5 million tonnes, the Parties agree to discuss the appropriateness of adopting constraints on TAC changes within the plan.
8. The Parties, on the basis of ICES advice, shall review this long-term management plan at intervals not exceeding five years and when the condition specified in paragraph 4 is reached.

New advice for Blue Whiting for 2010 was released mid October 2009.

Norwegian spring spawning (Atlanto-Scandian) herring

Annotations: The EU, the Faroe Islands, Iceland, Norway and the Russian Federation agreed in 2002 to implement a long-term management plan for the Norwegian spring-spawning (Atlanto-Scandian) herring stock, establishing a minimum level of spawning stock biomass (2,500,000 tonnes), restricting fishing to TACs consistent with a fishing mortality rate of less than 0.125 and adaptation of fishery mortality levels if the spawning stock biomass falls below a level of 5,000,000 tonnes.

New advice for this stock for 2010 was released 9 October 2009.

Mackerel

Annotations: The Coastal States - the EU, the Faroe Islands and Norway - agreed in 2001 to implement a long-term management plan for the mackerel stock restricting fishing to TACs consistent with a fishing mortality rate of 0.15 and 0.2 and adaptation of fishery mortality levels if the spawning stock biomass falls below a level of 2,300,000.
In 2004 ACOM changed its perception of the state of the mackerel stock and the way in which the egg-surveys are used. For mackerel, fishery-independent data of the stock size becomes available only once every 3 years from egg surveys. The next egg survey takes place in 2011.

New advice for this stock for 2010 was released mid-October 2009.

**Rockall haddock**

**Annotation:** There is no agreed management plan in place for this stock.

### ICES advice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Advice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Reduce F below Fpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Reduce F below Fpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Reduce F below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Lowest possible F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Lowest possible catch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Lowest possible catch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Lowest possible catch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Reduce F below Fpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Keep F below Fpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>No long-term gains in increasing F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>No long-term gains in increasing F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**g) Deep-sea species**

At the 25th Annual Meeting it was decided that each Contracting Party should undertake to limit the effort for 2007 put into the directed fishing for deep-sea species. The effort shall not exceed 65 per cent of the highest level put into deep sea fishing in previous years for the relevant species. The advice is biennial and was last given for 2009 and 2010 in June 2008.

Response to the NEAFC request on suitable criteria for differentiating fisheries into possible management types has been received from ICES June 2009. ICES concludes that no further progress can be made towards differentiating fisheries through cluster analysis until these apparent problems with the data can be explained and accounted for. This could be facilitated by the attendance at future meetings of the working group of an expert from NEAFC with detailed knowledge of the fisheries, the database and NEAFC’s reporting protocols. If cluster analysis can be performed on a more robust data set, studies of the species composition within clusters may allow the development of suitable criteria for differentiating between fisheries.

**Area management**

**Annotation:**

A major proposal for closing large areas on the Mid-atlantic Ridge to fishing gear which is likely to contact the seafloor during the normal course of fishing operations was agreed at the meeting of Heads of Delegations 24-27 March and later adopted by postal vote. The large closures have entered into force. An extension of the Hatton Bank closure was considered by PECMAS in September. It was sent to PECCOE for comments. Based on the comments from PECCOE it has been drafted as a recommendation for decision at the 28th Annual Meeting.

A proposal by Iceland for a recommendation for closing an area in NEAFC RA south of Iceland for bottom fishing to protect spawning aggregations of blue ling was discussed by PECMAS at its September meeting. It has been tabled as a recommendation by Iceland for decision at the 28th Annual Meeting.

PECMAS in September considered information on fishing activity 1987-2007. Information from the last three Contracting Parties may lead to revision of the borders of existing and new fishing
areas as set out in the measures on bottom fishing. This led to a new proposal for the definition of existing and new fishing areas described in AM2009/11.


Annotation: The April report, AM2009/04, and the October report from PECCOE, AM2009/17 and the October Report of the AGDC, AM2009/14 will be circulated when available. The reports will be presented at the 28th Annual Meeting under this item.

12. The NEAFC Scheme of Control and Enforcement

a) Implementation of the Scheme

Annotation: PECCOE will report on progress in implementing the Scheme.

b) Possible adoption of proposals from the PECCOE

Annotation: Recommendations from the PECCOE meetings will be decided under this item.

c) Possible adoption of proposals from the Advisory Group for Data Communication

Annotation: Recommendations from the AGDC meetings will be decided on under this item.

d) A- and B- lists of IUU vessels

Annotation: The A and B IUU lists will be considered. Proposals from PECCOE for possible revisions of the A- and the B-list will be presented.

e) Cooperating non-Contracting Parties

Annotation: PECCOE will report on the latest developments.

13. The NEAFC Fisheries Status Report

The NEAFC Fisheries Status Report will be tabled, but not read.

14. Relationships with other Regional Fisheries Management Organisations

a) Observer reports

Annotation: The observers to other Regional Fisheries Organisations appointed at the 27th Annual Meeting were:

NAFO - Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) (Doc AM 2009/07)
ICES - Iceland (Doc AM 2009/09)
NAMMCO – Norway (Doc AM 2009/20)
Pollock in the Bering Sea – Russian Federation (Doc AM 2009/05)
SEAFO – EU – not yet received

Observers are reminded to submit written reports in time for circulation before the 28th Annual Meeting. Contracting Parties may wish to consider appointing observers to NASCO and ICCAT.

Regional Fishery Bodies Secretariats Network, RSN-2, 9-10 March HQ FAO

Report of the Sixth Meeting of North Atlantic Regional Fisheries Management Organisations, NARFMOs
The Secretariats of ICCAT, NAFO, NAMMCO, NASCO and NEAFC met in connection with the RSN-2 Meeting in Rome
Other contacts
15. Reports from international developments in fisheries management and integration of fisheries and environmental policies

a) Development of cooperation with OSPAR under the MoU
   i. OSPAR Management Group (MAQ) for the Quality Status Report, QSR
   ii. OSPAR fisheries chapter of QSR drafting Group

b) FAO
   i. FAO Correspondence Group Global Record of Fishing Vessels
   ii. FAO Port State Measures
   iii. FAO COFI

c) UN meetings and initiatives
   i. The eighth round of informal consultations of States parties to the United Nations Fish Stocks Agreement (ICSP-8). 16/19 March UN HQ
   ii. ICP 10 17-19 June UN

d) MCAP-MICC meeting, 3-4 May ICES HQ, Copenhagen

e) FAO FIRMS fisheries fact sheet development, 11-14 May, HQ FAO

f) EU Inspector Meeting, 17-18 May, Bamio, Spain

g) OECD Workshop on the economics of rebuilding fisheries 22-21 May Rhode Island

h) Nordic Conference on efficient fisheries management 26-27 August, Reykjavik

i) CITES SG Workshop meeting Introduction from the Sea 14-16 September, Geneva

j) IFLOS symposium on Fish Stocks and IUU fishing, 26 September, Hamburg

k) International Arctic Fisheries Symposium, 19-21 October, Anchorage Alaska

l) Inter-RAC Conference “Decision-Making within a reformed Common Fisheries Policy”

Annotation: Reports covering agenda items 15 a) to 15 s) will be published on the NEAFC website before the annual meeting. The Secretariat will summarise the information in a presentation.

16. Election of President and Vice Presidents for the years 2010 -2012

Annotation: At the 21st Annual Meeting rule of procedure nr. 5 was amended as follows: The term of office of the incumbent President of NEAFC will terminate at the end of the year in which his successor is elected. Furthermore, the term of office of the new President will start on January 1 of the year immediately following his election. At the 25th Annual meeting the following officers were elected for the period 2007-2009 inclusive

President - Mr Stefán Asmundsson, Iceland;
1st Vice President - Mr Vladimir Shibanov, Russian Federation;
2nd Vice President - Mr Johán Williams, Norway

The incumbent President, Mr Stefán Asmundsson, (Iceland) completes his first period as President and has informed NEAFC that he will not seek re-election.

17. Finance and Administration Committee

Report on the Secretariat’s activities during the year
Audited accounts for the year ended 31 December 2008 and preliminary statements for 2009 (August inclusive)
Draft budget for 2010 and draft budget estimate for 2010
Review of annual contributions from Contracting Parties with reference to Article 17.4 c) of the Convention
Any other business

Annotation: The finance briefing for the FAC meeting was circulated before the 28th Annual Meeting (AM 2009/03). The FAC will report to the Commission at the Annual Meeting.
18. **Arrangements for future meetings**
   a) Annual Meetings 8 – 12 November 2010 and 7-11 November 2011

   **Annotation:** The Annual Meeting has moved permanently to the second full week of November and the Secretariat will make the necessary arrangements accordingly. The second full week in November 2009 starts on 8 November so the 29th Annual Meeting will take place 8-12 November 2009 and the 30th Annual 7–11 November 2010.

