

**INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS CONCERNING  
LIVING MARINE RESOURCES OF  
INTEREST TO NOAA FISHERIES**

---



**OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS**

**2007-2008**



**INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS  
CONCERNING LIVING MARINE RESOURCES  
OF INTEREST TO NOAA FISHERIES**

**2007-2008**

**NOAA**

**Office of International Affairs**

**National Marine Fisheries Service**

**National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration**

**U.S. Department of Commerce**

**1315 East-West Highway**

**Silver Spring, Maryland 20910**

**Telephone: (301) 713-2276**

**Fax: (301) 713-2313**



**INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS CONCERNING LIVING MARINE  
RESOURCES OF INTEREST TO NOAA FISHERIES**

**PART I. INTERNATIONAL AND REGIONAL MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS**

**ATLANTIC OCEAN**

International Convention for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (Basic Instrument for the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas -- ICCAT).....	3
Convention for the Conservation of Salmon in the North Atlantic Ocean (Basic Instrument for the North Atlantic Salmon Conservation Organization -- NASCO).....	17
Convention on Future Multilateral Cooperation in the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries (Basic Instrument for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization -- NAFO).....	27

**PACIFIC OCEAN**

Agreement on the International Dolphin Conservation Program (AIDCP) .....	39
Convention for the Establishment of an Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC) .....	43
Convention for the Preservation of the Halibut Fishery of the Northern Pacific Ocean and Bering Sea (Basic Instrument for the International Pacific Halibut Commission -- IPHC) .....	48
Convention for the Conservation of Anadromous Stocks in the North Pacific Ocean (Basic Instrument for the North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission – NPAFC) .....	54
Treaty Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada Concerning Pacific Salmon (Basic Instrument for the Pacific Salmon Commission – PSC) .....	59
Convention on the Conservation and Management of Pollock Resources in the Central Bering Sea .....	64
Treaty Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada on Pacific Coast Albacore Tuna Vessels and Port Privileges.....	68
Treaty on Fisheries Between the Governments of Certain Pacific Island States and the Government of the United States of America (South Pacific Tuna Treaty -- SPTT) .....	70
Multilateral High-level Conference on the Conservation and Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific (Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Convention-WCPFC).....	72

**SOUTHERN OCEAN**

Convention for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (Basic Instrument for the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources – CCAMLR).....	77
Convention for the Conservation of Antarctic Seals (CCAS) .....	86

**WESTERN HEMISPHERE**

Inter-American Convention (IAC) for the Protection and Conservation of Sea Turtles..... 89

**GREAT LAKES**

Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries Between the United States and Canada (Basic Instrument for the Great Lakes Fishery Commission – GLFC) ..... 92

**GLOBAL**

Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP)..... 98

Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) ..... 100

Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES).....105

International Whaling Commission (IWC)..... 108

**PART II. BILATERAL CONSULTATIVE ARRANGEMENTS**

**NORTH AMERICA**

Informal Fisheries Consultations Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada..... 112

Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada on Fisheries Enforcement..... 114

**CENTRAL AMERICA**

United States-Mexico Fisheries Cooperation Program..... 116

**SOUTH AMERICA**

United States-Chile Fisheries Cooperation Program ..... 118

**ASIA**

United States-Japan Consultative Committee on Fisheries ..... 120

United States-People’s Republic of China Bilateral Fisheries Consultations..... 122

Memorandum of Understanding Between the American Institute in Taiwan and the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States..... 124

## **EUROPE**

Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on Mutual Fisheries Relations (Basic Instrument for the U.S.-Russia Intergovernmental Consultative Committee -- ICC) .....	127
United States-European Union High Level Fisheries Consultation.....	132

## **PART III. SCIENTIFIC ORGANIZATIONS AND COUNCILS**

### **PACIFIC OCEAN**

North Pacific Marine Science Organization (PICES).....	135
--	-----

### **ARCTIC OCEAN**

Program for the Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF) .....	140
---	-----

### **ATLANTIC OCEAN**

International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES).....	145
--	-----

### **GLOBAL**

Global Environment Facility (GEF) .....	149
International Polar Year .....	152
Joint FAO/WHO International Codex Alimentarius Food Standards Program .....	153

## **PART IV. OTHER INTERNATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS OF INTEREST**

Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) .....	157
Asia-Pacific Fishery Commission (APFIC).....	159
Association of Official Analytical Chemists (AOAC) International .....	159
Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC).....	160
Canada/Mexico/US Trilateral Committee for Wildlife and Ecosystem Conservation and Management....	160
Commission for Sustainable Development (CSD) .....	161
Convention on the Conservation and Management of Fishery Resources in the Southeast Atlantic Ocean (SEAFO) .....	162
Coral Disease and Health Consortium (CDHC) .....	162
Fishery Committee for the Eastern Central Atlantic (CECAF) .....	162

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) Committee on Fisheries (COFI).....	163
Free Trade Agreements (FTAs).....	165
Global Ocean Ecosystem Dynamics (GLOBEC) .....	166
Global Ocean Observing System (GOOS) .....	167
Gulf of Maine Council (GOMC).....	167
Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC).....	167
Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).....	168
International Oceanographic Commission (IOC) .....	169
IOC Sub-Commission for the Caribbean and Adjacent Regions (IOCARIBE).....	170
International Queen Conch Conference.....	170
Large Marine Ecosystems (LMEs).....	171
Memorandum of Understanding on the Conservation and Management of Marine Turtles and Their Habitats Of the Indian Ocean and South-East Asia (concluded under the auspices of the Convention on Migratory Species).....	172
National Standards Foundation (NSF) International .....	173
NOAA Fisheries/Norwegian Institute of Marine Research Scientific Cooperation .....	173
NOAA-Republic of Korea Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries (MOMAF)Arrangement For Integrated Coastal and Ocean Resources Management.....	175
North Pacific Interim Scientific Committee for Tuna and Tuna-like Species (ISC).....	176
Office International des Epizooties (OIE) .....	177
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).....	178
Protocol for Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPAW) in the Wider Caribbean Region to the Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region (Cartagena Convention).....	179
Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) .....	181
Treaty on Fisheries Between the Governments of Certain Pacific Island States and the Government of the United States of America (South Pacific Tuna Treaty -- SPTT) .....	182
United Nations (UN) Atlas of the Oceans Agreement.....	183
United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) .....	184

U.S.-Canada International Joint Commission (IJC).....	184
U.S.-China Marine and Fisheries Science and Technology Protocol .....	185
U.S.-France Cooperative Program.....	188
U.S.-Republic of Ireland Cooperation .....	188
U.S.-Morocco Cooperation .....	190
U.S.-South Africa Cooperative Program .....	190
U.S.-Vietnam Fisheries Cooperation Program .....	191
Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission (WECAFC) .....	192
World Health Organization (WHO) of the United Nations .....	193
World Trade Organization (WTO).....	194

**PART V. APPENDIX**

Governing International Fishery Agreements (GIFAs) Between the United States and Foreign Entities ...	195
---	-----



**PART I. INTERNATIONAL AND REGIONAL MANAGEMENT  
ARRANGEMENTS**

## **ATLANTIC OCEAN**

**International Convention for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas  
(Basic Instrument for the International Commission for the  
Conservation of Atlantic Tunas -- ICCAT)**

**Basic Instrument**

International Convention for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (TIAS 6767), 20 U.S.T. 2887, 1969, which was signed on May 14, 1966.

**Implementing Legislation**

Atlantic Tunas Convention Act (ATCA) of 1975 (16 U.S.C. 971 et. seq.).

**Members**

There are currently 43 Contracting Parties: Algeria, Angola, Barbados, Belize, Brazil, Canada, Cape Verde, China (People's Republic), Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Equatorial Guinea, European Community (EC), France (in respect of St. Pierre et Miquelon), Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea (Republic of), Honduras, Iceland, Japan, Korea (Republic of), Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Philippines, Russian Federation, Sao Tome and Principe, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, South Africa (Republic of), Syria, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom (in respect of its overseas territories), United States, Uruguay, Vanuatu, and Venezuela.

It was agreed at the 1997 Annual Meeting that all EC Member States would withdraw from the Commission effective December 31, 1997. France and the United Kingdom rejoined in respect of their independent territories.

**Commission Headquarters**

International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas  
c/ Corazón de Maria, 8  
6th Floor  
28002 Madrid, Spain

Executive Secretary (as of May 2004): Mr. Driss Meski  
Telephone (from U.S.): (011) 34-91-416-5600  
Fax: (011) 34-91-415-2612  
Web address: <http://www.iccat.int/>

**Finance and Administration**

The Commission's Standing Committee on Finance and Administration (STACFAD) meets annually to approve a budget. Notably, the Madrid Protocol entered into force in 2005, which restructured the way Contracting Party assessments are calculated—linking payments to a country's level of economic development. Upon entry into force of this new contribution scheme, many ICCAT members saw their payments drop significantly, though developed countries have faced substantial increases. The agreed provisional budget for calendar year 2007 was 2,172,222.94 Euros (approximately \$2,875,520.97), with the understanding that the total might increase if the new management measures for eastern bluefin increased the responsibilities of the Secretariat to monitor catch reporting and VMS. With this total, the United States 2007 contribution will be 200,103.68 Euros (approximately \$264,891.01). The United States has also periodically provided extra-budgetary funds to ICCAT to support various initiatives, such as ICCAT's voluntary data fund.

In 2006, STACFAD reviewed the continuing shortfall in Contracting Parties' contributions. Accumulated arrears now equal almost one year's budget, although some parties such as Ghana have made significant progress in repaying their outstanding contributions. STACFAD reaffirmed the 2005 decision under Article X.8 of the Convention, to suspend automatically the voting rights of members with the equivalent of two year's contributions in arrears. As a result, Honduras, Gabon, Cape Verde, and Sao Tome and Principe's voting rights were suspended. Nicaragua, Panama, and Vanuatu will be in the same situation next year unless they pay some of their arrears. Finally, a U.S. proposal to elaborate the ICCAT rules of procedure for mail voting was approved.

### **U.S. Representation**

#### A. Appointment Process:

The ATCA provides that not more than three Commissioners shall represent the United States in ICCAT. Commissioners are appointed by the President and serve 3-year terms. Of the three U.S. Commissioners, one can be a salaried employee of any state or political subdivision thereof, or of the Federal Government. The Government Commissioner is not limited in the number of terms that he or she can serve. Of the two Commissioners who are not government employees, one must have knowledge and experience regarding commercial fishing in the Atlantic Ocean, Gulf of Mexico or Caribbean Sea and the other must have similar knowledge and experience regarding recreational fishing. Non-Government Commissioners are not eligible to serve more than two consecutive 3-year terms.

#### B. U.S. Commissioners:

##### Government

William T. Hogarth, Ph.D.  
Assistant Administrator for Fisheries  
NOAA Fisheries  
1315 East-West Highway  
Silver Spring, MD 20910

##### Commercial

Randi Parks Thomas  
National Fisheries Institute  
7918 Jones Branch Drive  
Suite 700  
McLean, VA 22102

##### Recreational

Robert Hayes  
Ball Janik, LLP  
1455 F Street, N.W., Suite 225  
Washington, D.C. 20004

#### C. Advisory Structure:

The U.S. Commissioners are required, under the ATCA, to constitute an Advisory Committee to the U.S. National Section to ICCAT. This body shall, to the maximum extent practicable, consist of an equitable balance among the various groups concerned with the fisheries covered by the Convention and is exempt from the Federal Advisory Committee Act. The Committee consists of (1) "not less than five nor more than twenty individuals appointed by the United States Commissioners who shall select such individuals from the various groups concerned with the fisheries covered by the Convention" and (2) the Chairs (or their designees) of the New England, Mid-Atlantic, South Atlantic, Caribbean, and Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Councils (FMCs). Public Committee members

serve 2-year terms and are eligible for reappointment. The Committee generally consists of the maximum 20 public members and the five FMC representatives.

Upon approval of the Committee and the Department of State, the directors (or their designees) of the fisheries agencies of each of the states, the residents of which maintain a highly migratory species fishery in the regulatory area of the Convention, may be invited to serve as *ex officio* members of the Committee. The Advisory Committee is invited to attend all non-executive meetings of the U.S. Commissioners and, at such meetings, shall have the opportunity to examine and to be heard on all proposed programs of investigation, reports, recommendations, and regulations of the Commission.

The ATCA also provides that the Commissioners may establish species working groups for the purpose of providing advice and recommendations to the Commissioners and to the Advisory Committee on matters relating to the conservation and management of any highly migratory species covered by the Convention. Any species working group shall consist of no more than seven members of the Advisory Committee and no more than four scientific or technical personnel. The Commissioners have established the following four working groups: billfish, swordfish, bluefin tuna, and BAYS (bigeye, albacore, yellowfin, and skipjack) tunas. The Commissioners generally appoint the maximum number of technical advisors provided by law.

The Chairman of the Advisory Committee is Dr. John Graves, The College of William and Mary, Virginia Institute of Marine Science, School of Marine Science, Gloucester Point, VA 23062. The Committee's Executive Secretary is Kelly Denit (see addresses below). The Committee meets at least twice a year, usually in Silver Spring, Maryland, and often holds additional meetings along the East Coast, Gulf of Mexico and Caribbean Sea. The Committee's Statement of Operating Practices and Procedures is available from its Executive Secretary.

### **Description**

#### **A. Mission/Purpose:**

ICCAT was established to provide an effective program of international cooperation in research and conservation in recognition of the unique problems related to the highly migratory nature of tunas and tuna-like species. The Convention area is defined as all waters of the Atlantic Ocean, including the adjacent seas. The Commission is responsible for providing internationally coordinated research on the condition of Atlantic tuna and tuna-like species, and their environment, as well as for the development of regulatory recommendations. The objective of such regulatory recommendations is to conserve and manage species of tuna and tuna-like species throughout their range in a manner that maintains their population at levels that will permit the maximum sustainable catch.

#### **B. Organizational Structure:**

The ICCAT is comprised of a (1) commission, (2) council, (3) executive secretary, and (4) subject area panels. The Commission consists of not more than three delegates from each Contracting Party. The Council is an elected body within the Commission consisting of a chairman, vice-chairman, and representatives of not less than four nor more than eight Contracting Parties and which performs such functions as are assigned to it by the Convention or Commission. Although the Council is supposed to meet at least once between regular meetings (which occur every other year), since 1978 Special Meetings of the Commission have been held in lieu of meetings of the Council.

The Executive Secretary is responsible for coordinating the programs of investigation, preparing budget estimates, disbursing funds and accounting for expenditures; preparing the collection and analysis of data to accomplish the purposes of the Convention; and preparing scientific, administrative, and other reports for approval by the Commission.

Panels are established by the Commission and are responsible for review of the species under their purview; collection of scientific and other information; proposing conservation recommendations for joint actions; and recommending studies by the Contracting Parties. Panel 1 covers tropical tunas (bigeye, yellowfin, and skipjack). Panel 2 covers North Atlantic temperate tunas (northern bluefin and albacore). Panel 3 covers South Atlantic temperate tunas (southern bluefin and albacore). Finally, Panel 4 covers other species, including swordfish, billfishes, and sharks. Standing Committees on Research and Statistics (SCRS), Finance and Administration (STACFAD), and Compliance have been established by the Commission. ICCAT also has constituted a Permanent Working Group for the Improvement of ICCAT Statistics and Conservation Measures (PWG), which met for the first time in 1993. Much of the focus of the PWG is directed toward gaining the cooperation of ICCAT non-members with the conservation and management measures of the Commission.

### C. Programs:

The Commission concerns itself with (1) joint planning of research, coordination of research carried on by agencies of the Parties in accordance with its plans, and joint evaluation of the results of such research; (2) the collection and analysis of statistical information relating to the condition of fishery resources in the Convention area; and (3) joint formulation of regulatory recommendations for submission to the Parties.

Recommendations adopted by the Commission are submitted to governments for acceptance. These recommendations become effective for all Parties to the Convention six months after their formal submission to all Parties (unless otherwise stated) provided objections are not made during that period by concerned Contracting Governments. Each Contracting Party has the responsibility for implementing and enforcing the Commission's recommended conservation and management measures.

#### Panel 1 - Bigeye, Yellowfin and Skipjack Tunas

*Status of the stocks and scientific advice:* The most current information on the status of bigeye, yellowfin, and skipjack tunas in the Convention area together with scientific advice for these stocks is available in the 2006 SCRS report, which can be found on the ICCAT website ([www.iccat.int](http://www.iccat.int)).

#### *Conservation and Management Actions:*

*Small fish measures.* In 1972, the Commission recommended a ban on the taking of yellowfin tuna weighing less than 3.2 kilograms (kg), allowing an incidental catch of not more than 15 percent of the number of fish landed per trip. This regulation was extended to bigeye tuna in 1979. These standards remained unchanged until 2004 when it was decided the minimum size for bigeye tuna was no longer required. The minimum size for yellowfin tuna was later repealed as well. Adherence to the minimum size for bigeye and yellowfin tunas had been poor.

Bigeye tuna conservation was a priority at the 2004 ICCAT meeting and discussions were time-consuming and lengthy. Ultimately, a proposal was adopted that contained several important elements including a capacity limitation for China, Chinese Taipei, and the Philippines, catch limits for the major harvesters, and payback schedules for China and Chinese Taipei who had overharvested their quota in previous years. The proposal did not establish catch or effort limits on minor harvesters and this issue has been of significant debate in recent years. The recommendation also significantly changed the Gulf of Guinea time and area closure originally adopted in 1999 and amended over the years. The new measure reduced the size of the closed area, and the temporal coverage was reduced from three months to one month. Also, instead of banning fishing on FADs, the measure established a complete moratorium in the area by the surface fishery (bait boats and purse seines). The measure does not expressly require that FADs be removed from the closed area during the moratorium month although it was agreed in plenary discussions that this was the intention. In addition, the parties agreed that there would be no carry-forward of bigeye tuna underharvests. The SCRS will be reviewing the change to the closed area. The next stock assessment for bigeye tuna will be 2007. The current management arrangement will need to be reviewed at that time.

In 1993, ICCAT adopted a measure for yellowfin tuna requiring ICCAT Parties to cap effective fishing effort at 1992 levels. Total effective effort has remained relatively stable since 1990. Yellowfin tuna is probably fully fished. With regard to skipjack, ICCAT has not adopted any management measures for either the eastern or western Atlantic stock.

Panel 2 - North Atlantic Bluefin Tuna and Albacore:

*Western Atlantic Bluefin Tuna:* The capture of bluefin tuna in the western Atlantic was prohibited in 1981, except for a catch quota for continuing scientific monitoring of the stock. This catch was allocated to ICCAT member nations which had actively participated in the fishery (United States, Canada, Japan). Brazil and Cuba, whose catches were less than 50 mt annually, were exempt from these early regulations. The Commission continued in following years to review periodically and adjust catch quotas as deemed appropriate. Other measures were also adopted, such as limiting small fish catches; prohibiting directed bluefin fisheries in spawning areas such as the Gulf of Mexico; addressing the problem of overages; and encouraging tag and release of fish less than 30 kg.

Given the continued overfished status of western Atlantic bluefin tuna, ICCAT adopted at its 1998 meeting a rebuilding program for the western stock with the goal of reaching MSY in 20 years. This represents the first time that ICCAT articulated a rebuilding goal to guide its management actions and fashioned a plan for achieving that goal. The annual total allowable catch (TAC) established under the program was 2,500 mt, inclusive of dead discards. The rebuilding program provides flexibility to alter the TAC, the MSY target, and/or the rebuilding period based upon subsequent scientific advice.

The TAC has been adjusted periodically since 1998. In 2006, the Commission adopted a U.S. proposal to lower the TAC to 2100 mt, in line with scientific advice to stop overfishing. In addition, the tolerance for recreational catches of bluefin tuna weighing less than 30 kg (the current minimum size in the west) was increased slightly from 8% to 10%. As in previous years, the TAC is shared by the United States, Japan, Canada, the United Kingdom (in respect of Bermuda), France (in respect of St. Pierre et Miquelon), and Mexico. After reducing the TAC to account for (a) the bycatch quotas for United States and Canada for their directed longline fisheries in the vicinity of the management boundary area, (b) the quotas for the UK, France, and Mexico, the remainder of the TAC is to be allocated among the United States (57.48%), Japan (18.77%), and Canada (23.75%). The relative shares will change if the remainder of the annual TAC exceeds 2660 mt.

In addition, the program contains a provision for the United States to transfer 175 mt of existing U.S. underharvest to Mexico over the next two years. It was clearly stipulated that these fish could not be harvested from the Gulf of Mexico. The program also provides that 50 mt of U.S. underharvest will be transferred to Canada. The recommendation includes a clause, moreover, that allows the transfer of up to 15% of a country's quota from one ICCAT member to another within a given year. Under the program, the United States and Canada also received bycatch quotas of 25 mt and 15 mt, respectively. Finally, a resolution was adopted in 2006 to control catches in the central Atlantic given the importance of this area with respect to stock mixing.

*Eastern Atlantic Bluefin Tuna:* ICCAT began adopting measures to limit harvests of eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean bluefin tuna, including TACs and country specific quotas, in the mid to late 1990s due to concerns about the status of the stock. The United States has been supportive of strong conservation measures for this stock, in particular given the potential impact of mixing between the eastern and western Atlantic stocks of bluefin tuna. (The eastern stock is twice the size of the western stock and even small amounts of mixing could have a significant impact on western bluefin tuna.) Unfortunately, compliance with agreed eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean catch limits has been poor over the years. For example, the TAC established by ICCAT for this fishery for the years 2003 through 2006 was 32,000 mt per year. Estimates of actual catches for each of these years, however, were 50,000 mt or more.

Lack of effective management action in the past has now led to a more dire situation for the eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean stock. The 2006 stock assessment indicated that this stock has a "high risk of fishery and stock

collapse.” Despite the strong recommendation from ICCAT’s science body that catch levels for this stock should not exceed about 15,000 mt (the level expected to halt overfishing), the proposal adopted by ICCAT did not include an appropriate suite of measures to ensure this. The adopted proposal, championed by the EC, established a 15 year management plan, which is to be reviewed in 2008. It set a 29,500 mt catch level for 2007 with gradual reductions to 25,500 by 2010. Country specific quota allocations were developed at a special intersessional meeting in early 2008 and adopted by mail vote in March 2007. In addition to the excessive TAC, the proposed time/area closure for the fishery did not cover the peak Mediterranean spawning month of June for the purse seine fleet, and the increase in the minimum size limit to 30 kg contained significant carve outs that allow 8 kg fish to be harvested in Spain’s Bay of Biscay fishery and by Croatia to supply their farming operations. The EC proposal also did not require Parties to payback past quota overharvests, and it does allow the carry forward of 50% of under harvests from 2005 and/or 2006.

The EC proposal did include enhancements to fishery monitoring and control to improve compliance with agreed conservation and management measures. Among other things, these included prohibition of chartering by 2010, prohibition of transshipment at sea, enhanced controls on landing in port, real time data collection and reporting to the flag state and the ICCAT Secretariat, enhanced controls on farming activities, including the use of observers, increased observer coverage on bluefin tuna fleets, centralized VMS data reporting to the ICCAT Secretariat, enhanced market controls, and application of ICCAT’s existing joint international inspection scheme and a commitment to develop a revised scheme.

Because of concerns by the United States and others that the 2006 recommendation would not address the conservation concern for the stock, there was no consensus on it and, for the first time, ICCAT voted on a proposal. The measure passed at the subcommittee level with the minimum 10 votes in favor. There were 4 votes against and 4 abstentions. The United States, Norway, Canada, and France (in respect of St. Pierre and Miquelon) voted against the measure. Iceland, Belize, Mexico, and St. Vincent and the Grenadines abstained from the voting, which is equivalent to a no vote given ICCAT’s voting rules. The sponsors of the proposal voted in favor. They included the EC, Morocco, Turkey, Algeria, Libya, Croatia, Tunisia, China, Korea, and Japan. At the Commission level, the proposal as adopted by vote in Panel 2 was again discussed and concerns were raised but its adoption was not blocked.

*Trade Tracking:* In 1992, the Commission adopted the Bluefin Tuna Statistical Document (BSD) program, which requires the use of an ICCAT-accepted reporting system to monitor trade in fresh and frozen bluefin tuna. The BSD requires exporters of bluefin tuna to include documents identifying the location and flag of the vessel catching the fish. This information has been used to address the problem of harvests that are contrary to ICCAT rules, especially by non-member countries. The 2003 trade resolution linked information from the BSD program with compliance. The Compliance Committee is tasked with reviewing Contracting Party activities, while the Permanent Working Group (PWG) is tasked with reviewing the activities of non-Contracting Parties. Information on the BSD and the work of the PWG and Compliance Committee can be found later in this chapter.

*Northern Albacore:* At its 1998 meeting, ICCAT adopted a measure to limit fishing capacity in the northern albacore fishery. This action was intended to prevent further increases in fishing mortality given scientific advice at the time which considered that the stock was close to full exploitation. To improve control over the overfished northern albacore fishery, ICCAT agreed at its 2000 meeting to establish first-ever catch limits on that fishery. These catch limits continued until 2003. Despite difficulties with the stock assessment on northern albacore conducted in 2003, the Commission adopted a multi-year recommendation for this stock. The three-year recommendation established a total allowable catch (TAC) of 34,500 metric tons through 2006 and included an allocation arrangement covering ICCAT’s major and minor harvesters as well as non-members. The TAC level was not projected to result in rebuilding. In recognition of concerns of stockpiling underharvests, the 2003 measures included a provision limiting carryover resulting from underharvests for a particular party in any given year to 50% of its initial catch quota. In 2006, the Commission agreed to roll over the existing recommendation for northern albacore through 2007. Management measures for albacore will be comprehensively reviewed at the 2007 ICCAT annual meeting in light of the results of the 2007 stock assessment.

Panel 3 - South Atlantic Bluefin Tuna and Albacore:

*Southern Bluefin Tuna:* No management measures have been established by ICCAT for southern bluefin tuna. This stock is distributed among the Indian, Pacific, and Atlantic Oceans. Stocks are assessed and managed by the Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tunas (CCSBT). ICCAT collaborates with the CCSBT regarding this stock.

*Southern Albacore:* Due to concerns about the status of the resource, ICCAT adopted management measures for southern albacore for the first time at its 1994 meeting. Southern albacore is currently under a multi-year management measure, adopted in 2004. The recommendation sets the total allowable catch (TAC) at 30,915 mt, the estimated MSY, for the years 2005-2007. However, specific catch limits for those “actively” fishing albacore (i.e., South Africa, Brazil, Namibia, and Taiwan) were not established. If parties (in aggregate) exceed the previously agreed 2004 TAC of 29,200 mt, the overage will be subtracted from the 2006 TAC. Similarly, if parties exceed the TAC of 30,915 mt in 2005 or 2006, the overage will be subtracted from the 2007 or 2008 TACs, respectively. (Recent catches have remained below the established trigger point.) There is no provision to carry forward underharvests. The recommendation also requires an intersessional meeting for participants to discuss allocation criteria for this fishery if the TAC is exceeded. As was the case in previous measures for this stock, the catch limit for parties not actively fishing for southern albacore and having caught less than 100 mt during the years 1992-1996 was set at 100 mt, which included the United States. Those parties not actively fishing for southern albacore and having caught more than 100 mt during the same years were held to the previous provision of 110% of their average during those years. The next stock assessment for southern albacore will take place in 2007 and new management measures will be considered at that time.

Panel 4 - Swordfish, Billfish, Sharks, and Other Species:

*North Swordfish Stock:* Concern about the status of North Atlantic swordfish led ICCAT to begin management of this stock around 1990. Initial management actions were not successful in stemming the decline of the resource and a rebuilding program was developed and adopted by ICCAT in 1999. Specifically, ICCAT parties committed to rebuild North Atlantic swordfish to the biomass that will produce MSY within 10 years, with a greater than 50 percent probability. Among other things, the swordfish rebuilding program included TACs and country specific allocations.

The 2006 stock assessment for North Atlantic swordfish indicated that the stock was virtually rebuilt only seven years into the 10 year rebuilding program. In 2006, ICCAT adopted revisions to the rebuilding program setting a TAC of 14,000 mt per year for 2007 and 2008. Given the improved status of the resource, several ICCAT members sought increased access to the fishery and temporary quota allocations using existing quota underharvests from the United States were provided to a number of countries. The U.S. allocation (30.49% of 12,815 mt) and quota (3,907 mt) under the rebuilding program, however, remained unchanged for 2007 and 2008.