   Meetings in subsidiary bodies of NEAFC in 2008
   **Annotation:** The Annual Meeting will have to decide on proposals for possible meetings in 2009 of ad hoc Working Groups, PECCOE, the Advisory Group on Data Communication, the Working Group on the Future of NEAFC and PECMAS.

19. **Press statements and other reports of the Commission's activities**

   **Annotation:** The President and the Secretariat will prepare reports and press statements after the meeting.

20. **Any other business**

21. **Closure of the 27th Annual Meeting**
Recommendation I

RECOMMENDATION BY THE NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES COMMISSION IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 5 OF THE CONVENTION ON FUTURE MULTILATERAL COOPERATION IN NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES AT ITS ANNUAL MEETING IN NOVEMBER 2009 ON CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT MEASURES FOR BLUE WHITING IN THE NEAFC CONVENTION AREA IN 2010

1. NEAFC takes note of the Agreed Record of Conclusion of Fisheries Consultations between the Faroe Islands, the European Community, Iceland and Norway on the Management of Blue Whiting in the North-East Atlantic in 2010 signed in London, 22 October 2009.

2. NEAFC further notes that by way of the said Agreed Record, the aforementioned Parties agreed to restrict their fishery on the Blue Whiting Stock in 2010 according to a total catch limitation of 497 022 tonnes.

3. The Contracting Parties recommend the following measures:

   a. In order to ensure consistency and compatibility with the said Agreed Record, the Contracting Parties hereby establish an allowable catch limitation of 78 516 tonnes of Blue Whiting for 2010 in waters beyond the areas under national fisheries jurisdiction of the Contracting Parties.

   b. This allowable catch limitation shall be allocated as follows:

   Denmark in respect of:
   - Faroe Islands 9 196 tonnes (*)
   - Greenland 2 924 tonnes
   - European Community 10 935 tonnes (*)
   - Iceland 6 213 tonnes (*)
   - Norway 9 196 tonnes (*)
   - Russian Federation 40 054 tonnes

   (*) Catches taken under these allocations shall be deducted from quotas allocated to Parties to the Agreed Record referred to in paragraph 2.

4. At the annual meeting in 2008 the Contracting Parties agreed that the relative shares established under paragraphs 2 and 3 are fixed for the future management of blue whiting in the NEAFC context. In addition to these fixed shares, the Russian Federation was granted a quantity of 16 237 tonnes for 2009, 8 000 tonnes for 2010 and 4 000 tonnes for 2011. There will be no additional quantity available in 2012.

5. The national quotas referred to in Annex I of the Agreed Record referred to in paragraph 2 may be fished in the areas defined in paragraph 3 a.

6. Quotas that are transferred to a Contracting Party to be fished within national waters of another Contracting Party may be fished in the areas defined in paragraph 3 a, subject to agreement between the Contracting Parties concerned.
7. Each Party may transfer unutilised quantities of up to 10% of the quota allocated to it for 2009 to 2010. Such transfer shall be in addition to the quota allocated to the Party concerned for 2010. In the event of over-fishing of the allocated quotas by any Party in 2009, the quantity shall be deducted from the quota allocated in 2010 for the Party or Parties concerned.

8. Each Party may transfer unutilised quantities of up to 10% of the quota allocated to it for 2010 to 2011. Such transfer shall be in addition to the quota allocated to the Party concerned for 2011. In the event of over-fishing of the allocated quotas by any Party in 2010, the quantity shall be deducted from the quota allocated in 2011 for the Party or Parties concerned.
Recommendation II: 2010

RECOMMENDATION BY THE NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES COMMISSION IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLES 5 AND 6 OF THE CONVENTION ON FUTURE MULTILATERAL COOPERATION IN NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES AT ITS ANNUAL MEETING IN NOVEMBER 2009 FOR CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT MEASURES FOR DEEP AND SHALLOW PELAGIC REDFISH IN THE IRMINGER SEA AND ADJACENT WATERS IN THE NEAFC CONVENTION AREA IN 2010¹

Taking note of the most recent scientific advice from ICES;

Recognising the need to continue towards improved future management measures for deep and shallow pelagic redfish in the Irminger Sea and adjacent waters, the Parties recognise the need for ad hoc measures until such future management measures are in place;

Recognising that the north-eastern area of the Irminger Sea and adjacent areas are important areas of larval extrusion, and need particular protection to promote the recovery of the deep and shallow pelagic redfish in the Irminger Sea and adjacent waters;

Noting that if suitable harvest control rules are devised and subsequently effectively implemented, it will be possible to continue sustainable fishing, whilst still allowing for the recovery of deep and shallow pelagic pelagic redfish in the Irminger Sea and adjacent waters;

In accordance with Articles 5 and 6 of the Convention, the Contracting Parties have agreed the following ad hoc measures for the pelagic redfish fisheries in the Irminger Sea and adjacent waters for 2010:

1. Each Contracting Party shall establish management measures that shall include a total allowable catch that is not higher than that set for 2009, as reported to NEAFC, and notify these measures to the Secretary before 1 March 2010. The Secretary shall notify these measures to the other Contracting Parties.² Total allowable catch for each vessel and any adjustment made in total allowable catches for each vessel shall be reported to the Secretariat. This information has to be made accessible for Contracting Parties on the secure site of the Secretariat website.

2. A maximum of 70% of the total allowable catch set in accordance with paragraph 1 can be taken within an area bounded by the lines joining the following coordinates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point No.</th>
<th>Lat</th>
<th>lon</th>
<th>lat</th>
<th>Lon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>64.75</td>
<td>-28.5</td>
<td>64°45</td>
<td>-28°30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>62.83</td>
<td>-25.7</td>
<td>62°50</td>
<td>-25°45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>61.91</td>
<td>-26.7</td>
<td>61°55</td>
<td>-26°45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>61.00</td>
<td>-26.5</td>
<td>61°00</td>
<td>-26°30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The Russian Federation maintains its position that there is one stock of pelagic redfish (Sebastes mentella) in the Irminger Sea and adjacent waters.

² As in 2009, 2,875 tonnes are set aside in accordance with an understanding with NAFO; and 123 tonnes will be available to co-operating non-Contracting Parties of NEAFC.
3. To enhance the protection of the areas of larval extrusion, no more than 15% of the total allowable catch set in accordance with paragraph 1 can be taken within the area defined in paragraph 2 during the period 1 April to 10 May.

4. Contracting Parties may conduct scientific research in addition to ICES co-ordinated surveys, with the aim of improving scientific knowledge on redfish. They may set aside a part of their respective total allowable catch for scientific purposes. Any catches taken as a part of such a scientific research exercise must be within the limitations set in paragraphs 1, 2 and 3.

5. Only vessels flying the flag of a NEAFC Contracting Party or of a Cooperating non-Contracting Party, having been authorised by its flag State to fish for redfish in the NEAFC Convention Area, are entitled to participate in this fishery. The authorisation to fish for redfish in the Regulatory Area is only valid if the information transmitted in accordance with paragraph 1 of this Recommendation and Articles 11, 12 and 13 of the Scheme of Control and Enforcement (the Scheme) is made available to the Secretary according to Article 14.

6. With reference to paragraph 1 the Secretariat shall on a weekly basis compile a table for each Contracting Party, showing the total allowable catch and the catch already taken, based on the catch reports received from the fishing vessels. When 75 % of the total allowable catch has been taken, this table shall be compiled daily. The tables shall be transmitted without delay to all Contracting Parties as well as being accessible on the NEAFC website. The table shall show details for each vessel. This constitute a derogation from the provisions of Article 14.3 of the Scheme.

7. To further ensure prompt reporting, the Secretariat shall on a daily basis monitor the reports from each vessel and notify all Contracting Parities without a delay if a vessel has not fulfilled its obligations according to paragraph 5.

8. Masters of fishing vessels shall record in their fishing logbooks each entry and exit from the area defined in paragraph 2 and the cumulative catches retained on board, in accordance with the format set out in Annex IV of the Scheme. The record shall identify the relevant area by a specific code: inside the area defined in paragraph 2 “RCA” and outside the area “XRR”.

9. By way of derogation from the provisions of Article 12 (b) of the Scheme when in the area defined in paragraph 2 fishing vessels shall report their catches on a daily basis. The catch report shall be transmitted after the fishing operations of that calendar day have been

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>59.00000</td>
<td>-30.00</td>
<td>59°00</td>
<td>-30°00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>59.00000</td>
<td>-34.00</td>
<td>59°00</td>
<td>-34°00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>61.50000</td>
<td>-34.00</td>
<td>61°30</td>
<td>-34°00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>62.83333</td>
<td>-36.00</td>
<td>62°50</td>
<td>-36°00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (same as 1)</td>
<td>64.75000</td>
<td>-28.50</td>
<td>64°45</td>
<td>-28°30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
completed. It shall indicate the catches on board taken since the last communication of catches.

10. In addition to information required under the provisions of Article 12 of the Scheme fishing vessels shall communicate the catch on board taken since the last communication of catches prior to entering and exiting the area defined in paragraph 2.

11. The reports referred to in paragraphs 9 and 10 shall be made in accordance with the format set out in Annex VIII 2) of the Scheme. Reports of catches taken in the area defined in paragraph 2 shall indicate “RCA” as the relevant area and reports of catches taken outside the area defined in paragraph 2 shall indicate “XRR” as the relevant area.

12. By way of derogation from the provisions of Article 8 of the Scheme the catch area for fish caught in the area defined in paragraph 2 shall be identified by “RCA”.

13. All receivers of fish shall ensure that all quantities are weighed when landed or transhipped. The weight of fish landed in standardized boxes may be determined by using a sampling methodology. For the purpose of transparency Contracting Parties shall report to the Secretariat on weekly basis of the landed catches and this information shall be made available to Contracting Parties on the secure site of the Secretariat website.

14. A Contracting Party may request access to the information communicated pursuant to Articles 11, 12 and 13 of the Scheme of Control and Enforcement for the areas where they intend to undertake inspection and surveillance activities. The Secretary shall inform other Contracting Parties and make the information available to the requesting Contracting Party during the relevant fishing season. The Contracting Party that requests access to this information shall present a detailed report to the next meeting of PECCOE on its use of the information provided.

15. It is prohibited to use trawls with a mesh size of less than 100 mm.

16. The conversion factor used in this fishery for gutted and headed presentations, including Japanese cut, shall be 1.70. This conversion factor shall be used for the purposes of this Recommendation and is without prejudice for other purposes.

17. Each Contracting Party shall notify the Secretary of the systems in place for verifying catches from this fishery, including weighing procedures and inspection of landings.

18. Inspectors of any Contracting Party may accompany the inspectors of another Contracting Party during the inspection of landings or transhipment operations. The Contracting Party interested to observe a landing at a port of another Contracting Party shall at its earliest opportunity notify the port Contracting Party of its intentions. The port Contracting Party shall upon receiving a such a notification from another Contracting Party promptly respond with details of the vessels to be inspected such as place, date and time of arrival of the relevant vessel.

19. PECCOE shall continue the development of proposals for the establishment of conversion factors for different fish products and methods of processing.
20. These management measures are without prejudice to any future management measures for the pelagic redfish in the Irminger Sea and adjacent waters.

21. The coastal States will invite the other NEAFC Contracting Parties to a meeting during 2010, to discuss future management of redfish in the Irminger Sea and adjacent waters.
Recommendation III: 2010

RECOMMENDATION BY THE NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES COMMISSION IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 5 OF THE CONVENTION ON FUTURE MULTILATERAL COOPERATION IN NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES AT ITS ANNUAL MEETING IN NOVEMBER 2009 ON CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT MEASURES FOR PELAGIC REDFISH (*SEBASTES MENTELLA*) IN THE NEAFC REGULATORY AREA OF ICES SUB-AREAS I AND II IN 2010

The Contracting Parties recommend the following measures:

1. Each Contracting Party shall, for the period 1 January to 14 August 2010 and 1 to 31 December 2010, prohibit the fishing by its vessels.

2. Contracting Parties shall be permitted to fish for a quantity of 8,600 tonnes within the period 15 August to 30 November 2010.

3. The conditions concerning the fishery referred to under paragraph 2 shall be as follows:

   a. The allowable catch shall not be specifically allocated to individual Contracting Parties.

   b. Fishing participation shall be restricted to those vessels, which have previously been engaged in the redfish fishery in the Regulatory Area, or have replaced such vessels.

   c. A special monitoring system shall be established on the basis of catches reported in accordance with the provisions of Article 12 of the NEAFC Scheme of Control and Enforcement. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 12, vessels engaged in this fishery shall report their catch on a daily basis. The Secretary shall be responsible for the coordination of this monitoring system. The Secretary shall notify all Contracting Parties without delay and by the most rapid means possible when the total catches have reached 80% of the allowable catch. Furthermore, the Secretary shall notify all Contracting Parties of the date on which:

      i. The accumulated reported catch;

      ii. The estimated catch not yet reported;

      iii. The estimated remaining quantity of the allowable catch; and

      iv. The likely by-catches taken during the period for which the catch limitation applies equal the allowable catch provided for under a.

   d. No vessels shall be permitted to engage in a directed fishery on this stock in the specified area after the date notified by the Secretary.
e. The authorisation to fish for redfish in the Regulatory Area is only valid if the information transmitted in accordance with Articles 11, 12 and 13 of the Scheme of Control and Enforcement is made available to the Secretary according to Article 14.

f. A Contracting Party may request access to the information communicated pursuant to Articles 11, 12 and 13 of the Scheme of Control and Enforcement for the areas where they intend to undertake inspection and surveillance activities. The Secretary shall inform other Contracting Parties and make the information available to the requesting Contracting Party during the relevant fishing season. The Contracting Party that requests access to this information shall present a detailed report to the next meeting of PECCOE on its use of the information provided.

4. Contracting Parties shall ensure that scientific information is collected by scientific observers on board their vessels or by other means considered appropriate by the individual Contracting Parties. As a minimum, information collected shall include representative sex, age and length composition data by depths. This information shall be reported to ICES.

5. The conversion factor used in this fishery for gutted and headed presentations, including Japanese cut, shall be 1.70. This conversion factor shall be used for the purposes of this Recommendation and is without prejudice for other purposes.

6. A limitation of 1% on by-catches of pelagic redfish (*Sebastes mentella*) on board in other non-target fisheries in ICES Sub-areas I and II shall be applied. All by-catches shall be properly documented and reported. Compatible measures should be applied within relevant areas under national jurisdiction.

7. This measure shall be considered as an interim measure applicable only for 2010 and shall be without prejudice to any future allocation between the Contracting Parties.
Recommendation IV: 2010

RECOMMENDATION BY THE NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES COMMISSION IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 5 OF THE CONVENTION ON FUTURE MULTILATERAL COOPERATION IN NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES AT ITS ANNUAL MEETING IN NOVEMBER 2009 TO ADOPT REGULATORY MEASURES FOR THE PROTECTION OF HADDOCK IN ICES DIVISION VIB (ROCKALL HADDOCK) FOR 2010

The Contracting Parties recommend the following measure:

All fishing, except with long-lines, shall be prohibited in waters beyond the areas under national fisheries jurisdiction of the Contracting Parties in the box bounded by the following co-ordinates:

\[
\begin{align*}
- & 57° 00' N, & 15° 00' W \\
- & 57° 00' N, & 14° 00' W \\
- & 56° 30' N, & 14° 00' W \\
- & 56° 30' N, & 15° 00' W
\end{align*}
\]

This measure shall be applicable for the period 1 January to 31 December 2010.
Recommendation V: 2010

RECOMMENDATION BY THE NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES COMMISSION IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 5 OF THE CONVENTION ON FUTURE MULTILATERAL COOPERATION IN NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES AT ITS ANNUAL MEETING IN NOVEMBER 2009 ON CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT MEASURES FOR THE NORWEGIAN SPRING-SPAWNING (ATLANTO-SCANDIAN) HERRING IN THE NEAFC REGULATORY AREA IN 2010

The Contracting Parties recommend the following measures:


2. NEAFC further notes that by way of the said Agreed Record, the aforementioned Parties agreed on a total allowable catch (TAC) for the Norwegian Spring-Spawning (Atlanto-Scandian) Herring of 1,483,000 tonnes in 2010.

3. In accordance with Article 5 of the Convention on Future Multilateral Cooperation in North-East Atlantic Fisheries, the Contracting Parties recommend the following measures for the Norwegian Spring-Spawning (Atlanto-Scandian) Herring in 2010:

   a) All fisheries conducted in waters of the Convention Area as defined in Article 1(1) of the Convention, which lie beyond the waters under the fisheries jurisdiction of Contracting Parties (the Regulatory Area) shall be within the TAC referred to in paragraph 2,

   b) The national quotas referred to in Annex I of the said Agreed Record may be fished in the Regulatory Area,

   c) Catches taken by a Contracting Party in the Regulatory Area in accordance with the said Agreed Record shall be deducted from the respective quotas allocated to the Contracting Parties representing a Party to the said Agreed Record.