*South Atlantic Stock:* The Commission established management measures for South Atlantic swordfish for the first time in 1994, which limited harvests based on catches in reference years. The 1994 measures for South Atlantic swordfish were extended in 1995, 1996, and 1997. In 1997, ICCAT adopted more specific limits on the fishery, setting a TAC together with a sharing arrangement and specified country quotas for 1998-2000. For the 2001 and 2002 fishing years, however, only a TAC was set; country specific allocations could not be agreed. At the 2002 ICCAT meeting, agreement was finally reached on a sharing arrangement and country specific quota allocations for the stock. This measure applied from 2003 through 2006. New management negotiations took place for southern swordfish at the 2006 ICCAT meeting with a number of countries expressing interest in additional quota to develop or expand their fisheries. The adopted measure set the TAC at the scientifically recommended 17,000 mt, but authorized takes of 17,475 in 2007 and 2008 and 17,440 in 2009. Given that some parties have not been catching their full quotas in recent years, however, actual catches in 2007-09 are not expected to exceed the TAC level. Further, to help ensure the TAC will not be exceeded, a provision was included in the recommendation that requires the Commission to adjust catch limits as necessary and appropriate if the annual TAC of 17,000 is exceeded in any

given year such that the overall catch for the 2007-09 period does not exceed the total allowable catch for the period (i.e., 51,000 mt).

*Mediterranean Stock:* With respect to the Mediterranean stock of swordfish, in 2003, following a new stock assessment for Mediterranean swordfish, the Commission adopted a recommendation that requires Contracting Parties to take the necessary measures to reduce the mortality of juvenile swordfish in the Mediterranean. The measures also prohibits the use of driftnets for fisheries of large pelagics in the Mediterranean (for more information on driftnets, see Other Issues section).

*Billfishes:* Since the mid-1990s, ICCAT has been paying increasing attention to the conservation and management of billfishes. At its 1997 meeting, the Commission adopted the first mandatory conservation measures for Atlantic blue marlin and white marlin. These first measures were continued through 2000. Due to continuing concern over the status of marlins, the Commission adopted a two-phase plan to rebuild severely depleted populations of Atlantic blue marlin and white marlin at its 2000 meeting. The marlin rebuilding plan has since been amended four times, most recently in 2006. The 2006 revisions rolled over the primary provisions of the plan, including landings reductions and limits, and included several enhancements, including improved reporting requirements, controls on artisanal fisheries, and the provision by SCRS of a work plan to achieve Phase 2 of the rebuilding plan at the 2010 Commission meeting. The next assessment for Atlantic blue and white marlin will be in 2010.

*Sharks:* U.S. leadership resulted in adoption at the 2004 ICCAT meeting of a binding management measure for sharks caught in association with fisheries managed by ICCAT. The decision was taken by consensus and is the first time ICCAT has ever asserted management authority over sharks. To address the issue of shark finning, a major component of the measure is to require full utilization of shark catches. Countries are required to ensure that their vessels retain onboard fins that total no more than 5% by weight of sharks onboard up to the first point of landing. The 2004 agreement also (1) establishes requirements for data collection on catches of sharks, (2) calls for research on shark nursery areas, and (3) encourages the release of live sharks, especially juveniles. At its 2006 meeting, ICCAT adopted a proposal to hold a shark data preparatory meeting in 2007 and delay the formal assessment of shortfin mako and blue sharks until 2008 due to SCRS concerns about the data for shark fisheries.

*Ecosystem/Bycatch Issues, including Sea Turtles and Seabirds:* After more than two years of negotiation, ICCAT took action in 2003 in response to a U.S. proposal regarding sea turtles. The Commission adopted a non-binding resolution that encourages all parties to provide information on interactions with sea turtles in the ICCAT Convention area -- in particular, the bycatch of sea turtles in ICCAT fisheries. Pursuant to this resolution, parties agreed to share all available information on technical measures to reduce the incidental capture of sea turtles in ICCAT fisheries and ensure the safe handling of turtles that are released. ICCAT also resolved to have its scientific body develop standardized data collection and reporting methods to assess the problem of sea turtle bycatch. Furthermore, the United States provided significant information about research that has been conducted in the northern Atlantic regarding methods to reduce the incidental capture and mortality of sea turtles by longline vessels.

At the 2002 Commission meeting, ICCAT adopted a resolution on the incidental mortality of seabirds. The resolution urges parties to inform SCRS and the Commission of the status of their National Plans of Action for Reducing Incidental Catches of Seabirds in Longline Fisheries (NPOA-Seabirds) and to implement such plans, where appropriate. Furthermore, the resolution encourages parties to collect and provide to SCRS all available information on interactions with seabirds, including incidental catches in all fisheries under the purview of ICCAT. SCRS is to conduct an assessment of the impact of incidental catch of seabirds resulting from the activities of ICCAT related fishing activity in the Convention area. In 2006, the SCRS met to begin the process of undertaking this assessment.

In 2005, ICCAT adopted a U.S. proposed resolution on circle hooks that encouraged research on their use in commercial longline, recreational, and artisanal fisheries. Parties were also encouraged to share information on fishing methods and gears changes that improve safe handling and research of incidentally caught species. Finally,

SCRS is to present an assessment of the impact of circle hooks on dead discard levels in ICCAT pelagic longline fisheries when feasible.

In 2005, ICCAT also adopted a U.S. proposal on pelagic sargassum that calls on parties to provide information on activities that impact sargassum on the high seas and requests the SCRS to examine the ecological importance of sargassum on ICCAT species.

Permanent Working Group (PWG):

*Trade Measures.* Up through 2003, much of the work of the PWG was guided by the Bluefin Tuna Action Plan Resolution (1994), the Swordfish Action Plan Resolution (1995), and the Unregulated and Unreported Catches (UU Catches) Resolution (1998), which were adopted to promote cooperation with ICCAT conservation measures. The Resolutions established mechanisms by which multilateral trade measures could be imposed against parties deemed to be diminishing the effectiveness of the ICCAT conservation measures for ICCAT species under certain circumstances. Following several years of work, ICCAT took a decisive step in 2003 to broaden its regime of trade restrictive measures and adopted a comprehensive trade resolution. The trade resolution adopted by ICCAT members applies equally to all fisheries and all parties (both ICCAT members and non-members), establishes a more transparent process for the application of trade restrictive measures, and uses comparable standards for evaluating fishery related activities. In addition, the resolution allows for swift re-imposition of trade sanctions in cases where parties recently released from sanctions act in bad faith and again engage in problem fishing activities. This comprehensive approach, which replaces the separate Action Plans, has bolstered ICCAT's already significant efforts to eliminate IUU fishing in the ICCAT Convention Area. In 2006, ICCAT adopted a few changes to the trade measures instrument, including making it a binding recommendation and adding specific language to cover farming information and activities.

Each year, and in accordance with the various instruments described, the Commission reviews fishery related activities in the Convention Area. Many countries under ICCAT scrutiny have had trade sanctions placed against them in the past but, due in large measure to pressure exerted through the multilateral process, have rectified their fishing activities and any agreed sanctions have been lifted. These parties include Belize, Costa Rica, Cuba, Equatorial Guinea, Honduras, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, and Singapore. Others continue to diminish the effectiveness of ICCAT. In the 2006 review, ICCAT agreed to identify Cambodia and Sierra Leone under the Trade Measures Resolution and to continue sanctions against Georgia and Bolivia. In 2004, Taiwan was identified under the trade measures resolution due to information indicating serious overharvests and misreporting activities by Taiwan vessels. In 2005, ICCAT reviewed the situation and adopted a measure setting very severe limitations on Taiwan's bigeye fishery and requiring Taiwan to take significant actions to improve monitoring and control of its fleet. This decision was taken in lieu of imposing trade sanctions. In 2006, ICCAT acknowledged the progress made by Taiwan to rectify the situation, including reducing fleet capacity, and reinstated Taiwan's bigeye tuna quota. A second recommendation was adopted, however, that requires Taiwan to continue certain monitoring and control activities, including periodic reports on its compliance activities through 2007 and continued efforts to eliminate IUU fishing supported by Taiwan business interests. In addition, several vessels were put on ICCAT's 2007 IUU list (see Compliance Committee section for more information on the IUU vessel list).

*Statistical Document Programs:* A bluefin tuna statistical document program (BSD program) was established by the Commission in the early 1990s. It covers fresh and frozen fish. Subsequently, statistical document programs were adopted for swordfish (fresh and frozen) and bigeye tuna (frozen). These programs contribute to ICCAT's review of fishery activities under the trade instrument and can also assist with catch data verification regarding members and non-members. The programs track trade of product and provides information on the flag state and name of the harvesting vessel, the location of harvest, the point of export, a description of the fish in the shipment and the like. Updates to the statistical document programs have been adopted since the first program was established. For example, the Commission adopted a recommendation changing the documents to include a field for the harvesting vessels ICCAT record number (under ICCAT's authorized vessel listing program) and, for the bluefin tuna statistical document, the collection of information on the farming operation that the bluefin tuna products came from, where

applicable. Intersessional meetings of ICCAT have been held over the past several years to consider additional improvement in the programs but little progress has been made. The most significant issue is whether one or more of the programs should be changed from a program to track product only after it enters trade or to track product from the point of catch. This matter will be the subject of another discussion in the summer of 2007.

In 2006, ICCAT adopted a U.S. proposal to establish electronic statistical document pilot programs. Also in 2006, The Commission adopted a Japanese proposal designed to enhance control and management of ICCAT quotas through cooperation between and among parties. This recommendation specifies that flag countries shall validate bluefin tuna statistical documents only when a country has not exhausted its quota and is in compliance with other relevant conservation and management measures. Importing states shall not import bluefin tuna unless the statistical document is duly validated. Finally, countries are required to cooperate to ensure statistical documents are not forged or do not contain misinformation.

*Cooperating Parties:* ICCAT continues to encourage certain non-members to become cooperating parties. Granting such status helps ICCAT expand and improve its control over the fisheries under its purview. Non-members with said status agree to voluntarily abide by ICCAT's rules and in return receive certain benefits, such as qualifying for quota allocations and placing their vessels on the "positive" vessel list (see Compliance Committee section for more information on vessel lists). ICCAT recently clarified the criteria and responsibilities of cooperating parties, and in 2003 adopted a recommendation on criteria for attaining the status of cooperating party. The new measure also outlines the type of information countries need to submit for consideration and allows for the yearly review of those in cooperating status.

Over the years ICCAT has granted cooperating status to Mexico (1998), Taiwan (aka Chinese Taipei - 1998), the Philippines (2000), and Guyana (2003). Netherlands Antilles was granted cooperating status in 2004. This status was revoked in 2006, however, since that country did not respond to issues raised in a 2005 ICCAT letter and no catch information was provided by Netherlands Antilles to ICCAT. Mexico joined the Commission in 2002 and the Philippines in 2004.

*Other Actions:* In an effort to improve ICCAT statistics, the Commission adopted at its 1999 meeting a resolution on improving recreational fishery statistics that calls on parties to provide to the SCRS specific data relating to recreational fisheries. Beginning in 2000, parties are also required to include a discussion of such data in their annual national report. In the future, SCRS will carry out an examination of the extent and impact of recreational fisheries on Atlantic tunas and tuna-like species.

Other measures adopted by ICCAT that remain in effect include: (1) a recommendation establishing a process for reporting and taking action against stateless vessels and for reporting observed possible violations by both non-Contracting and Contracting Parties (adopted in 1997); (2) a recommendation that prohibits landing and transshipment in ICCAT member ports by non-members under certain conditions (adopted in 1998); and (3) a recommendation to address attribution of catch classified as not-elsewhere included (NEI) to the catch data (Task 1) of the appropriate ICCAT member or non-member (adopted in 1997).

#### Compliance Committee:

*Terms of Reference:* At the 1995 meeting, the Commission adopted new terms of reference for its Compliance Committee (then, the Infractions Committee). The new terms were intended to strengthen the Committee's ability to evaluate compliance by Contracting Parties by allowing the Committee to make recommendations to the Commission on how to resolve problems of non-compliance by Contracting Parties and provide for the development of measures to ensure proper application of Convention provisions, including the development of international inspection and enforcement schemes.

*Data reporting:* In general, data reporting for ICCAT fisheries is poor although the situation differs depending on the fishery and on the country involved. In light of the need to improve this situation, ICCAT adopted a U.S.

proposal in 2005 to establish a process and procedure for reviewing compliance by ICCAT parties and cooperating parties with data submission requirements. Specifically, the recommendation on compliance with statistical reporting obligations establishes a procedure for identifying data gaps and their causes and for developing appropriate actions to address those data problems. The measure tasks the SCRS with providing a report of data gaps and their impacts on assessments. It further requires the responsible member or cooperating party to explain the reporting deficiency and provide a plan for corrective action. The measure provides that the Commission can recommend appropriate action based on relevant information.

*Quota compliance:* In the mid-1990s, ICCAT adopted first ever recommendations on Contracting Party quota compliance, which apply to the Atlantic bluefin tuna and swordfish fisheries. (Brazil, Uruguay, and South Africa formally objected to the southern swordfish quota compliance measure, and are, therefore, not bound to its provisions. The established process requires members to first explain how overharvests for the subject species occurred and the actions taken or to be taken to prevent further overharvests. Overharvests must be paid back in full and additional actions, including application of quota penalties, can be considered. Application of these measures was clarified at the 1998 ICCAT meeting. In some instances, the issue of quota payback (and carry forward in the case of underharvests) is dealt with in specific species recommendations, such as for eastern bluefin tuna. Such provisions take precedence over the general quota compliance provisions.

Full implementation of ICCAT's member compliance regime has been slow. In the past, there have been numerous delays in the submission of reporting tables by ICCAT members. Once reported, some members have altered their compliance data one or more times during the ICCAT meeting without explanation. Moreover, while reviewing member compliance, it has become apparent that there are fundamental differences in interpretation of both ICCAT's conservation and management measures as well as its compliance rules. ICCAT has made effort to improve the compliance regime, including by requiring earlier submission of compliance data, but progress has been slow and application of the rules remains problematic. Despite this, ICCAT has been adopting a "Compliance Annex" each year based on data submitted by members in their reporting tables, which serves as the official record of harvest possibilities from year to year—taking into account the need for quota payback or carryover.