4. Only vessels entitled to fly the flag of a NEAFC Contracting Party, having been authorised by its flag State to fish for Norwegian Spring-Spawning (Atlanto-Scandian) Herring in the NEAFC Convention Area in accordance with the said Agreed Record, may take part in the fishery.
Recommendation VI: 2010

RECOMMENDATION BY THE NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES COMMISSION IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 5 OF THE CONVENTION ON FUTURE MULTILATERAL COOPERATION IN NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES AT ITS ANNUAL MEETING IN NOVEMBER 2009 ON CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT MEASURES FOR DEEP-SEA SPECIES IN THE NEAFC REGULATORY AREA 2010 TO 2012

The Contracting Parties recommend the following measures:

1. Each Contracting Party undertakes to limit the effort for 2010-2012 put into the directed fishing for deep-sea species as set out in Annex 1B of the Scheme in the NEAFC Regulatory Area

2. The effort shall not exceed 65 per cent of the highest level put into deep-sea fishing in previous years for the relevant species.

3. The effort should be calculated as aggregate power, aggregate tonnage, fishing days at sea or number of vessels, which participated.
Recommendation VII: 2010

RECOMMENDATION BY THE NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES COMMISSION IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 5 OF THE CONVENTION ON FUTURE MULTILATERAL COOPERATION IN NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES AT ITS ANNUAL MEETING IN NOVEMBER 2009 FOR CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT MEASURES FOR SPURDOG (Squalus acanthias) IN THE NEAFC REGULATORY AREA IN 2010

Considering the poor status of the stock of spurdog (Squalus acanthias) in the Northeast Atlantic that makes it necessary to react immediately,

Acknowledging the ICES report that the stock is depleted and may be in danger of collapse, targeted fisheries should not be permitted to continue, and by-catch in mixed fisheries should be reduced to the lowest possible level. Furthermore, ICES recommends a zero TAC.

Contracting Parties are encouraged to take conservation measures with equal effect within waters under their national jurisdiction.

1. Each Contracting Party shall, for 2010, prohibit direct fishing of spurdog (Squalus acanthias) in the Regulatory Area by vessels flying its flag.

2. In order to assist ICES in its work, Contracting Parties shall submit to NEAFC all by-catch information.

3. Contracting Parties shall submit all available data on spurdog, including by-catch data, to ICES for further evaluation of the state of the stock.

4. Contracting Parties are encouraged to take conservation measures with equal effect within waters under their national jurisdiction.
Annex H

Recommendation VIII: 2010

RECOMMENDATION BY THE NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES COMMISSION IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 5 OF THE CONVENTION ON FUTURE MULTILATERAL COOPERATION IN NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES AT ITS ANNUAL MEETING IN NOVEMBER 2009 TO ADOPT CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT MEASURES BY CLOSING CERTAIN AREAS ON THE HATTON BANK, ROCKALL BANK, LOGACHEV MOUNDS AND WEST ROCKALL MOUNDS IN THE REGULATORY AREA IN ORDER TO PROTECT VULNERABLE MARINE ECOSYSTEMS FROM SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS IN 2010

The Contracting Parties recommend the following measures:

1. Bottom trawling and fishing with static gear, including bottom set gillnets and long-lines should be prohibited within the NEAFC Regulatory Area enclosed by sequentially joining with rhumb lines the following positions:

   On the Hatton Bank, within the area delimited by the following co-ordinates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corner</th>
<th>Latitude (N)</th>
<th>Longitude (W)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>59°26'</td>
<td>14°30'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>59°12'</td>
<td>15°08'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>59°01'</td>
<td>17°00'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>58°50'</td>
<td>17°38'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>58°30'</td>
<td>17°52'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>58°30'</td>
<td>18°22'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>58°03'</td>
<td>18°22'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>58°03'</td>
<td>17°30'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>57°55'</td>
<td>17°30'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>57°45'</td>
<td>19°15'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>58°11.15'</td>
<td>18°57.51'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>58°11.57'</td>
<td>19°11.97'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>58°27.75'</td>
<td>19°11.65'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>58°39.09'</td>
<td>19°14.28'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>58°38.11'</td>
<td>19°01.29'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>58°53.14'</td>
<td>18°43.54'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>59°00.29'</td>
<td>18°01.31'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>59°08.01'</td>
<td>17°49.31'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>59°08.75'</td>
<td>18°01.47'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>59°15.16'</td>
<td>18°01.56'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>59°24.17'</td>
<td>17°31.22'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>59°21.77'</td>
<td>17°15.36'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>59°26.91'</td>
<td>17°01.66'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>59°42.69'</td>
<td>16°45.96'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>59°20.97'</td>
<td>15°44.75'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NB this is the corrected version following HOD Letter 09/71
On the Rockall Bank, in the parts of the areas falling within the NEAFC Regulatory Area delimited by the following co-ordinates:

**North-West Rockall:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corner</th>
<th>Latitude (N)</th>
<th>Longitude (W)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>57°00'</td>
<td>14°53'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>57°37'</td>
<td>14°42'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>57°55'</td>
<td>14°24'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>58°15'</td>
<td>13°50'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>57°57'</td>
<td>13°09'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>57°50'</td>
<td>13°14'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>57°57'</td>
<td>13°45'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>57°49'</td>
<td>14°06'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>57°29'</td>
<td>14°19'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>57°22'</td>
<td>14°19'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>57°00'</td>
<td>14°34'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>56°56'</td>
<td>14°36'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>56°56'</td>
<td>14°51'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**South-West Rockall (Empress of Britain Bank):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corner</th>
<th>Latitude (N)</th>
<th>Longitude (W)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>56°24'</td>
<td>15°37'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>56°21'</td>
<td>14°58'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>56°04'</td>
<td>15°10'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>55°51'</td>
<td>15°37'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>56°10'</td>
<td>15°52'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NB this is the corrected version following HOD Letter 09/71*
On the Logachev Mounds, within the area delimited by the following coordinates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corner</th>
<th>Latitude (N)</th>
<th>Longitude (W)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>55°17'</td>
<td>16°10'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>55°34'</td>
<td>15°07'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>55°50'</td>
<td>15°15'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>55°33'</td>
<td>16°16'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Return to position 1

On the West Rockall Mounds, within the area delimited by the following coordinates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corner</th>
<th>Latitude (N)</th>
<th>Longitude (W)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>57°20'</td>
<td>16°30'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>57°05'</td>
<td>15°58'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>56°21'</td>
<td>17°17'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>56°40'</td>
<td>17°50'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Return to position 1

2. Contracting Parties shall take appropriate measures to detect any diversion of fishing effort to other previously unknown areas of deep-water corals.

3. The boundaries of the closed areas may be adjusted in the light of more precise scientific evidence on the distribution of deep-water coral. If scientific research demonstrates that there are sub-areas where no vulnerable marine ecosystems are found within the areas referred to in this measure, the measure can be amended by the Commission to exclude those sub-areas from the prohibition. However, in so deciding, the Commission shall continue to be mindful that the delineation of the closure areas must continue to permit the necessary control to ensure compliance with the measures.

4. Within the areas defined in paragraph 1, Contracting Parties intending to conduct fisheries related to scientific research shall notify NEAFC of their intended research programmes. In advance of the proposed research programmes, the NEAFC Secretariat shall make the proposed plans available to the NEAFC Contracting Parties. Subsequent information from these research programmes shall also be made available to the Parties.

5. These closures are without prejudice to any sovereign rights of Coastal States over the continental shelf in accordance with the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, including sovereign rights of Coastal States to exploit sedentary species on the continental shelf.

6. This measure shall be in force from 1 January to 31 December 2010.

*NB this is the corrected version following HOD Letter 09/71
Recommendation IX: 2010

RECOMMENDATION BY THE NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES COMMISSION IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 5 OF THE CONVENTION ON FUTURE MULTILATERAL COOPERATION IN NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES AT ITS ANNUAL MEETING IN NOVEMBER 2009 FOR MANAGEMENT MEASURES FOR ORANGE ROUGHY IN 2010 & 2011

In accordance with Article 5 of the Convention on Future Multilateral Cooperation in North-East Atlantic fisheries, the Contracting Parties recommend the following measures for orange roughy in the Regulatory Area in 2010 & 2011:

1. There shall be no targeted fishery for orange roughy in the NEAFC Regulatory Area in ICES subareas V, VI and VII, where all available information indicates that the stocks are severely depleted.

2. In other areas, directed fishery for orange roughy may be undertaken only under the following precautionary conditions:

   2.1 Fishing activities shall be restricted to vessels of Contracting Parties having participated in fishery for orange roughy in the NEAFC Regulatory Area in areas other than V, VI and VII prior to 2005.

   2.2 The annual total catches of any Contracting Party shall not exceed 150 tonnes.

   2.3 All information for orange roughy fisheries shall be provided in accordance with NEAFC Recommendation X: 2007 concerning submission of scientific information on deep sea fisheries.