*IUU Fishing and Trade Issues:* As noted above, a number of ICCAT's recommendations provide for the use of trade restrictive measures against ICCAT members. This was done for the first time in 1999, when a recommendation was adopted that required ICCAT members to prohibit the import of bluefin tuna from Equatorial Guinea pursuant to the terms of ICCAT's compliance recommendation regarding bluefin tuna and swordfish quotas. This action was agreed to given the fact that Equatorial Guinea did not have a quota for either stock of bluefin tuna, did not report catch data to the Commission, and had not taken any steps to address concerns expressed by ICCAT in repeated communications. At the 2004 meeting, trade restrictions were lifted for Equatorial Guinea.

In 1999, for the first time, the Commission identified ICCAT members pursuant to its "Resolution Concerning the Unreported and Unregulated Catches of Tunas by Large-Scale Longline Vessels in the Convention Area," adopted in 1998. (For a description of this resolution, see the PWG section above.) Upon review of relevant information, the Commission identified three Contracting Parties (Equatorial Guinea, Republic of Guinea, and Trinidad and Tobago) as nations whose large-scale longline vessels have been fishing for ICCAT species in a manner that diminishes the effectiveness of relevant ICCAT conservation and management measures. ICCAT requested that these countries take all necessary measures to ensure that their large-scale longline vessels cease fishing operations for tuna and tuna-like species in a manner inconsistent with ICCAT conservation measures. The Commission considered at its 2000 meeting whether or not to recommend that trade restrictive measures be placed against any of these three ICCAT members and adopted a measure that requires its members to ban the import of bigeye tuna from Equatorial Guinea. These sanctions have since been lifted. Fishery related infractions and compliance are now reviewed in accordance with the 2003 trade measure resolution (no recommendation). (See PWG section for information on the trade measures resolution (now recommendation) and for information on trade actions relative to non-members.) Fishing activities by a number of ICCAT members have been considered pursuant to the trade recommendation but no additional trade restrictive measures have been adopted.

In 2005, a non-binding measure was adopted by ICCAT that specified conditions under which an ICCAT member could register or flag a vessel, including by requiring the presentation of proof of consent from the previous registry that the ship can be transferred. The measure also urged the proposed flagging country to investigate the history of compliance of the vessel to be flagged with ICCAT's rules or the rules of other RFMOs.

At the 2006 ICCAT meeting, ICCAT adopted a binding measure designed to control IUU fishing and promote compliance through the conduct of investigations into the activities of nationals subject to an ICCAT member's jurisdiction. The measure also requires that information on such investigations be reported to ICCAT subject to national confidentiality requirements.

*Monitoring and Control:* ICCAT has a number of measures in effect relating to monitoring and control, including with regard to VMS, port inspection, in port landings and transshipments, at sea transshipment (see below for more information), vessel sightings, vessel chartering, vessel lists (see below for more information), recording of catches, duties of a flag state, and others. In an effort to comprehensively evaluate and strengthen where needed ICCAT's monitoring and control measures as well as identify gaps, a Working Group on Integrated Monitoring and Control Measures was established. It has met three times in recent years and is set to meet again the summer of 2007. Topics of discussion could include at sea boarding and inspection, improvements to ICCAT's port inspection program, trade/catch monitoring, and possibly enhancing the use of observers in ICCAT fisheries.

*Vessel Lists.* ICCAT adopted proposals at its 2002 meeting to establish positive and negative (IUU) vessel lists. The list of authorized vessels is compiled by ICCAT. Regarding the negative list, the Secretariat compiles a provisional negative vessel list based on input from parties and circulates it for consideration each year. Based on the agreed negative (IUU) list, ICCAT members and cooperating parties are to take all necessary measures not to support the fishing activities of vessels on the list, including prohibiting imports, landings or transshipments of ICCAT species. Significantly, amendments to ICCAT's IUU list were adopted in 2006, including defining IUU activities, establishing a process to remove vessels from the list intersessionally (by majority decision), and extending the measure to ICCAT member vessels. Both the positive and negative vessel lists can be viewed at [www.ICCAT.int](http://www.ICCAT.int).

*At-Sea Transshipment Controls:* After several years of negotiation, the Commission succeeded in adopting a measure for the monitoring and control of transshipments of ICCAT species. The 2005 recommendation, which was revised in 2006, requires at sea transshipment operations to take place in port with the exception of large-scale tuna longline vessels. (Small scale longline vessels are exempt from the requirements of the recommendation for the time being.) The measure establishes standards and procedures for transshipments by large scale tuna longline vessels that occur on the high seas and within areas of national jurisdiction. The measure establishes a record of carrier vessels authorized to receive ICCAT-managed species and requires carrier vessels to use VMS and to have an ICCAT observer on board. It also establishes an ICCAT Regional Observer Program for placing observers on carrier vessels in the Atlantic – the first of its kind at ICCAT. The observer program is up and running and is funded by members and cooperating parties engaging in transshipment operations. The program is operated by the ICCAT Secretariat, who is responsible for training and placement of observers. Nationals/residents of ICCAT parties and cooperating parties are eligible for the program.

#### Other Issues:

*Large-Scale Tuna Vessel Size:* Since 2004, discussions have been underway concerning the need to reclassify large-scale vessels from greater than 24 m to a smaller size, perhaps 15 m or greater. Proposals have been stymied due to uncertainty about the overall affect on fleets and management. This discussion is expected to continue and information on the impact of such a change for each party and for ICCAT should be compiled.

*Transparency:* In a significant development, the United States was successful in improving the transparency of ICCAT by getting agreement at the 1998 meeting on meaningful changes to the Commission's guidelines and criteria for granting observer status at ICCAT meetings. Among other things, these changes resulted in lower

participation fees. Representatives from several non-governmental organizations participated in the 1999 ICCAT meeting representing their organizations at an ICCAT meeting for the first time and subsequent meetings have seen a continuation of this participation.

*Fishing Capacity:* Overcapacity is a serious problem in many ICCAT-managed fisheries as it contributes to poor stock productivity, unsatisfactory economic performance, and excessively contentious management discussions. ICCAT, like other Regional Fishery Management Organizations (RFMOs) and most national governments, has experienced problems in its efforts to effectively and efficiently manage fisheries. Overcapacity may be directly responsible for overharvest in these fisheries. The United States has been working for several years to establish a capacity working group within ICCAT. At its 2006 meeting, ICCAT adopted the U.S. proposal setting up this group. It will meet in the United States in July 2007 to determine data needs as assess the level of fishing capacity by country/fleet/gear/fishery in light of the status of the resources and available fishing possibilities--with priority being given to eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean bluefin tuna. The working group may, if necessary, develop guidelines for managing capacity.

*Compendium Working Group:* Efforts have been underway for a number of years to develop a revised format for ICCAT compendium of recommendations and resolutions. If agreed, such a compendium should make it easier to see what rules are in place for ICCAT's fisheries and fleets. There is some hesitancy on the part of some members, however, to embrace the compendium developed by a subset of ICCAT's members (the so called Key Contacts of the Compendium Working Group) if the resultant document will, in essence, replace the measures adopted at each annual meeting rather than just being a user guide. In that regard, there are legitimate interpretive issues that were presented to the Commission for resolution. Unfortunately, ICCAT as a whole has not yet reached agreement concerning the purpose and status of the revised compendium. This issue is to be revisited in 2007.

*Driftnets:* In 2003, a provision prohibiting the use of driftnets in the Mediterranean Sea for large pelagics was adopted. Morocco was identified as having driftnet fisheries in violation of the recommendation. Currently, they are working toward improving their compliance, and have requested financial assistance in order to help accomplish that goal.

*Recreational fisheries:* In 2006, ICCAT adopted a joint US-EC proposal to establish a working group on Sport and Recreational fisheries. The working group is to examine the biological and economic impacts of recreational and sport fisheries on ICCAT stocks, assess the level of harvest, identify approaches for managing these fisheries and report the results of the deliberations to ICCAT with a view to proposing appropriate recommendations. This group is expected to meet in early 2008. In the meantime, ICCAT adopted an EC proposal in 2004 banning the use of certain gear in Mediterranean recreational fisheries as well as the sale of recreationally caught ICCAT species from the Mediterranean.

*Strengthening ICCAT:* In 2005, the Commission adopted a Canadian proposal that follows up on initiatives endorsed at several international meetings to improve and strengthen RFMOs. The adopted resolution committed the Commission to review ICCAT's conservation and management regime and to develop a work plan to strengthen the organization at the 2006 annual meeting. Following up on the commitments made in 2005, ICCAT adopted a resolution in 2006 on the strengthening of ICCAT that acknowledges the importance of the intersessional work on capacity and monitoring and control. In addition, the resolution included terms of reference for a working group on the future of ICCAT. This working group will meet in 2008 to consider the ICCAT Convention and recommendations and resolutions *vis a vis* relevant international treaties and agreements. The review will also include consideration of ICCAT's decision making process, its current structure, issues raised at the 2006 Chair's regional workshops, and any other matters of relevance. After undertaking this comprehensive review, the working group will make recommendations to strengthen the organization, possibly including amending the Convention, the organization's rules of procedure, or other matters.

A complete accounting of all ICCAT conservation and management measures can be found on the ICCAT website ([www.ICCAT.int](http://www.ICCAT.int)). The Twentieth Regular Meeting of the Commission will be held November 9-18, 2007, in Antalya, Turkey. The plenary meeting of the SCRS is scheduled for October 1-5, 2007, in Madrid, Spain.

**Staff Contacts**

*NOAA Fisheries:*

Kimberly Blankenbeker and Kelly Denit  
Office of International Affairs  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
1315 East-West Highway  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Tel: 301-713-2276  
Fax: (301) 713-2313  
E-mails: [Kimberly.Blankenbeker@noaa.gov](mailto:Kimberly.Blankenbeker@noaa.gov)  
[Kelly.Denit@noaa.gov](mailto:Kelly.Denit@noaa.gov)

*Department of State:*

Deirdre Warner-Kramer  
Office of Marine Conservation (OES/OMC)  
U.S. Department of State  
2201 C Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20520-7818  
Telephone: (202) 647-2335  
Fax: (202) 736-7350  
E-mail: [Warner-KramerDM@state.gov](mailto:Warner-KramerDM@state.gov)

**Convention for the Conservation of Salmon in the North Atlantic Ocean  
(Basic Instrument for the North Atlantic Salmon Conservation Organization -- NASCO)**

**Basic Instrument**

Convention for the Conservation of Salmon in the North Atlantic Ocean (TIAS 10789), 1982.

**Implementing Legislation**

Atlantic Salmon Convention Act of 1982 (16 U.S.C. 3601).

**Members**

Canada, Denmark (in respect of the Faeroe Islands and Greenland), the European Commission or EC, Iceland, Norway, the United States, and the Russian Federation.

**Commission Headquarters**

North Atlantic Salmon Conservation Organization  
11 Rutland Square  
Edinburgh, EH1 2AS Scotland  
United Kingdom

Secretary: Dr. Malcolm Windsor  
Tel: 44 131 228 2551  
Fax: 44 131 228 4384  
E-mail: hq@nasco.int  
Web address: www.nasco.int

**Budget**

The Convention provides that 30 percent of the Organization's budget will be borne equally by the Parties; 70 percent will be based on recent catches of salmon in intercepting fisheries. NASCO agreed on a 2008 draft budget of Pounds Sterling 641,180 but because of income (mainly from the NASCO headquarters property which is owned by the organization), the contribution of the Parties is Pounds Sterling 582,180 (USA share Pounds Sterling 24,951). The 2008 budget represents about a 4 percent increase over the previous year.

NASCO receives its scientific advice from the International Council for the Exploration of the Seas (ICES). After careful consideration, NASCO agreed to finalize its revised MOU with ICES which spells out the relationship between the two bodies and formalizes the cost structure associated with the provision of scientific advice. Although the MOU was agreed in principle in 2006, final approval was delayed last year pending clarification as to how payments would be affected if no advice were requested or if NASCO made a request for information that did not require peer review.

**U.S. Representation**

A. Appointment Process:

The Atlantic Salmon Convention Act of 1982 provides that the United States shall be represented on the Council and Commissions by three U.S. Commissioners, appointed by the President to serve at his pleasure. Of the

Commissioners, one must be an official of the U.S. Government and two must be individuals (not officials of the U.S. Government) who are knowledgeable or experienced in the conservation and management of salmon of U.S. origin.

B. U.S. Commissioners:

Patricia A. Kurkul  
Director, Northeast Regional Office  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
One Blackburn Drive  
Gloucester, MA 01930-2298

George D. LaPointe  
Commissioner  
Maine Department of Marine Resources  
21 State House Station  
Augusta, ME 04333

Stephen R. Gephard  
State of Connecticut  
Department of Environmental Protection  
Inland Fisheries Division  
P.O. Box 719  
Old Lyme, CT 06371

C. Advisory Structure:

The U.S. Section of NASCO was formally constituted to provide the U.S. Commissioners with advice, with particular reference to development of U.S. policies, positions, and negotiating tactics. Membership of the U.S. Section includes public and *ex officio* members. Public members are appointed by the Commissioners and serve for a term of 2 years with eligibility for an additional 2-year term. Public members are limited to 15 in number and must be persons knowledgeable or experienced in the conservation and management of salmon of U.S. origin.

*Ex officio* members include:

- (1) the Chair (or designee) of the New England Fishery Management Council;
- (2) a representative of the fishery agency of each of the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut;
- (3) the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and Space or her representative;
- (4) a representative of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce; and
- (5) a representative of the Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior.

In addition, the U.S. Commissioners established the U.S. Atlantic Salmon Assessment Committee, which is composed of staff from State and Federal fishery agencies. The work of this body focuses on assessing New England stocks of Atlantic salmon, proposing and evaluating research needs, and serving the U.S. Section to NASCO. Each year this body meets for an Assessment Meeting from which an assessment document is produced for the use of the U.S. Commissioners.

**Description**

A. Mission/Purpose:

The Convention applies to the salmon stocks that migrate beyond areas of fisheries jurisdiction of coastal states of

the Atlantic Ocean north of 36°N latitude throughout their migratory range. The purpose of NASCO is to promote (1) the acquisition, analysis, and dissemination of scientific information pertaining to salmon stocks in the North Atlantic Ocean and (2) the conservation, restoration, enhancement, and rational management of salmon stocks in the North Atlantic Ocean through international cooperation.