   2.4 As a matter of priority, Contracting Parties shall develop research and sampling plans for orange roughy fisheries in accordance with Recommendation X: 2007, and with the view to providing information relevant to the development of procedures for monitoring the effects on the ecosystem of any fishery conducted in accordance with this measure. Research plans shall be communicated via NEAFC to ICES no later than 31 December 2009.

3. These measures shall apply from 1 January 2010.
Recommendation X:2010

RECOMMENDATION BY THE NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES COMMISSION IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 5 OF THE CONVENTION ON FUTURE MULTILATERAL COOPERATION IN NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES AT ITS ANNUAL MEETING IN NOVEMBER 2009 TO ADOPT REGULATORY MEASURES FOR THE PROTECTION OF BLUE LING IN THE NEAFC REGULATORY AREA (ICES DIVISION XIV)

The Contracting Parties recommend the following measure:

All fishing with bottom contacting gear (bottom trawl, longline and gillnet) is prohibited in the period 15 February to 15 April in the area bounded by following co-ordinates:

1. 60°58'76 N - 27°27'32 W
2. 60°56'02 N - 27°31'16 W
3. 60°59'76 N - 27°43'48 W
4. 61°03'00 N - 27°39'41 W

This measure shall be applicable for the years 2010, 2011 and 2012.
Recommendation XI: 2010

RECOMMENDATION BY THE NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES COMMISSION IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 5 OF THE CONVENTION ON FUTURE MULTILATERAL COOPERATION IN NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES AT ITS ANNUAL MEETING IN NOVEMBER 2009 TO ADOPT THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATION ON OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES FOR FISHING IN EXISTING AND NEW BOTTOM FISHING AREAS

Pursuant to Article 6 of the NEAFC Recommendation on bottom fishing activities in the NEAFC Regulatory Area, the Commission has adopted the following measure, replacing Article 4 in Recommendation XIII:2009 on bottom fishing setting threshold levels live corals and sponge

New Article 4 Threshold levels
For both existing and new fishing areas¹, an encounter with primary VME indicator species is defined as a catch per set (e.g. trawl tow, longline set, or gillnet set) of more than 60 kg of live coral and/or 800 kg of live sponge. These thresholds are set on a provisional basis and may be adjusted as experience is gained in the application of this measure.

¹ At the 28th Annual Meeting NEAFC took note of revisions to existing and new fishing areas following analysis in PECMAS of new data. For information the new maps and coordinates are listed below.
Map of proposal for 4 existing fisheries area in the Hatton-Rockall Bank area
# Annex II

## Coordinates for the proposed 4 new existing fishing areas in the Hatton – Rockall Bank Area

### HAR 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lat</th>
<th>lon</th>
<th>LAT</th>
<th>LON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60.05567</td>
<td>-14.20475</td>
<td>600334</td>
<td>-141229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.67083</td>
<td>-14.02749</td>
<td>594025</td>
<td>-140165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.52617</td>
<td>-14.26226</td>
<td>593157</td>
<td>-141537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.31956</td>
<td>-14.83799</td>
<td>591497</td>
<td>-145243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.12250</td>
<td>-14.69351</td>
<td>590707</td>
<td>-145723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.96200</td>
<td>-15.74297</td>
<td>590372</td>
<td>-154458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.87650</td>
<td>-15.92023</td>
<td>588589</td>
<td>-155521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.06200</td>
<td>-16.30335</td>
<td>590372</td>
<td>-161820</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HAR 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lat</th>
<th>lon</th>
<th>LAT</th>
<th>LON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59.69975</td>
<td>-16.70935</td>
<td>594199</td>
<td>-164256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.24598</td>
<td>-16.80656</td>
<td>591497</td>
<td>-164839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.12250</td>
<td>-17.46988</td>
<td>590918</td>
<td>-172819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.99131</td>
<td>-17.33836</td>
<td>589548</td>
<td>-172030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.88389</td>
<td>-19.95524</td>
<td>590530</td>
<td>-165731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.96184</td>
<td>-17.09355</td>
<td>587571</td>
<td>-164256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.45995</td>
<td>-17.45844</td>
<td>582760</td>
<td>-172751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.18971</td>
<td>-17.51563</td>
<td>581138</td>
<td>-173094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.09011</td>
<td>-17.22971</td>
<td>580541</td>
<td>-171378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.97203</td>
<td>-17.24115</td>
<td>575832</td>
<td>-171447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.91437</td>
<td>-17.10391</td>
<td>575486</td>
<td>-170623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.82922</td>
<td>-17.09247</td>
<td>574975</td>
<td>-170555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.55109</td>
<td>-17.78438</td>
<td>573307</td>
<td>-174706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.49275</td>
<td>-18.20753</td>
<td>572956</td>
<td>-181245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.29554</td>
<td>-18.49345</td>
<td>571773</td>
<td>-182961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.21512</td>
<td>-18.81939</td>
<td>571291</td>
<td>-184916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.06620</td>
<td>-19.35119</td>
<td>570397</td>
<td>-192107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.49922</td>
<td>-19.53989</td>
<td>562995</td>
<td>-193239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.61268</td>
<td>-20.02022</td>
<td>563676</td>
<td>-200121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.37910</td>
<td>-20.43765</td>
<td>562275</td>
<td>-202626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.37910</td>
<td>-20.64351</td>
<td>562275</td>
<td>-203861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.49922</td>
<td>-20.84937</td>
<td>562995</td>
<td>-205096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.61897</td>
<td>-20.84937</td>
<td>563714</td>
<td>-205096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.83543</td>
<td>-20.42622</td>
<td>565013</td>
<td>-202557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.23679</td>
<td>-20.56346</td>
<td>571421</td>
<td>-203381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.58176</td>
<td>-20.56346</td>
<td>573491</td>
<td>-203381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.85861</td>
<td>-20.18033</td>
<td>575140</td>
<td>-201082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.92348</td>
<td>-19.88298</td>
<td>575541</td>
<td>-195298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.48089</td>
<td>-19.24254</td>
<td>582885</td>
<td>-191455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.68061</td>
<td>-19.28257</td>
<td>584084</td>
<td>-191695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.97585</td>
<td>-18.99665</td>
<td>585859</td>
<td>-185980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.21447</td>
<td>-18.28759</td>
<td>591287</td>
<td>-181726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.27003</td>
<td>-17.92162</td>
<td>591620</td>
<td>-175530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.50009</td>
<td>-17.66430</td>
<td>593001</td>
<td>-173986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.69975</td>
<td>-16.70935</td>
<td>594199</td>
<td>-164256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HAR 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lat</th>
<th>lon</th>
<th>LAT</th>
<th>LON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54.94064</td>
<td>-17.20112</td>
<td>545644</td>
<td>-171207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.58101</td>
<td>-18.03027</td>
<td>543486</td>
<td>-180182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.40831</td>
<td>-18.39624</td>
<td>542450</td>
<td>-182377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.47814</td>
<td>-19.05384</td>
<td>542869</td>
<td>-190323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.41497</td>
<td>-19.31116</td>
<td>542940</td>
<td>-191867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.97674</td>
<td>-19.95160</td>
<td>535860</td>
<td>-195710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.84734</td>
<td>-20.12887</td>
<td>541108</td>
<td>-200773</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HAR 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lat</th>
<th>lon</th>
<th>LAT</th>
<th>LON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54.33503</td>
<td>-20.10028</td>
<td>542010</td>
<td>-200602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.63731</td>
<td>-19.39121</td>
<td>543824</td>
<td>-192347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.98003</td>
<td>-19.25398</td>
<td>545880</td>
<td>-191524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.06854</td>
<td>-18.73933</td>
<td>550411</td>
<td>-184436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.43033</td>
<td>-18.68215</td>
<td>552582</td>
<td>-184093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.40761</td>
<td>-18.41339</td>
<td>552446</td>
<td>-182480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.14377</td>
<td>-17.77295</td>
<td>550863</td>
<td>-174638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.95049</td>
<td>-18.03027</td>
<td>545703</td>
<td>-180182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.98003</td>
<td>-17.13250</td>
<td>545880</td>
<td>-170795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.94064</td>
<td>-17.20112</td>
<td>545644</td>
<td>-171207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lat</th>
<th>lon</th>
<th>LAT</th>
<th>LON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57.17</td>
<td>-33.17</td>
<td>571030</td>
<td>-332051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.10</td>
<td>-33.12</td>
<td>570585</td>
<td>-330745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.73</td>
<td>-33.49</td>
<td>564376</td>
<td>-332931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.50</td>
<td>-33.57</td>
<td>562966</td>
<td>-333418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.37</td>
<td>-34.02</td>
<td>562239</td>
<td>-340099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.32</td>
<td>-34.24</td>
<td>563173</td>
<td>-341466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.74</td>
<td>-34.14</td>
<td>564469</td>
<td>-340868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.15</td>
<td>-33.51</td>
<td>570910</td>
<td>-333042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mid-Atlantic Ridge Southern part. Proposal for four new existing fisheries area