#### B. Organizational Structure:

NASCO consists of: (1) the Council; (2) three regional Commissions (North American Commission or NAC, West Greenland Commission or WGC, and North-East Atlantic Commission or NEAC); and (3) the Secretariat. The Council, which consists of representatives of all Contracting Parties: (1) provides a forum for the study, analysis, and exchange of information on salmon stocks subject to the Convention; (2) provides for consultation and cooperation concerning salmon stocks beyond Commission areas; (3) coordinates the activities of the Commissions; (4) establishes working arrangements with the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) and other fisheries and scientific organizations; (5) makes recommendations concerning scientific research; (6) supervises and coordinates the administrative, financial, and other internal affairs of the Organization; and (7) coordinates the Organization's external relations.

The three Commissions each have the following functions: (1) to provide for consultation and cooperation among their members; (2) to propose regulatory measures for intercepting salmon fisheries; and (3) to make recommendations to the Council concerning scientific research.

Canada and the United States are members of the NAC. Canada, the EU, the United States, and Denmark (in respect of Greenland), are members of the WGC. Recently, Iceland has begun to express an interest in joining the WGC but no formal request has been made. Denmark (in respect of the Faeroe Islands), the EU, Iceland, Norway, and the Russian Federation are members of the NEAC. In the case of the NAC, the EU may submit and vote on proposals for regulatory measures concerning salmon stocks originating in the territories of its member States. Canada and the United States each have similar rights in the case of the NEAC.

#### C. Programs:

Scientific Advice: Scientific advice is provided to NASCO by ICES. The Advisory Committee on Fishery Management (ACFM), a standing committee within ICES, provides information on catch statistics and associated research results in response to the specific requests from NASCO. At the 1992 annual meeting, the NASCO Council established a Standing Scientific Committee (SSC), composed of a scientist and a management representative from each of NASCO's three geographic commissions, to formulate requests for future scientific advice from ICES. The SSC is designed to ensure that questions to the scientific working groups are formed to reflect accurately the information desired by managers. This arrangement is being continued, as it seems to be working well.

Non-Contracting Party Fishing: Fishing for Atlantic salmon by non-Contracting Parties to the NASCO Convention has been an issue for the organization for some time. At the 1992 meeting held in Washington, D.C., the Council approved a protocol to the NASCO Convention for signature by non-Contracting Parties to NASCO. The protocol was designed to provide non-Contracting Parties with a legal instrument for the creation and enforcement of domestic legislation and regulations. It calls upon non-members to prohibit the fishing of Atlantic salmon stocks beyond the areas of fishing jurisdiction of coastal states and to take appropriate actions to enforce the provisions of the protocol. The NASCO Council also approved a resolution calling upon NASCO Parties to encourage non-Contracting Parties fishing for salmon on the high seas to comply with the protocol, and to obtain and compile information on such fishing. The NASCO Secretariat was given the task of devising a mechanism by which Parties to the NASCO Convention may approach states in which vessels observed to be fishing on the high seas for Atlantic salmon are registered and of documenting and disseminating information on high seas fishing activities contrary to the protocol.

To date, no non-Contracting Parties have become bound by the protocol, although certain non-Contracting Parties (i.e., Panama and Poland) have taken actions to address the problem of salmon harvesting vessels registered in their countries. There have been no sightings of non-Contracting Parties fishing for salmon since February 1994. However, there have been few surveillance flights conducted over the winter and spring periods preceding NASCO annual meetings. Past estimates of catch taken by non-member vessels fishing in international waters has been 25-100 metric tons (mt).

The Council considered and did not pursue a proposal to conduct a pilot project to assess the utility of radar satellite data for the detection of salmon fishing by non-Contracting Parties in international waters; however, NASCO agreed to continue to consider the usefulness of satellite surveillance systems in this regard. Toward that end, NASCO intends to hold a follow-up meeting to its 1993 meeting in the next few years with coast guard/fishery protection agencies to review the results of a study of Norwegian satellite surveillance systems. NASCO will also continue to liaise with the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization and the North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission (NEAFC) with a view to obtaining relevant information on sightings.

Unreported Catch: The Council has expressed continuing concern over the years about the level of unreported catch and has taken steps to try to reduce it. In 2007, NASCO convened a Special Session at its Annual Meeting to provide an opportunity for exchange by the Parties on: methods used to estimate unreported catches; trends in estimates of unreported catches; the source of unreported catches; and the measures being taken to minimize them. A time series of reporting for estimates of unreported catch (1999 – 2006) was developed and made available to the parties (CNL(07)10). The data identifies estimates that range from a low of 534 tonnes (2006) to a high of 1,445 tonnes (2000), and represents estimates of unreported catch between 27-38% of the reported confirmed catch. The reason for review and greater scrutiny of information relative to unreported catch is founded on a number of factors. Foremost, the lack of reporting and under-reporting of catch, as well as illegal fishing, threaten salmon conservation. In addition, management measures to restrict legal fisheries in response to declines in salmon stocks can be offset by non-documented fishing mortality, all of which can have adverse resource and socio-economic impacts.

In general, sources of unreported catch include illegal target fishing; by-catch in directed fisheries for other species in riverine, estuarine and marine environments where it is illegal to retain salmon; and under-reporting in legal recreational and aboriginal fisheries. Unreported catches within the jurisdiction of many Parties may occur in localized fisheries that take place over broad geographic ranges with multiple rivers. All parties agreed that it is difficult to quantify unreported catches given that they result primarily from illegal fishing. Many Parties indicated that where legal salmon fisheries are allowed, surveys by, and local knowledge of, enforcement authorities have been used to quantify unreported catches. Also, local management groups and associations have often been approached to gather information. Additional methods for estimating unreported catch include analyses and comparison of catch statistics over multiple years and analyses of catch per unit effort from different netting sites or stations. In some cases, catch statistics from local anglers have been compared to catch statistics from foreign anglers which appear to be more accurate.

While it is agreed that the precise size of unreported catch in the jurisdictions of respective Parties is difficult to ascertain, trends in the level of unreported catch and related violations across jurisdictions suggest a decline in the amount of unreported catch. In some jurisdictions declines appear to correspond with increases in successful prosecutions and the severity of penalties imposed. Also, there are instances where sources of unreported catch in some aboriginal fisheries are now included in reported catch due to recent negotiated agreements. In recent years, regulatory measures such as area closures, onboard or at site observers, tagging and documentation of catch, sale, transfer or disposal by fishery proprietors or operators, and logbooks for recreational angling have been implemented. Public outreach, education, and notices likely have also proved to be useful in reducing unreported catch. The Council agreed to revisit the matter of unreported catch at its next meeting and has encouraged the Parties to maintain and continue efforts to reduce and eliminate unreported catch, and recommended that Parties include actions related to unreported catch in their Implementation Plans.

**Research Fishing:** At its 1995 Annual Meeting, NASCO first considered conditions under which research fishing by Contracting Parties might be undertaken. While all agreed that harvesting salmon for scientific research purposes could provide valuable management information, some were concerned that such research fishing could be contrary to Article 2 of the NASCO Convention. Following the 1995 Annual Meeting, the Parties considered a resolution to establish such a procedure, but for various reasons, NASCO was not able to adopt the resolution as presented. At the 1996 Annual Meeting, the Parties considered revised resolutions on the topic and adopted a resolution setting forth a procedure to allow research fishing. The measure does not distinguish where such fishing occurs (i.e., within areas of national jurisdiction or on the high seas) and allows research fishing provided certain safeguards are observed. Since the adoption of the resolution, NASCO has approved research-fishing proposals from several of its members.

**International Atlantic Salmon Research Board (IASRB):** Due to concerns about marine survival of salmon, the Council agreed at its 2000 meeting to set up a working group to develop ideas for a 5-year international cooperative research program to identify and explain the causes of increased marine mortality of Atlantic salmon and to consider ways to counteract this problem. The resultant IASRB was established and has been meeting regularly to identify and coordinate needed research and consider funding sources. The United States has agreed to provide US\$150,000 as start up funding but additional monetary contributions have been slow to materialize. Other NASCO members are providing support to the work of the board, primarily in the form of in-kind contributions.

In 2007, the IASRB updated its inventory of research related to salmon mortality in the sea, received advice from its Scientific Advisory Group, and received a progress report on implementing and promoting the Salmon at Sea (SALSEA) program. The Board had agreed to fund an extension to the West Greenland Sampling Program to allow examination of trophic feeding state and condition of salmon – continent of origin and age at maturity comparisons. In the event that ICES organizes a second workshop on the Development and Use of Historical Salmon Tagging Information from Oceanic Areas, the Board agreed to fund the participation of a GIS expert and oceanographer. The Board had unanimously elected Dr Ken Whelan as its new Chairman. The Board had also considered a number of finance and administrative issues. Funding for the SALSEA work continues to be an issue, although Canada has agreed to provide some funding for various projects. A particular concern for some is the need to increase studies into the migration and distribution of salmon at sea through marine surveys in 2008 and 2009.

**Precautionary Approach:** In 1997, the Council agreed to establish a working group to consider how the precautionary approach might be applied to NASCO's work. Its first meeting was held in January 1998 and representatives of ICES and FAO were invited to attend. At its 1998 annual meeting, NASCO adopted an agreement on adoption of the precautionary approach, which was largely developed at the 1998 intersessional. The key provisions of the agreement were: (a) NASCO and its Contracting Parties agree to adopt and apply a precautionary approach; (b) NASCO and its Contracting Parties should apply the precautionary approach to the entire range of NASCO salmon conservation and management activities; and (c) the application of the precautionary approach should focus on (1) management of North Atlantic salmon fisheries, (2) the formulation of management advice and associated scientific research, and (3) introductions and transfers including aquaculture impacts and possible use of transgenic salmon. To further this work, NASCO adopted the Action Plan for the Application of the Precautionary Approach to Salmon Management at its 1999 meeting. The action plan provides a framework to further implement the precautionary approach in NASCO and establishes a standing committee to oversee this work. The action plan addresses such issues as: management of fisheries; socioeconomic issues; unreported catches; scientific advice and research requirements; stock rebuilding programs; introductions, transfers, aquaculture and transgenics; habitat issues; and bycatch. The agreement by NASCO to apply the precautionary approach to its work represents a significant milestone in cooperation by the Parties. The NASCO Parties recognized that ultimate development of the precautionary approach will take many years and will seriously challenge the resources of the organization and its members. Progress has been made on a number of fronts, however, including the development of a decision structure for use by the Council and Commissions as well as by relevant authorities of NASCO member in the management of single and mixed stock salmon fisheries; a plan of action for the application of the precautionary approach to the protection and restoration of Atlantic salmon habitat; revision and broadening of the Oslo Resolution, including incorporating into it all other NASCO measures addressing introductions, transfers,

aquaculture and transgenics (i.e., the guidelines on transgenic salmon, the NAC protocols, and the NEAC resolution, and the guidelines on containment). In addition, guidelines on stocking were developed and appended. The new and improved resolution was dubbed the Williamsburg Resolution. In addition, progress has been made in the area of the socio-economics through the adoption of guidelines for incorporating social and economic factors in decisions under the precautionary approach.

*Liaison Group:* NASCO has recognized the need to involve the salmon farming industry in efforts to protect the wild stocks through improved salmon farming management. Toward that end, NASCO established a Wild and Farmed Salmon Liaison Group with the International Salmon Farmer's Association (ISFA) to effect closer cooperation with the salmon farming industry. This group has met several times since its inception, but until its 2007 meeting, NGOs were not invited to participate. At its more recent meeting, the group agreed that it should: (1) share information on area management initiatives (local cooperation between wild and farmed salmon interests to address impacts of aquaculture on wild stocks, e.g. from sea lice) and promote area management to NASCO's Parties; (2) continue to explore opportunities for cooperation between wild and farmed salmon interests and that reports of such initiatives should be made available to the Group; (3) hold a one-day session at its next meeting focusing solely on the level and causes of escapes and opportunities to minimize them; (4) encourage research into alternative treatments for sea lice and make representations to the authorities urging that they make effective sea lice treatments available as quickly as possible where these are environmentally acceptable. The industry representatives at the Liaison Group had agreed to explore how they might support the SALSEA program. They had also agreed to develop a discussion document on how NASCO could further support the salmon farming industry. This discussion document had been received and was entitled 'Incentivising the Industry'.

In considering the results of the Liaison group meeting and the discussion document presented by industry, the Council decided that a Joint Technical Task Force should be established to consider matters further. Membership would be from the Secretariat and two or three nominated expert participants from NASCO and ISFA, and it will likely meet before the 2008 NASCO meeting. The Terms of Reference for this Group are: taking account of the findings in the 2005 ICES/NASCO Bergen Symposium, the Joint ISFA/NASCO Trondheim Workshop and any other relevant scientific information regarding impacts from aquaculture on wild stocks; and identify and agree on a series of best practice recommendations to address the continuing impacts of salmon farming on wild stocks (e.g. escapes, interbreeding, sea lice infestations, disease transfers to and from the wild). The Task Force should, for the time being, replace the NASCO/ISFA Liaison Group.

*Next Steps for NASCO:* On the occasion of its 20th anniversary, NASCO decided to undertake a review of the Organization in order to ensure that it was properly positioned to be able to address the current and future issues facing Atlantic salmon in the North Atlantic. Through an intensive working group process that included public scoping meetings, NASCO comprehensively reviewed its convention, rules of procedure, decision making, structure, and operations. The Working Group developed a Strategic Approach which articulated the vision for NASCO, framed future activities of NASCO, and laid out a clear approach for moving forward in addressing challenges and implementing the recommendations. The Council endorsed the work of the Working Group, calling for speedy implementation of some recommendations and setting up processes to consider implementation aspects for the more complicated issues, including those surrounding improving implementation of and reporting on Contracting Party commitments. A Public Relations Working Group was created to develop a strategy to raise the profile of the Organization and generally to improve public relations and outreach. A Task Force met intersessionally to develop improved reporting procedures to enhance compliance and accountability with NASCO agreements. Developing improvements to the transparency and inclusiveness of the organization, including by considering modification of the rules governing observers at NASCO meetings, was also a key recommendation. Advancements in all the areas identified for improvement have been made. Relevant information on the task force recommendation follows:

**Transparency:** Regarding transparency, revisions to NASCO's rules of procedures concerning NGOs were developed which increased their level of involvement, including allowing them to take the floor more frequently during NASCO meetings and participate in working groups. This move helped resolve a longstanding difference

between NASCO and at least two North American NGOs whose observer status in the organization had been suspended. In addition, more debate on issues occurs in plenary rather than in Heads of Delegation meetings so that the rationale for decisions is more clearly understood.