#### ii. Positions proposed new existing fishing area New MAR 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lat</th>
<th>Lon</th>
<th>LAT</th>
<th>LON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>44.74949</td>
<td>-25.21871</td>
<td>444497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>44.48731</td>
<td>-24.96838</td>
<td>442924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>44.37494</td>
<td>-25.28666</td>
<td>442250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.56889</td>
<td>-25.42612</td>
<td>443413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>44.79772</td>
<td>-25.33314</td>
<td>444786</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### iii. Positions proposed new existing fishing area New MAR 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lat</th>
<th>Lon</th>
<th>LAT</th>
<th>LON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>45.68403</td>
<td>-27.25707</td>
<td>454104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>45.47629</td>
<td>-27.14263</td>
<td>452858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>45.42863</td>
<td>-27.41799</td>
<td>452572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>45.20230</td>
<td>-27.62182</td>
<td>451214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.18718</td>
<td>-27.76129</td>
<td>451123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>45.49134</td>
<td>-27.87573</td>
<td>452948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>45.66904</td>
<td>-27.66831</td>
<td>454014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>45.66904</td>
<td>-27.25707</td>
<td>454014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### iv. Positions proposed new existing fishing area New MAR 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lat</th>
<th>Lon</th>
<th>LAT</th>
<th>LON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>46.38435</td>
<td>-27.62182</td>
<td>462306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>46.05280</td>
<td>-27.64686</td>
<td>460317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>46.05280</td>
<td>-27.91864</td>
<td>460317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>46.39915</td>
<td>-27.91864</td>
<td>462395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>46.39915</td>
<td>-27.66831</td>
<td>462395</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### v. Positions proposed new existing fishing area New MAR 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lat</th>
<th>Lon</th>
<th>LAT</th>
<th>LON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>47.55560</td>
<td>-27.43945</td>
<td>473334</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Bay of Biscay**

This existing fishing area is unchanged (4489 km²);

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lat</th>
<th>lon</th>
<th>LAT</th>
<th>LON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 48.16965 -10.81804</td>
<td>481018 -104908</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 46.55805 -10.29569</td>
<td>463348 -101774</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 46.44995 -10.59271</td>
<td>462700 -103556</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 48.23109 -11.13555</td>
<td>481387 -110813</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 48.20152 -10.93070</td>
<td>481209 -105584</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation XII: 2010

RECOMMENDATION BY THE NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES COMMISSION IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 8 OF THE CONVENTION ON FUTURE MULTILATERAL COOPERATION IN NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES AT ITS ANNUAL MEETING IN NOVEMBER 2009 TO ADOPT AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE 9 AND ANNEX IV.A OF THE “SCHEME OF CONTROL AND ENFORCEMENT IN RESPECT OF FISHING VESSELS FISHING IN AREAS BEYOND THE LIMITS OF NATIONAL FISHERIES JURISDICTION IN THE CONVENTION AREA” AS FOLLOWS:

(Test in bold and underlined should be added to the text)

Article 9 - Recording of Catch and Fishing Effort

1. Each Contracting Party shall ensure that all fishing vessels flying its flag and conducting fishing activities under Article 2 keep either a bound fishing logbook with numbered pages or an electronic fishing logbook and, where appropriate, a production logbook and stowage plan. However, a Contracting Party may exempt from keeping a fishing logbook a vessel engaged in transhipment operations which on-loads quantities on board.

(…)

2. b) on a daily basis and/or for each haul, by species in live weight kilograms:

- catches retained on board;
- the estimated cumulative catch since the entry into the Regulatory Area;
- the type of gear (number of hooks, length of gill nets, etc);
- the number of fishing operations per day (where appropriate);
- the small statistical rectangle or fishing location (longitude and latitude);
- the amount of fish discarded.
- the fishing depth (where appropriate)
ANNEX IV  
Recording of catch and fishing effort

A.  Logbook recordings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Element:</th>
<th>Field code</th>
<th>Mandatory / Optional</th>
<th>Remarks:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A. Catches per haul or fishing operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latitude</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>M³</td>
<td>Activity detail; position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitude</td>
<td>LO</td>
<td>M³</td>
<td>Position when the fishing operation starts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Position when the fishing operation starts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing depth</td>
<td>FD</td>
<td>M⁴</td>
<td>Distance from water surface to the lowest part of the fishing gear (in metres).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>TI</td>
<td>M⁴</td>
<td>Activity detail; time when the fishing operation starts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catch</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species²</td>
<td></td>
<td>M³</td>
<td>Activity detail; catch retained on board per fishing operation by species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity²</td>
<td></td>
<td>M³</td>
<td>FAO species code for species listed in Annex V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Live weight in kilogrammes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁴ Mandatory where required by specific management measures.

⁵ Only mandatory if radio station is used.
Recommendation XIII: 2010

RECOMMENDATION BY THE NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES COMMISSION IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 8 OF THE CONVENTION ON FUTURE MULTILATERAL COOPERATION IN NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES AT ITS ANNUAL MEETING IN NOVEMBER 2009 TO ADOPT AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE 23.4 OF THE “SCHEME OF CONTROL AND ENFORCEMENT IN RESPECT OF FISHING VESSELS FISHING IN AREAS BEYOND THE LIMITS OF NATIONAL FISHERIES JURISDICTION IN THE CONVENTION AREA” AS FOLLOWS:

(Text in bold and underlined should be added to the text)

Article 23 - Authorisation to land or tranship

(…)

4. The port State shall notify without delay its decision whether or not to authorise the landing or transhipment to the master of the vessel or his representative and to the Secretary by transmitting a copy of the form pursuant to paragraph 1 with Part C duly completed. The Secretary shall put this information on the NEAFC website without delay.
Recommendation XIV: 2010

RECOMMENDATION BY THE NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES COMMISSION IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 8 OF THE CONVENTION ON FUTURE MULTILATERAL COOPERATION IN NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES AT ITS ANNUAL MEETING IN NOVEMBER 2009 TO ADOPT AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE 20 OF THE “SCHEME OF CONTROL AND ENFORCEMENT IN RESPECT OF FISHING VESSELS FISHING IN AREAS BEYOND THE LIMITS OF NATIONAL FISHERIES JURISDICTION IN THE CONVENTION AREA” AS FOLLOWS:

(Test in bold and underlined should be added to the text)

Article 20 - Scope

The provisions in this chapter apply to landings or transhipments in ports of Contracting Parties by fishing vessels with frozen catch on board of fisheries resources that have been caught in the Convention Area by foreign fishing vessels and that have not been previously landed or transhipped at a port.
Recommendation XV: 2010

RECOMMENDATION BY THE NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES COMMISSION IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 9, 1 AND 2 OF THE CONVENTION ON FUTURE MULTILATERAL COOPERATION IN NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES AT ITS ANNUAL MEETING IN NOVEMBER 2009 PROVIDING FOR THE COLLECTION OF STATISTICAL INFORMATION RELATING TO FISHERIES BEYOND AND UNDER THE FISHERIES JURISDICTION OF CONTRACTING PARTIES AS FOLLOWS:

Recognising the need to establish a more efficient reporting system for uptakes of quotas from resources regulated by NEAFC the Contracting Parties have agreed the following measures:

1. Each Contracting Party shall, within 30 days following the calendar month in which the catches were landed, or transhipped, report to the Secretary, provisional monthly statistics of catches from stocks listed below. These reports shall be made in accordance with the specifications and format given below, whether or not that Party has quota allocations for the stocks from which catches were obtained.

2. The Secretary shall, within 10 days following the monthly deadlines for receipt of the provisional catch statistics, collate the information received and circulate it to the Contracting Parties. Annual catch data should be submitted not later than 1 July of the following year.

3. This Article shall also apply to Regulated Resources caught in areas under national fisheries jurisdiction.

4. The stock units reported by are:
### Annex H

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stock units</th>
<th>Stock code</th>
<th>NEAFC stock – common name</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>FAO code</th>
<th>Scientific name</th>
<th>NEAFC area list as defined in the Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICES definitions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Common name</td>
<td></td>
<td>Scientific name</td>
<td>ICES Sub-areas &amp; Divisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian spring spawning herring</td>
<td>XHE</td>
<td>Norwegian spring spawning herring (Atlanto Scandian)</td>
<td>Herring</td>
<td>HER</td>
<td>Clupea harengus</td>
<td>I, II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue whiting combined stock</td>
<td>XWH</td>
<td>Blue whiting</td>
<td>Blue whiting</td>
<td>WHB</td>
<td>Micromesistius poutassou</td>
<td>Ia, IVa, Vb, VI, VII, XII, XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Area I-IX, XII, XIV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Atlantic Mackerel</td>
<td>XMA</td>
<td>Mackerel</td>
<td>Mackerel</td>
<td>MAC</td>
<td>Scomber scombrus</td>
<td>Ia, IV, V, VI, VII, XII, XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockall haddock</td>
<td>XHA</td>
<td>Haddock</td>
<td>Haddock</td>
<td>HAD</td>
<td>Melanogrammus aeglefinus</td>
<td>VIb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelagic redfish in the Irminger Sea</td>
<td>XIS</td>
<td>Redfish</td>
<td>Redfish</td>
<td>REB</td>
<td>Sebastes mentella</td>
<td>V, XII, XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Areas I, II</td>
<td>XNS</td>
<td>Redfish</td>
<td>Redfish</td>
<td>REB</td>
<td>Sebastes mentella</td>
<td>I, II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Sea Fisheries</td>
<td>XDS</td>
<td>Deep-sea species</td>
<td>Annex I, B Scheme list</td>
<td>See list</td>
<td>See list</td>
<td>I - XIV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. An input table is annexed to this recommendation
2. The provisions in this recommendation should be implemented not later than 1 February 2011.
The following tables should be used by Contracting Parties as a standard data input tool:

**NEAFC**  
*Monthly catch statistics of Regulated Resources*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CP</th>
<th>YM</th>
<th>RR</th>
<th>STK</th>
<th>ZON</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>CC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NEAFC**  
*Annual catch statistics of Regulated Resources*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CP</th>
<th>YM</th>
<th>RR</th>
<th>STK</th>
<th>ZON</th>
<th>CC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description of reporting elements:

**CP  Contracting Party**
- XEU European Union
- FRO Faroe Islands (DFG)
- GRL Greenland (DFG)
- ISL Iceland
- NOR Norway
- RUS Russian Federation

**YM  Year / Month**
- 200901 for January 2009

**STK  Stock**
- XIS Pelagic *S. mentella* in the Irminger Sea
- XNS Pelagic *S. mentella* in ICES sub-areas I and II
- XMA North east Atlantic Mackerel
- XHE Norwegian spring spawning Herring
- XWH Blue whiting combined stock
- XHA Rockall Haddock
- XDS Deep sea fisheries

**ZON  Fishing grounds either international waters or EEZs**
- XNE NEAFC’s Regulatory Area
- XNW NAFO’s Regulatory Area
- XNW-GRL Greenland’s EEZ within NAFO Convention Area
- XEU European Union EEZs
- XSV Svalbard
- XJM Jan Mayen
- FRO Faroe Islands EEZ
- GRL Greenland EEZ
- ISL Iceland EEZ
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NOR</th>
<th>Norway EEZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RUS</td>
<td>Russian Federation EEZ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CA**  **Monthly catch**  
Quantity in metric tonnes of catch landed or transhipped in the relevant month.  No decimals, rounded up.

**CC**  **Cumulative catch**  
Quantity in metric tonnes of cumulative catch up to and including the relevant month.  No decimals, rounded up.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species common name</th>
<th>FAO code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redfish</td>
<td>REB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian Spring Spawning Herring (Atlanto Scandian)</td>
<td>HER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue whiting</td>
<td>WHB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackerel</td>
<td>MAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haddock</td>
<td>HAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baird’s smoothhead</td>
<td>ALC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risso’s smoothhead</td>
<td>PHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue antimora (Blue hake)</td>
<td>ANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black scabbardfish</td>
<td>BSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland catshark</td>
<td>API</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater silver smelt</td>
<td>ARG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfonsinos</td>
<td>ALF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tusk</td>
<td>USK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulper shark</td>
<td>GUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leafscale gulper shark</td>
<td>GUQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black dogfish</td>
<td>CFB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese dogfish</td>
<td>CYO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longnose velvet dogfish</td>
<td>CYP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep-water red crab</td>
<td>KEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbit fish (Rattail)</td>
<td>CMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frilled shark</td>
<td>HXC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conger eel</td>
<td>COE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundnose grenadier</td>
<td>RNG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitefin shark</td>
<td>SCK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birdbeak dogfish</td>
<td>DCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (Deep-water) cardinal fish</td>
<td>EPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Name</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater lanternshark</td>
<td>SHL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velvet belly</td>
<td>SHL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackmouth dogfish</td>
<td>SHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouse catshark</td>
<td>GAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluemouth (Blue mouth redfish)</td>
<td>BRF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blondnose six-gilled shark</td>
<td>SBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange roughy</td>
<td>ORY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver roughy (Pink)</td>
<td>HPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large-eyed rabbit fish (Ratfish)</td>
<td>CYH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver scabbard fish (Cutless fish)</td>
<td>SFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eelpout</td>
<td>ELP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roughhead grenadier (Rough rattail)</td>
<td>RHG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue ling</td>
<td>BLI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ling</td>
<td>LIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common mora</td>
<td>RIB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailfin roughshark (Sharptack shark)</td>
<td>OXN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red (blackspot) seabream</td>
<td>SBR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forkbeards</td>
<td>GFB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wreckfish</td>
<td>WRF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round skate</td>
<td>RJY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arctic skate</td>
<td>RJG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian skate</td>
<td>JAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenland halibut</td>
<td>GHL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightnose rabbitfish</td>
<td>RCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knifetooth dogfish</td>
<td>SYR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small redfish (Norway haddock)</td>
<td>SFV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenland shark</td>
<td>GSK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiny (Deep-sea) Scorpionfish</td>
<td>TJX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation XVI: 2010

RECOMMENDATION BY THE NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES COMMISSION IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 5 OF THE CONVENTION ON FUTURE MULTILATERAL COOPERATION IN NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES AT ITS ANNUAL MEETING IN NOVEMBER 2009 FOR A BAN ON DISCARDS IN THE NEAFC REGULATORY AREA

In accordance with Article 5 of the Convention, the Contracting Parties have agreed to the following measure to be applied in the Regulatory Area:

Each Contracting Party shall ensure that its fishing vessels operating in the Regulatory Area are prohibited from discarding or releasing catches of any of the species listed in Annex I A) of the Scheme of Control and Enforcement.
Recommendation XVII: 2010

THE NORTH EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES COMMISSION AT ITS ANNUAL MEETING ON 11 NOVEMBER 2009 ADOPTED, IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 8 OF THE CONVENTION, AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE 9 AND ANNEX VII OF THE “SCHEME OF CONTROL AND ENFORCEMENT IN RESPECT OF FISHING VESSELS FISHING IN AREAS BEYOND THE LIMITS OF NATIONAL FISHERIES JURISDICTION IN THE CONVENTION AREA” AS FOLLOWS:

(Text in bold and underlined should be added to the text)

ANNEX VII
VMS

4. Each Contracting Party shall take the necessary measures to ensure that its FMC receives through the VMS, at least the mandatory information requested in Article 11(1)(b). The Contracting Parties concerned shall take the necessary measures to ensure that the NEAFC Secretary receives the position of the vessel in real time upon entering into or exiting from the Regulatory Area and at least once every hour when operating in the NEAFC Regulatory Area. Reports shall be in accordance with the format set out in Annex IX(D)(1)
Press Release

Embargoed 17 November 2009, 09:00 am GMT

The high seas of the NEAFC Regulatory Area inside the NEAFC Convention Area in the North-East Atlantic are shown shaded on the map below.

At its 28th Annual Meeting held in London on 9-13 November 2009 NEAFC adopted management measures for 6 out of 7 fisheries. Parties will continue consultations on mackerel later this year with a view to agreeing measures later.

Based on Coastal State Agreements, management measures for the two major pelagic fisheries - Norwegian Spring Spawning (Atlanto-Scandian) herring and blue whiting - were agreed as were management measures for Rockall haddock and deep-sea fisheries. For
pelagic redfish in the Norwegian Sea and for pelagic redfish in the Irminger Sea, arrangements similar to those for 2009 were agreed. With regard to mackerel, meetings allowing continued consultations with a view to reaching agreement on measures that can be adopted by NEAFC later are ongoing.

A ban on using gillnets in waters greater than 200 metres depth was maintained as were measures to remove and dispose of unmarked or illegal fixed gear and retrieve lost gear to minimise ghost fishing.

Considering the poor status of the shark stock of Spurdog (Squalus acanthias) in the Northeast Atlantic, the ban on directed fisheries of spurdog was continued.

NEAFC adopted a ban on discards in NEAFC high seas fisheries.

To protect vulnerable marine ecosystems and in line with scientific advice, NEAFC extended the area closed to fisheries on the Hatton Bank and closed an area south of the Icelandic EEZ known as spawning ground for blue ling. A proposal to extend the closures on the Mid-Atlantic Ridge was sent to the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea for scientific comments. An overview of area management undertaken by NEAFC can be found on page 5.