Accountability/Implementation Plans: During its 2005 annual meeting, NASCO agreed that one way to improve implementation, commitment, and accountability was to have each Party produce an Implementation Plan (IP) and report annually on progress in achieving the objectives contained therein. The Next Steps Task Force met intersessionally before the 2006 Annual meeting developed guidelines to assist the Parties in preparing the IPs and to provide a proposed process and schedule for review and finalization of IPs, as well as for focus area reports under the IPs. The Council refined this work at the 2006 annual meeting. At the 2007 NASCO meeting, the Council held an open “Special Session” on the Report of the *Ad Hoc* Review Group appointed in 2006 to evaluate the IPs. At this stage, the review focused on the structure of the plans and how well they conformed with the guidelines for development of the plans not the adequacy of their substantive content. It was agreed that plans should be submitted or resubmitted for final review by November 1, 2007. It was also decided that the next phase of review of the Next Steps Process would be to focus on the areas of fisheries management in the Implementation Plans.

Public Relations Group: As part of the Next Steps process, the Council agreed in 2006 to establish a Public Relations Group to advise on implementation of public relations/outreach issues. Terms of reference were adopted. The Public Relations Group met in London in December 2006. The Group developed recommendations for a strategy to enhance NASCO’s profile and increase publicity for its work, including development of an annual ‘State of salmon populations’ report, undertake a major enhancement of the Organization’s website, and employ an Information Officer with good public relation skills. In order to carry out some of the tasks identified by the PR group, the Council decided to allocate 25,000 Pounds Sterling (approximately USD\$50,000) to upgrade and improve the website of NASCO and the IASRB, and produce possible formats for a “State of the Salmon Stocks” report. Moreover, there was general agreement that the organization should be developing a communications rather than a public relations strategy. The work of the first meeting of the PR working group was seen as valuable in supporting future work in this area.

Socio-Economic Working Group: The Council had previously agreed that a Technical Working Group (TWG) should be held to consider the development of a bio-economic model. This decision was consistent with the decision in the ‘Strategic Approach for NASCO’s Next Steps, CNL(05)49, to continue and expand existing efforts to incorporate social and economic factors in the Organization’s work. However, for a number of reasons it had not been possible to organize a meeting of the TWG. Leading up to the annual meeting, Norway developed new terms of reference for a working group on socio-economics. After consultation, revised terms of reference were agreed that establish a working group with a broader mandate than the development of a bio-economic model. The working group will meet inter-sessionally at least once before the 2008 Annual Meeting. It was also agreed that appropriate experts, including the NGOs, would be invited to participate.

**Performance Review of the Work of NASCO:** A proposal was made by the EU to the Council that NASCO conduct a performance review similar to those being conducted by tuna Regional Fishery Management Organizations (RFMOs). Prior to the meeting, the performance criteria agreed to guide reviews for tuna RFMOs were circulated to all Parties. Most Parties expressed reservations to undertaking another review at this time in light of the Next Steps process. As a compromise, the US tabled a proposal which essentially called for a side-by-side comparison of the Next Steps process with the criteria and processes developed by tuna RFMO followed by an external review after the Next Steps process had been fully implemented. Consensus could not be reached on either the U.S. or EC proposals. After significant discussion over the course of the week, the Council agreed to postpone this matter until 2008, noting its commitment to undertake an additional external review, to be carried out by an appropriately experienced team of external and internal reviewers in the future. In 2008, the timing and terms of reference for such a review will be decided.

**Actions Taken by NASCO's Three Regional Commissions:**

NAC Discussions/Actions: The NAC heard scientific advice from ICES, indicating that all areas were below their conservation limit (CL) and suffering reduced reproductive capacity, except Newfoundland which was at risk of suffering reduced reproductive capacity. ICES advised that there are no catch options in the foreseeable future for the composite North American fisheries. Canada further stated that the sampling in the Labrador fishery would continue in 2007. Both Parties tabled reports outlining their science and management activities. Canada specifically highlighted a number of changes in rules and regulations that have the potential to significantly influence salmon management. Three major initiatives were introduced in Canada in 2007 that will affect Atlantic salmon management and conservation: modernization of the Fisheries Act to put emphasis on the Precautionary Approach to conserve fish and other resources; the introduction to stakeholders of a draft Wild Atlantic Salmon Conservation Policy, the first overhaul of these policies since 1986; and the establishment of an Atlantic Salmon Endowment Fund to which the Federal Government has contributed Can\$30 million. The report also described the regional plans for the management of the aboriginal and recreational fisheries in 2007. There is no commercial salmon fishery in Canada.

*The St Pierre and Miquelon Salmon Fishery:* The Secretary presented a report provided by France (in respect of St Pierre and Miquelon) containing updated information from the French authorities on the regulatory framework for managing the fishery, providing catch statistics and information on the number and type of licenses issued, and describing the sampling program conducted in 2006. France (in respect of St Pierre and Miquelon) was not in attendance this year, which was extremely disappointing to NASCO. The cooperating shown by France (in respect of St. Pierre and Miquelon) over the years has been inconsistent, and the organization has tried a wide variety of means to enhance this cooperation. In 2007, it was agreed to try a new approach in this regard; thus, NASCO agreed to invite France (in respect of SPM) to become a Party to the NASCO Convention.

*Salmonid Introductions and Transfers:* The U.S. and Canada agreed to meet inter-sessionally for discussions on this subject and other issues. The intention would be to hold a meeting in the fall 2007. The meeting would be based on the Framework for an Inter-sessional Meeting of the NAC Parties to Coordinate on Atlantic Salmon. The Commission decided that the agenda for the meeting would be mutually agreed. The Commission also agreed that discussions with regard to the development of a research plan for the Northwest Atlantic component of the SALSEA Program would continue during the summer with a view to resolving the issue at the inter-sessional meeting on introductions and transfers.

WGC Discussions/Actions: The WGC received scientific advice from ICES, which states that the stock complex at West Greenland is below conservation limits and thus suffering reduced reproductive capacity. In 2006, the North American stock complex and the Southern European stock complex are suffering reduced reproductive capacity. Thus, ICES concludes that none of the stated management objectives would allow a fishery at West Greenland to take place in 2007, 2008, or 2009. As previously stated, ICES provided a finalized FWI. There was a significant amount of discussion related to the FWI and whether NASCO or ICES would be responsible for applying the FWI. The Parties ultimately agreed that it should be NASCO's responsibility to collect the data from all Parties and apply the FWI when necessary. It was further agreed that there would be a representative from each of the members of the Commission to coordinate the collection of data and application of the FWI. NASCO would then communicate the conclusion of the analysis of the FWI to ICES. Given the depressed state of the stocks and the acceptance of the FWI by all Parties, the 2006 multi-annual regulatory measure will remain in place for 2007 and will likely be retained in 2008 as well. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) also stated that the Greenlandic government will consider accepting a new multi-annual advice at the NASCO Annual Meeting in 2009 in light of further development of the FWI, the continued research of the mortality of salmon stocks and possible improvement of the stocks.

There was also support from all Parties to continue the sampling program in the West Greenland Fishery. The West Greenland sampling brochure and poster were also completed and displayed during the Commission meeting.

NEAC Discussions/Actions: The NEAC received scientific advice from ICES, which estimates both Northern stocks (1SW and MSW) to be at full reproductive capacity and both Southern stocks (1SW and MSW) to be at risk of suffering reduced reproductive capacity prior to the commencement of any distant water fisheries. Thus, there are no options for the Faroese fishery that would be consistent with the precautionary approach.

For the Faroese fishery, ICES was unable to deliver a finalized FWI because of the lack of specific management objectives, the lack of a formalized sharing agreement for any harvestable surplus among the Parties of NASCO, no indicator datasets for the European stocks meeting the FWI criteria, and the lack of quantitative catch advice for 3 of the 4 contributing stock complexes. There was some concern expressed by the representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) with respect to the level of fishing that might be targeting river stocks that are not meeting conservation limits. The data reported to ICES is country specific and therefore not available on a river by river basis. The Chairman asked the representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) if a multi-annual measure could be considered in light of the view that the scientific advice from ICES was unlikely to change for a number of years. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) commented that it was difficult to argue that there should not be a fishery at Faroes when fisheries were operating in home waters on the same stocks. With regard to a regulatory measure for 2008, he indicated that Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) was prepared not to have a quota set for 2008. Ultimately all Parties agreed to accept the annual regulatory measure of no quota for 2008 and hopefully a multi-annual measure would be able to be negotiated in the future. The representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) stated that hopefully in the future countries will incorporate river specific information about the conservation limits of stocks into their Implementation Plans.

*Gyrodactylus salaris Working Group:* The Secretary gave a brief history of issues relating to *Gyrodactylus salaris*. In 2004, the Commission had adopted a road map for minimizing the risks posed by *G. salaris* and the risk of transmission to non-infested countries. The road map included terms of reference for a Commission Working Group and this Group reported in June 2006. It had not been possible for the group to meet since the last Annual Meeting. The Secretary asked the Parties if they wished the Working Group to continue to examine the risk of transmission of *G. salaris* and to update the Commission on measures to deal with this parasite. There was support from all Parties for the continuation of the *G. salaris* Working Group to operate. The role and objectives of the Working group were further defined and include:-monitoring the spread of the parasite; reviewing methods for identifying *G. salaris*; reviewing treatments methods; identifying control measures; and considering appropriate measures to prevent the spread of the parasite. The Commission agreed that the Working Group should meet prior to the next Annual Meeting and that the need for subsequent meetings be reviewed on an annual basis.

*Report on a Pilot Study to Improve Understanding of the Migration, Dispersal and Survival of Farmed Salmon:* It was agreed at the 2003 Annual Meeting of the North-East Atlantic Commission that a pilot program should be undertaken to determine the fate of salmon released from farms and to study the implications for wild salmon fisheries. Dr Lars Petter Hansen (Norway) presented the results of a study of two releases of farmed salmon in Scotland and Norway in 2006. In April 2006, 678 farmed salmon were released from a farm in the north-west of Scotland and in May, 594 salmon were released from a farm in mid-western Norway. The Norwegian fish were released in areas of high salmon fishing activity. Recapture rates were very low with a recapture rate of 0.6% and 7.0% respectively for Scottish and Norwegian fish. Norwegian fish were recorded both north and south of the release location but the majority of fish were recaptured in the release area. The study suggests that farmed salmon which escape from Scottish farms in spring are not as abundant as was previously suggested along the Norwegian coast. However, a large escape of farmed fish in Scotland may result in more significant numbers of farm fish appearing along the Norwegian coast. Recapture data suggest that the released farm salmon were following the predominant current. Dr. Hanson concluded that while it was somewhat controversial to release farmed salmon, there is need to continue these studies and release salmon at different life stages in order to understand more about the movement and migration of escaped farmed salmon.

*Other matters:* Additional information on the work of NASCO can be found on its website ([www.nasco.int](http://www.nasco.int)). The Council agreed to hold its 25th Annual Meeting in Spain, from June 2-6, 2008.

**Staff Contacts***NOAA Fisheries:*

Kim Blankenbeker  
International Fisheries Division (F/IA1)  
Office of International Affairs  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
1315 East-West Highway, Room 12635  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-2276  
Fax: (301) 713-2313  
e-mail: Kimberly.Blankenbeker@noaa.gov

Mary Colligan (F/NER)  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
One Blackburn Drive  
Gloucester, MA 01930  
Telephone: (978) 281-9116  
Fax: (978) 281-9394  
E-mail: Mary.Colligan@noaa.gov

*Department of State:*

Alex Curtis  
Office of Marine Conservation (OES/OMC)  
U.S. Department of State  
2201 C Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20520-7818  
Telephone: (202) 647-2335  
Fax: (202) 736-7350

**Convention on Future Multilateral Cooperation in the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries  
(Basic Instrument for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization -- NAFO)**

**Basic Instrument**

Convention on Future Multilateral Cooperation in the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries (entered into force January 1, 1979).

**Implementing Legislation**

Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention Act of 1995 (Title II of P.L.104-43).

**Member Nations**

Current members of NAFO include: Canada, Cuba, Denmark (in respect of the Faeroe Islands and Greenland), the European Union (EU), France (in respect of St. Pierre et Miquelon), Iceland, Japan, Republic of Korea, Norway, the Russian Federation, Ukraine, and the United States. The United States acceded to the Convention on November 29, 1995, and participated for the first time as a Contracting Party at the 1996 Annual Meeting (the United States attended earlier annual meetings as an observer).

**Commission Headquarters**

Executive Secretary: Dr. Johanne Fischer

Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization  
P.O. Box 638  
Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, Canada B2Y 3Y9  
Telephone: (902) 468-5590  
Fax: (902) 468-5538  
Web address: <http://www.nafo.int>

**Budget**

NAFO adopted a budget for 2007 of Can\$1,263,017 (approximately US\$1,069,357), of which the U.S. contribution is expected to be approximately Can\$219,871 (approximately US\$186,158).

**U.S. Representation**

A. The Appointment Process:

The Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention Act of 1995 provides that not more than three U.S. Commissioners and not more than three U.S. Representatives to the NAFO Scientific Council (see below) shall represent the United States in NAFO. Commissioners and Representatives are appointed by the Secretary of Commerce and serve at his pleasure. Each Commissioner and Representative is appointed for a term not to exceed 4 years, but is eligible for reappointment.

Of the three Commissioners, one (but no more than one) must be an official of the U.S. Government, at least one a representative of the commercial fishing industry, and one a voting (non-government employee) member of the New England Fishery Management Council. Commissioners must be knowledgeable and experienced concerning the fishery resources to which the NAFO Convention applies. Of the three U.S. Representatives to the NAFO

Scientific Council, at least one must be an official of the U.S. Government. All Representatives must be knowledgeable and experienced concerning the scientific issues dealt with by the Scientific Council.

B. U.S. Representatives:

U.S. Commissioners (expiration date in parentheses):

Dr. Dean Swanson (03/10)  
Chief, International Fisheries Affairs Division  
Office of International Affairs  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
1315 East-West Highway  
Silver Spring, MD 20910

John W. Pappalardo  
CCCHFA  
210 New Orleans Road  
N. Chatham, MA 02650

James W. Salisbury  
130 Eastern Promenade  
Portland, ME 04101

Representatives to the Scientific Council:

Fredric M. Serchuk  
Chief, Resource Evaluation and Assessment Division  
Northeast Fisheries Science Center  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
166 Water Street  
Woods Hole, MA 02543

C. Advisory Structure:

The Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention Act of 1995 further requires that the Secretaries of Commerce and State establish jointly a Consultative Committee to advise the Secretaries on issues related to the Convention. Each member of the Consultative Committee shall serve for a term of 2 years and shall be eligible for reappointment. The membership of the Committee shall consist of representatives from the New England and Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Councils, the States represented on those Councils, the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, the fishing industry, the seafood processing industry, and others knowledgeable and experienced in the conservation and management of fisheries in the Northwest Atlantic. There are currently six members of the NAFO Consultative Committee, excluding *ex officio* members.

**Organizational Description**

A. Mission/Purpose:

NAFO is the successor organization to the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries (ICNAF). Its mission is: (1) to provide for continued multilateral consultation and cooperation with respect to the study, appraisal, and exchange of scientific information and views relating to fisheries of the Convention Area and (2) to conserve and manage fishery resources of the NAFO Regulatory Area (NRA), i.e., that part of the Convention Area

which lies beyond the areas in which coastal states exercise fisheries jurisdiction. The Convention Area is located within the waters of the Northwest Atlantic ocean roughly north of 35\_ north latitude and west of 42\_ west latitude.

(Note: The Convention applies to all fishery resources of the Convention Area with the exception of: salmon; tunas, swordfish, and marlins; cetacean stocks managed by the International Whaling Commission or any successor organization; and sedentary species of the Continental Shelf.)

#### B. Structure:

NAFO consists of a General Council, Fisheries Commission, Scientific Council, a Secretariat, and seven standing committees. The General Council provides executive guidance for the Secretariat and provides a forum for member nations' approval of programs and regulations. The Scientific Council provides a forum for the exchange of scientific information and views relating to the fisheries of the Convention Area; compiles, maintains, and publishes statistics pertaining to the fisheries, including environmental and ecological factors in the Convention Area; provides scientific advice to coastal states when requested to do so; and provides scientific advice to the NAFO Fisheries Commission. The Fisheries Commission is responsible for the management and conservation of the fishery resources of the Regulatory Area. The Standing Committees consider and make recommendations in the areas of (1) finance and administration; (2) inspection and control; (3) fishery science; (4) research coordination; (5) publications; and (6) fisheries environment. The structure of NAFO is currently under review within the NAFO reform process and will likely undergo changes in the near-term. More information is contained in the section on NAFO Reform below.

#### C. General Programs:

Species managed: The principal species managed by NAFO are cod, flounders, redfish, American plaice, Greenland halibut (turbot), capelin and shrimp. Occasionally, a significant squid fishery occurs in the Regulatory Area as well. Following decades of unregulated fishing by non-members; over-harvesting, under-reporting and fishing under formal objection by members, 9 of the 19 stocks managed by NAFO have collapsed and remain at all-time low levels. NAFO-imposed moratoria continue for nine stocks in 2007. Details on current U.S. allocations from NAFO as well as efforts to reform the NAFO allocation process and secure a useable allocation of yellowtail flounder are detailed in the allocation section below.

Conservation and Management Measures: NAFO has established and maintained conservation and management measures in the NRA since 1979. In addition to adoption of annual total allowable catches (TACs), member nation quotas by species, and one fishing effort allocation), NAFO also maintains and establishes: 1) general and fishery-specific conservation and management measures (e.g., bycatch, minimum size and gear requirements); 2) control measures (e.g., fishing authorizations, vessel registry, and chartering requirements); and 3) monitoring requirements (data recording and reporting, vessel monitoring system (VMS) and observer requirements). In addition, NAFO has implemented: a scheme of joint international inspection and surveillance in the NRA, a scheme to promote compliance by non-Contracting Parties, and a listing mechanism for tracking IUU vessels.

#### D. Current Programs/Issues of Interest:

NAFO Reform: At its 2005 Annual Meeting, the NAFO General Council adopted a reform proposal creating an ad hoc working group with terms of reference to: 1) evaluate and recommend changes to the NAFO Convention to reform the NAFO decision-making process; 2) analyze options to streamline NAFO's structure and operations; and 3) provide other relevant recommendations to update the NAFO Convention. The Reform Working Group met twice in 2006 (April and September) and reported its results to the General Council during the 2006 NAFO Annual Meeting.

During both meetings of the Working Group and again at the 2006 NAFO Annual Meeting, the United States made clear its priorities for the NAFO reform effort (listed in no specific order): ensure a thorough review and updating of the NAFO Convention and the Organization itself; secure a fair and equitable allocation process that reflects the

legitimate interests of all NAFO Parties (e.g., a U.S. allocation of Division 3LNO yellowtail flounder); revise the NAFO Convention language on member dues assessments to distribute the funding burden more equitably among those who receive the most benefits from NAFO membership; continue to review and update the NAFO conservation and enforcement provisions to reflect a more comprehensive and modern approach to issues such as bycatch, the ecosystem approach to fisheries management, compliance and IUU fishing.

Although the Working Group was able to review the Convention in great detail and identify many potential changes to its text during its 2006 meetings, it was unable to reach consensus on the specifics of key issues such as: decision-making (including the objection procedure and dispute settlement), calculation of budget contributions, and allocations. During the 2006 NAFO Annual Meeting, compromise language on decision making was adopted. However, there was a general understanding that it could not be codified in a revised NAFO Convention without further adjustments. Thus, it was noted that “technical edits” would have to be made in the future. The General Council provided no guidance regarding future work on this topic.

Similarly, little progress was achieved on revision of the dues assessment process. This issue was tabled at the Reform Working Group by the United States, which pays the second highest dues in the Organization despite having had no catches in the NAFO Regulatory Area since becoming members. The current NAFO Convention includes a list of species to be used for determining the nominal catches used for calculating the annual budget. This list includes species that occur throughout the NAFO Convention Area (including within the EEZs of the three coastal States). However, NAFO maintains management measures in its Regulatory Area for fewer than half of these species. Budget assessments for NAFO Contracting Parties are currently applied as follows: 10% of the budget is divided among Coastal States (there are 3 --including the United States) in proportion to nominal catches in the Convention Area; 30% is divided equally among all Contracting Parties (there are now 12); and 60% is divided among all Contracting Parties based on nominal catches in the Convention Area.

The U.S. proposal on dues assessment focused on adjusting the percentages and species used in the assessment procedure to create a more equitable distribution of costs among Contracting Parties. Although there was agreement (in principle) among Working Group participants that this issue should be addressed in the future, the proposal was not accepted and some Parties stated that the issue should not be addressed in the NAFO reform process. Ultimately, there was agreement at the 2006 annual meeting that a special meeting should be held in the near future to resolve this outstanding issue.

Although there was considerable discussion during the Reform Working Group meetings regarding possible amendments to the NAFO Convention relating to allocations, the amended language ultimately adopted by the General Council was limited to a clarification that the interests of relevant coastal States should be taken into account in allocative decisions.

Finally, in an effort to streamline NAFO, the General Council (and Fisheries Commission) agreed at the 2006 NAFO Annual Meeting to fold the activities of the General Council’s Standing Committee on the Activities of non-Contracting Parties in the Regulatory Area (STACFAC) into those of the Fisheries Commission’s Standing Committee on International Control (STACTIC). The NAFO Secretariat will merge/update the Rules of Procedure for these bodies to reflect their new status in time for the 2007 Annual Meeting..

There will be a Special Meeting of the NAFO General Council in April 2007, to discuss suggested amendments to the NAFO Convention. This will likely be followed by a “technical editing” session, which will provide its results for consideration at the 2007 NAFO Annual Meeting. The United States will continue to push for a dues assessment process that provides a more equitable distribution of costs among Contracting Parties. Additionally, the United States will continue to seek further reform of the NAFO Convention text and adoption of a fair and equitable process for allocations.

NAFO Allocations:

*i) Current U.S. Allocations:* For 2007, the United States received the following country-specific allocations in the NRA: Division 3M redfish (69 mt); Subareas 3+4 *Illex* squid (453 mt); Division 3L shrimp (245 mt); and an effort allocation of 100 fishing days for 1 vessel for Division 3M shrimp. U.S. fishermen are also entitled to harvest, on a first-come-first-served basis, any allocation for which an “Others” category has been designated, provided there is not a country-specific allocation to the United States for that fishery. For 2007, “Others” category allocations available to U.S. fishermen include: Division 3LNO yellowtail flounder (76mt), Division 3O Redfish (100mt), Division 3NO white hake (500mt), and Division 3LNO skates (500mt). Additionally, the United States may fish any portion of the 627 mt of Oceanic redfish available to non-NEAFC members in Subarea 2 and Divisions 1F and 3K, on a first-come, first-served basis.

*ii) U.S. efforts to secure an allocation of yellowtail flounder:* For over 20 years, NAFO Division 3LNO yellowtail flounder was allocated exclusively to two Contracting Parties (Canada and the European Union), with a very small amount allocated to the “others” category. In 2005, the European Union (EU) agreed to forgo its allocation so that it could be given to France (on behalf of St. Pierre and Miquelon). Canada still receives the lion’s share (over 97%) of the allocations.

The NAFO Scientific Council provides advice on the status of the 3LNO yellowtail flounder stock biennially. This advice has resulted in a series of NAFO Fisheries Commission increases to the total allowable catch (TAC) for this stock (from 13,000mt in 2002 to 15,000 mt in 2005-2006). In 2006, the Scientific Council once again indicated that a TAC increase --to 15,500 mt each year for the 2007-2008 management period would be scientifically acceptable. Additionally, in response to a U.S. request for advice, the Scientific Council indicated that the current harvest rate for the stock could be increased from  $F=65\%msy$  to  $F=75\%msy$  (or even  $F=85\%msy$ ) with only a slight decrease in catch biomass over the next 10 years (but generating a greater accumulated harvest). The risk of the stock exceeding buffer limits for this stock under the precautionary approach at any of these harvest rates was miniscule.

In response to each of the TAC increases to this stock, the United States has tabled strong proposals for a (first time) national allocation based on: the relative (and increasing) good health of the stock; a demonstrated U.S. history of fishing for this stock in the NAFO Regulatory Area; and the principle that the agreed increase in TAC for this stock should be shared among all those with a history in the fishery. In all instances, although TAC increases were adopted, U.S. proposals for a share received little support.

In addition to its efforts to secure a useable share of Div. 3LNO yellowtail flounder “at the table” within NAFO, the United States has engaged in repeated bilateral meetings with Canadian government and fishing industry representatives. Although an early (failed) attempt was made to set up an industry-to-industry arrangement within the Canadian EEZ, the Canadian Government has been consistently unable/unwilling to support the United States in NAFO on this issue. U.S. efforts to secure this support have included many bilateral meetings, diplomatic communications and official visits by Department of State and National Marine Fisheries Service leadership to key Canadian officials and members of Parliament in Ottawa. Although the Canadian Government has continually expressed its understanding of the U.S. position on NAFO yellowtail flounder, the Canadian fishing industry (particularly in Newfoundland and Labrador) are not in favor of creating any new allocations within any existing Grand Banks fisheries. Specifically, they do not support the addition of another Party to the NAFO allocation key for yellowtail flounder, even if the TAC is increased such that there is no loss of fish for Canadian vessels/processors.

In bilateral consultations preceding the 2006 NAFO Annual Meeting, the United States shared yet another draft proposal with the Canadians on yellowtail. This proposal increased the harvest rate for the stock from  $F=65\%msy$  to  $F=75\%msy$ , resulting in a TAC of 17,200 mt for each year of the 2-year management period. From this increased TAC, the U.S. proposed an allocation of 14,000mt. This proposal was ultimately distributed to all NAFO Parties in advance of the 2006 Annual Meeting. Upon arrival at the meeting, bilateral consultations were initiated with Canada and it appeared that they might support a permanent transfer of some amount of the 2007 Canadian yellowtail allocation to the United States, thus creating a U.S. spot on the allocation key with no change to the harvest rate.

However, they noted it would be necessary to negotiate internally with industry representatives on their delegation regarding the amount to be transferred.

In the days that followed, the Canadians proposed a number of trade-offs that the United States might offer in exchange for consideration on yellowtail (primarily Atlantic swordfish and/or Gulf of Maine haddock). The U.S. delegation responded (as it had in earlier bilateral discussions on this possibility) that it could not offer anything beyond its current (small) NAFO allocations and that the amount of yellowtail suggested by Canada (400mt) was far from useable. By the middle of the meeting week, with Canada still referring to possible exchanges and very small amounts in return, it appeared that no progress would be made. The United States then decided to pursue the possibility of forcing a NAFO vote on the issue. The U.S. delegation met bilaterally with a number of delegations and negotiated the support necessary to defeat Canada in a vote. The United States then submitted a new proposal to NAFO that supplemented the original one with a new allocation key for 3LNO yellowtail flounder. This key included allocations (from the increase) for the United States, St. Pierre, Russia, and Ukraine. Canada responded to the U.S. proposal by pressuring two of the supporting NAFO Parties to withdraw support. At that point, the U.S. estimated that a tie might be forced on the vote if certain Parties abstained, but the U.S. delegation chose to leave its proposal on the table (i.e., not withdraw) and allowed interim measures to be set for 3LNO yellowtail with the TAC suggested by the Scientific Council (15,500mt) at the current harvest level and with the allocation key unchanged. The U.S. proposal can be re-tabled at the next meeting, and consultations are on-going with like-minded NAFO Parties to secure support at the 2007 annual meeting.

*iii) U.S. efforts to reform the NAFO allocation process:* At the 1997 NAFO Annual Meeting, the United States offered a proposal to reform NAFO's quota allocation practices. In response, the Fisheries Commission formed an Allocation Working Group (WG), which first met in March 1998. This first meeting of the Working Group focused first on setting guidelines for future discussions, including: exploring the meaning of the term "real interest" in relation to future new members; considering adoption of a broad strategy to guide expectations of future new members with regard to fishing opportunities in the NRA; development of a broad strategy to allocate future fishing opportunities for stocks not currently allocated; and exploring in connection with stocks under TACs possible margins to accommodate requests for fishing opportunities.