NEAFC noted the continued results of the NEAFC IUU (Illegal, Unregulated, Unreported) A- and B-lists. The transhipment activities that underpinned these fisheries have been brought under control by flag states, reefer registries and owners of reefer vessels. The NEAFC Port State Control System, which was introduced on 1 May 2007, has continued to work without problems and is deemed to have led to a significant reduction in unreported catches in the NEAFC area.

Based on information on vessels on the IUU B-list that had sunk or been scrapped, NEAFC removed 10 vessels from the B-list.

In September 2008 NEAFC signed a Memorandum of Understanding with its environmental counterpart in the North East Atlantic, the OSPAR Commission (for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic) and the Annual Meeting considered how to make the MoU operational. It was agreed to consider the feasibility of organising a workshop, in collaboration with NAFO and OSPAR, in the first half of 2010 to review respective progress on ecosystem-based area management in international waters in the North Atlantic, with a particular emphasis on defining management objectives.

The cooperative non-Contracting Party status of Belize, Canada, Japan, and New Zealand was renewed for 2010. The Cook Islands have also been a cooperative non-Contracting Party to NEAFC in recent years but had not requested the renewal of that status before the meeting. Cooperative non-Contracting Party status for the Bahamas and Panama is still being considered.

Commenting on these developments at the end of his 3 years as NEAFC President, Mr Stefán Ásmundsson, Iceland, said: *Although we have to admit we were not able to reach agreement in all matters I am confident that Contracting Parties, in the tradition of close cooperation, will reach solutions that can be adopted by NEAFC in time to regulate all fisheries in 2010. We have a solid framework to support sustainable fisheries where legal*
operators are well protected. With our extensive measures on bottom fishing activities in the high seas I am confident that NEAFC is fully prepared to meet all requirements in international law, technical guidelines adopted in FAO and the objective of its own Convention ‘to ensure the long-term conservation and optimum utilisation of the fishery resources in the Convention Area, providing sustainable economic, environmental and social benefits’. Cooperation with other Regional Fisheries Management organisations, OSPAR and IMO underlines the need to control all human activities with an impact on marine ecosystems.”

As the incumbent President Mr Stefán Ásmundsson, Iceland ended his three years term, NEAFC elected Dr Sergey Belikov, the Russian Federation, as President for 2010-2012. Johán H. Williams, Norway, was elected first Vice-President and Andrew Thomson, EU, was elected second Vice-President for the same period.

For more information, please contact Kjartan Hoydal, Secretary of NEAFC
Telephone +44 02076310016
Mobile +44 07788457070
e-mail kjartan@neafc.org
or the NEAFC website www.neafc.org

More Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Fisheries/ stocks</th>
<th>Management measure 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian spring spawning (Atlanto-Scandian) herring</td>
<td>Overall TAC of 1,483 thousands tonnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue whiting</td>
<td>Overall TAC of 497 thousands tonnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackerel</td>
<td>Consultations continue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockall haddock</td>
<td>Box closed to trawl fisheries to protect juvenile haddock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelagic redfish in the Irminger Sea</td>
<td>Total allowable catch not higher than in 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelagic redfish Norwegian Sea</td>
<td>Overall TAC of 8,600 tonnes to be fished from 15 August to 30 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Sea Fisheries</td>
<td>Effort less than 65 % of effort in earlier years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange roughy</td>
<td>TAC of 150 tonnes for each Contracting Party</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The four main fisheries in the Convention Area are Norwegian spring spawning (Atlanto-Scandian) herring, mackerel, blue whiting and pelagic redfish. About 3 million tonnes have been taken in these fisheries. Catches of the three pelagic species in 2005 had a landed value of approximately US $681 million from the Convention Area and US $236 million from the Regulatory Area.
Overview of the 28th Annual Meeting

1. The 28th Annual Meeting of the North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission (NEAFC) took place in London on 9-13 November 2009 under the chairmanship of Mr. Stefán Ásmundsson, Iceland.

2. All Contracting Parties were represented: Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), the European Community, Iceland, Norway and the Russian Federation. Representatives from Belize, Canada, the Cook Islands, New Zealand, the International Government Organisation OSPAR and two non-governmental organisations, Seas at Risk and the Pew Foundation, attended as observers.

3. The Commission reviewed scientific information from the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) concerning the status of fish stocks in the North-East Atlantic. Specific attention was given to reports on stocks under NEAFC’s regulatory competence (pelagic redfish, blue whiting, Norwegian spring spawning (Atlanto-Scandian) herring, mackerel, pelagic redfish in the Irminger and the Norwegian Seas, Rockall haddock and deep-sea species). The Commission also reviewed scientific information on Marine Ecosystems.

4. In 2003 NEAFC agreed on temporary measures to freeze effort in fisheries for fish species inhabiting deep waters in the Regulatory Area from 1 January 2004. This year NEAFC agreed to maintain a reduction in fishing effort in these fisheries by 35% in 2010.

NEAFC agreed on management measures to control the exploitation of major fish stocks in the high seas (the NEAFC Regulatory Area). These measures include total allowable catches for Norwegian spring spawning (Atlanto-scandian) herring, blue whiting, pelagic redfish in ICES Sub-areas I and II and in the Irminger Sea, blue whiting, Rockall haddock, orange roughy and deep-sea species. A ban on directed fishery for spurdog sharks was also agreed.

Consultations on mackerel will continue after the Annual Meeting.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional measures related to fishing</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ban on finning of sharks</td>
<td>2007---→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haddock box</td>
<td>2003--→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closures of large areas for bottom fisheries</td>
<td>2004--→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom fishing regulations</td>
<td>2008--→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ban of gill net fishing in depths over 200 m in the Regulatory Area</td>
<td>2006 --→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ban on directed fisheries for spurdog, <em>Squalus achanthias</em></td>
<td>2009 ---→</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. NEAFc reviewed recent trends in the international management of marine resources, including the ecosystem approach and cooperation with other regional and global organisations. NEAFc evaluated the protection of vulnerable marine ecosystems, VMEs.

Meeting schedules for subsidiary bodies (the Permanent Committees on Control and Enforcement, PECCOE, and the Permanent Committee on Science and Management, PECMAS) and working groups were adopted.

The 29th Annual Meeting is scheduled to take place in London on 8-12 November 2010.

**NEAFc evaluates the protection of Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems in the High Seas of the North East Atlantic and agrees measures and plans for most major fisheries in the NEAFc Regulatory Area.**

At its 28th Annual Meeting, held in London on 9-13 November 2009, NEAFc made an evaluation of measures in place to protect Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems (VMEs). A summary of actions taken by NEAFc to conserve VMEs and deep sea species in the high seas of the North East Atlantic is attached.

NEAFc continues to review these measures and, at the meeting, it was decided to seek cooperation with the OSPAR Commission. At the meeting it was agreed to extend the closures on the Hatton Bank to bring them in line with scientific advice from the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea, ICES, NEAFc’s scientific provider. In the same line a spawning area for blue ling was closed south of the Icelandic EEZ.

In a postal vote earlier this year NEAFc adopted measures that close more than 330,000 square kilometres to bottom fisheries on the Mid-Atlantic Ridge.

This comes on top of a number of other measures adopted by NEAFc to protect deep-sea diversity. The closures are shown on the map below.
The five green areas on the Mid-Atlantic ridge are the closures adopted earlier this year. The red line is the boundary of the high sea areas in the North East Atlantic. The “existing” bottom fishing areas are the relatively small areas within the white lines in the north east corner (the Hatton – Rockall Banks area, of the high seas area). All areas outside the white lines are considered as "new" bottom fishing areas.

The draft FAO International Guidelines for the Management of Deep-sea Fisheries in the High Seas in paragraph 43bis reads as follows: “Risk assessments referred to in paragraph 43 (vi) above should take into account, as appropriate, differing conditions prevailing in areas where DSF\(^1\) are well established and in areas where DSF have not taken place or only occur occasionally”.

\(^1\) DSF. Deep-sea Fisheries
Based on this, in its bottom fishing regulation NEAFC has outlined “existing fishing areas” where fishing has taken place and “new fishing areas” where fishing has not taken place. The “new” fishing areas are 99.1% of the area seen in the map above. To reduce risks of significant adverse impacts on VMEs, bottom fisheries in these areas are severely restricted. Normal commercial bottom fisheries authorisations are not sufficient in the areas, as bottom fishing can only be authorised under the strict conditions in the NEAFC Exploratory Bottom Fisheries Protocol. Vessels authorised under this protocol must have an observer on board. Observers shall collect data in accordance with a Vulnerable Marine Ecosystem Data Collection Protocol.