Discussion at the 1999 Working Group meeting focused on a number of useful working papers submitted by Contracting Parties on the topics agreed at the previous meeting. These discussions resulted in some forward movement by the WG and a "Draft Resolution to Guide the Expectations of Future New Members with Regard to Fishing Opportunities in the NAFO Regulatory Area" was adopted noting that: any state may accede to the NAFO Convention; all Contracting Parties are members of the General Council; membership in the Fisheries Commission is limited to Contracting Parties who either presently fish or have an immediate intent to begin fishing in the NRA; and new Contracting Parties admitted into the Fisheries Commission can expect fishing opportunities to be limited to new fisheries or the quota allocation available to all Contracting Parties without a national quota (the "others" category) for stocks presently under TACs for the foreseeable future. This resolution was adopted at the 1999 NAFO Annual Meeting and it was agreed that the Allocation WG should meet again in March 2000.

Discussions during the 2000 meeting of the Working Group focused to a large degree on continued development of a broad strategy for allocation of future fishing opportunities for stocks not currently allocated. The WG attempted to create non-exhaustive, non-prioritized "shopping lists" relating to both qualifying criteria and allocation criteria with regard to such opportunities. In addition, the WG examined possible opportunities for fishing opportunities on the margins of stocks currently under TAC. Much of this discussion related to the possible creation of an "others" quota. However there was no agreement regarding possible sources for such a quota, nor was it determined who should have access to the fish contained therein.

At the 2000 NAFO Annual Meeting, Contracting Parties examined the utility of continued work by the Working Group. The United States and others expressed strong support for continued work, noting that allocation issues pertaining to new stocks must be dealt with in a timely manner. Other Contracting Parties stated that allocative issues should be addressed only once stocks begin to recover. Following further discussion, it was decided that the Working Group would not meet in 2001. However, there was general agreement that further discussions on the

allocation issue should take place during the 2001 annual meeting. The United States raised this issue at the January 2002 Special Meetings in order to ensure that it is included on the agenda for the September 2002 Annual Meeting. During the 2002 Annual Meeting, it was agreed that the Allocation Working Group should meet during early 2003 to continue its work. Terms of reference were agreed based on those in place when the work of the WG was suspended.

The March 2003 Working Group meeting focused primarily on consideration of two papers: a U.S. white paper proposing that NAFO develop a comprehensive list of allocation criteria that would be applicable in all situations (ala ICCAT), and the Report of the Norway-FAO Expert Consultation on the Management of Shared Fish Stocks. The Working Group chose not to follow the U.S. proposal, instead developing a list of allocation criteria applicable only to stocks that are not now and never have been allocated by NAFO. While the criteria are useful, their present scope is severely limited. Additionally, the Working Group agreed only to give a status report back to the Fisheries Commission, indicating the work that was done. It did not recommend adoption of that work or any next steps to be taken. The United States made a strong statement that the progress that had been made was very small, not particularly useful in practical terms, and that NAFO would suffer in the longer term if it continued to fail to address the allocation interests of all of its members. The Fisheries Commission has not called for any further meetings of this Working Group.

Monitoring and Enforcement: Work relating to development and strengthening of NAFO compliance and enforcement measures is generally done at both annual meetings and intersessional meetings of in the Fisheries Commission and its Standing Committee on International Control (STACTIC). NAFO requires the use of VMS on 100 percent of Contracting Party vessels operating in the NRA. Until March 2004, NAFO also required 100% observer coverage for Contracting Party vessels. However, following a two-year pilot project, the NAFO Fisheries Commission adopted an observer program with reduced vessel coverage offset by greater vessel reporting requirements. This new program will be reviewed again in 2010.

NAFO continues to develop and refine its monitoring and enforcement measures. Procedures have been adopted for: processing information from at-sea inspections; a hail system requiring 6-hour advance notification by vessels entering or leaving the NRA and 24-hour advance notification by vessels transshipping at sea; and a requirement for NAFO Contracting Parties to inspect the fishing vessels of other Contracting Parties during port calls to verify species and quantities caught.

NAFO also conducts an annual review of compliance with the NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures. This annual review is currently carried out by STACTIC (with input from the NAFO Secretariat) and presented for consideration by the Fisheries Commission at every annual meeting. Although the compliance review requirement process has been in place since 2002, results continue to be hindered by non-standardized reporting and a lack personnel to assess existing data. Despite strong support among some NAFO Contracting Parties for this initiative, this program has yet to produce much useful/actionable information.

Non-Contracting Party Fishing: In 1998, NAFO implemented its Scheme to Promote Compliance by Non-Contracting Party Vessels with the Conservation and Enforcement Measures Established by NAFO. This Scheme presumes that a non-Contracting Party (NCP) vessel that has been sighted fishing in the NRA is undermining NAFO conservation and enforcement measures. If such vessels enter the ports of Contracting Parties, they must be inspected. No landings or transshipments are permitted in Contracting Party ports unless such vessels establish that certain species on board were not caught in the NRA, and for certain other species that the vessel applied the NAFO conservation and enforcement measures. Contracting Parties must report the results of inspections to NAFO and all other Contracting Parties. The scheme also calls for coordinated joint demarches by NAFO Contracting Parties to the governments of NCPs whose vessels had been observed fishing in the NRA requesting that the activity be stopped.

NAFO Contracting Parties may also board, inspect, and apply actions in accordance with international law against vessels appearing to be operating without nationality ("stateless vessels"). In addition, Parties are encouraged to examine the appropriateness of domestic measures to exercise jurisdiction over such vessels. NAFO contacts

relevant nations to attempt to confirm the registries of NCP vessels sighted fishing in the NRA, and has taken measures to increase communication and information sharing among relevant regional fisheries management organizations and international bodies (such as the FAO) regarding the fishing activities of such vessels.

In addition, NAFO has recently responded to the international dialogue on Illegal, Unregulated and Unreported (IUU) fishing by establishing and maintaining a list of vessels presumed to have conducted illegal, unreported, or unregulated fishing (IUU) in the NAFO Regulatory Area. The listing procedure, which includes follow-up actions to be taken by NAFO and its Contracting Parties, also contains a mechanism to share IUU vessel sighting information with other regional fisheries management organizations (e.g., NEAFC).

Precautionary Approach: At the 1996 NAFO Annual Meeting, the United States introduced a draft paragraph for inclusion in the request for advice from the Fisheries Commission (FC) to the Scientific Council (SC). This paragraph noted the importance of early action to implement provisions of the precautionary approach and requested that the SC provide a report examining specific elements of these provisions and how they might be implemented in NAFO. In the years that followed this request, support among members of the Fisheries Commission for the implementation of the precautionary approach has been guarded but generally positive. During this time the SC has, at the request of the FC (and with some FC participation): developed a conceptual framework and Action Plan for implementing the Precautionary Approach in NAFO; collaborated with other relevant fisheries organizations that had similar initiatives underway (i.e., ICES, FAO and others); held a workshop of the precautionary approach in March 1998; examined theoretical, general and specific considerations regarding NAFO stocks; examined the role of scientists and fisheries managers in relation to the Precautionary Approach; and initiated and conducted simulations of a precautionary approach to management for three categories of NAFO fish stocks.

At the May 1999 meeting of the Joint SC/FC Working Group, it was recommended that both the SC and FC consider elements in designing and formulating further action in respect to implementation of the Precautionary Approach for the three stocks used in the simulation and that similar actions be taken for other NAFO stocks with related characteristics as the implementation of the Precautionary Approach progresses. At its 1999 Annual Meeting, NAFO adopted a U.S.-proposed resolution to guide the implementation of the precautionary approach within NAFO that addresses many of the U.S. concerns. It was also agreed that the joint FC/SC Working Group should meet in 2000 to continue work on this issue. A Canadian-proposed agenda was also adopted for this meeting.

At its February 2000 meeting, the Joint SC/FC Working Group agreed on: implementation plans for applying the precautionary approach to 2 out of 3 model stocks that had been identified earlier; a similar implementation plan for 3LNO American plaice; a generic template for applying the precautionary approach to other NAFO-managed stocks; and general criteria for reopening a fishery in light of the precautionary approach. Despite this progress however, several issues of contention continued to plague the progress of the Working Group. Of particular concern are issues relating to terminology and operationalizing the precautionary approach within NAFO.

At the 2000 annual meeting, these and other concerns led Contracting Parties to consider whether or not the working group should continue its work. After considerable discussion, it was agreed that a small group of technical experts would meet in the first half of 2001 to advance future work. This group was to circulate a report to all Contracting Parties and recommend whether the Working Group should meet prior to the 2001 NAFO annual meeting. Unfortunately, this group was never convened.

At its June 2002 meeting, the Working Group examined and compared work done on the precautionary approach by the NAFO Scientific Council with that done by the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES). ICES provides scientific advice to a number of regional fisheries management organizations, including NEAFC. While the United States and Canada were strongly committed to the NAFO process and stressed the similarities between work done by NAFO and ICES, the European Union and other NEAFC members expressed concern regarding the differences. In the end, it was agreed that further progress could be made by addressing specific differences found between the NAFO and ICES work on precautionary approach. The Working Group recommended that the Fisheries Commission identify appropriate examples, and then instruct the Joint FC/SC Working Group to meet intersessionally to address them specifically. In addition, it was recommended that the

Fisheries Commission consider development of long-term plans for application of the precautionary approach to different fleet sectors within NAFO. No action was taken on these WG recommendations by the Fisheries Commission at the 2002 Annual Meeting.

At the 2003 Annual Meeting, the Chairman of the Scientific Council presented to the Fisheries Commission a summary and overview of the proposed revised NAFO precautionary approach framework, adopted and refined by the Scientific Council in June and September 2003. The United States tabled a strong proposal calling for Fisheries Commission adoption of the proposed revised NAFO framework and agreement to hold an intersessional meeting of the Joint Fisheries Commission/Scientific Council Working Group to examine application scenarios for specific NAFO stocks. Although the U.S. proposal had some support among Contracting Parties, the proposal was not adopted based on NAFO Budget and time constraints. No further work on this issue was recommended by the Fisheries Commission.

During its 2004 Annual Meeting, the Fisheries Commission adopted a Canadian proposal (that received considerable input from the United States) calling for practical application of the precautionary approach by NAFO on two selected stocks. The proposal called on the Scientific Council to provide advice within the revised precautionary approach framework for Div. 3LNO yellowtail flounder and Div. 3M shrimp. Division 3LNO yellowtail flounder represents a data-rich stock in good health, with a production-based assessment, and managed by TAC/quota. The Div. 3M shrimp stock is data-poor, in good condition, and managed by effort controls. This exercise was designed to facilitate future application of the revised NAFO precautionary approach framework, developed and adopted by the scientific council in 2003. The Precautionary Approach Framework has since been fully adopted.

Transparency: The United States first raised this issue at the 1996 NAFO Annual Meeting and a working group was created, with the United States serving as Chair, to examine applicable rules of other organizations and arrangements. Subsequent intersessional meetings of the working group in 1997 and 1998 were contentious, with the Nordic countries (i.e., Iceland, Denmark, and Norway) particularly resistant, and only limited headway was made on the issue. As a result of the difficulty of the discussions, in 1998 the Chair tabled a highly bracketed paper, "Procedures for Observers," designed to address the concerns of all parties. Although some progress was made at the 1999 working group intersessional, several disagreements remained on terms for admitting observers to NAFO meetings.

At the 1999 NAFO Annual Meeting, Canada presented a compromise text that set criteria for observer eligibility and stipulated that groups can participate in sessions of the General Council and FC unless a majority of Contracting Parties vote to exclude them. It also allowed NGOs to participate in meetings of subsidiary bodies unless one or more Contracting Parties objected. The new rules would be in place for two years, after which NAFO could evaluate the success of the program. In the end, the General Council adopted a modified version of this proposal as presented by Denmark. Observers are only able to sit in on sessions of the General Council and Fisheries Commission, not subsidiary bodies. The NAFO Secretariat will receive applications from interested observers and determine if they meet the eligibility criteria, which include a written statement that the organization supports the goals of NAFO. The Secretariat will then notify all Contracting Parties which groups have been deemed eligible; they will be allowed to participate unless a Contracting Party objects for cause in writing. Any objection will lead to a mail vote among all members on the issue. The guidelines stipulate that the vote be conducted according to the usual NAFO decision-making rules; we interpret this to mean that once a party makes a motion to exclude the group, it can participate unless a majority of Contracting Parties agree to exclude. As in the Canadian proposal, NAFO can reevaluate these rules any time after 2001.

Dispute Settlement: NAFO continues to explore the desirability and feasibility of establishing a formal dispute settlement procedure for the organization. A working group, chaired by Norway, has held a number of meetings to consider a proposal put forth by Canada which is designed, in effect, to limit the use of the objection procedure and to enforce those limitations through compulsory, binding dispute settlement. In response, the EU has presented various counter proposals that have broader implications for NAFO. There is a common element to all the EU proposals: each would create a dispute settlement procedure for all NAFO disputes, not just those arising from the use of the objection procedure.

At the February 1999 meeting of the Working Group, Canada stated that it was now unsure that a dispute resolution mechanism, modeled along the way that the EU contemplates it, would be desirable. Conversely, the EU--which had originally resisted the proposal--has worked along with Norway to create a proposal whereby a broad number of disputes would initially be sent to an ad hoc dispute settlement panel (i.e. a non-binding procedure) and ultimately to binding dispute resolution as contemplated by the Fish Stocks Agreement.

At the 1999 NAFO Annual Meeting, Contracting Parties disagreed widely on the utility of continuing the Working Group. Canada argued that the UN Fish Stocks Agreement (UNFSA) was rapidly acquiring enough ratifications to enter into force. They noted that, as UNFSA includes procedures for settling disputes within regional fisheries organizations, NAFO should simply adopt those procedures. Canada did not think the DSP Working Group should continue to try to devise a separate NAFO procedure. Other Contracting Parties, most notably the EU, felt strongly that the DSP Working Group should continue. They argued that the UNFSA procedures were too slow to resolve a dispute within a single fishing season and would not apply to NAFO-regulated discrete stocks. Prompted by the United States, the General Council decided the DSP Working Group would continue, but under new terms of reference that focus on devising means to implement the UNFSA provisions in a NAFO context.

The May 2000 meeting of the DSP Working Group began with a discussion of whether the parties could agree to adopt recommendations found in a Chairman=s Paper which essentially proposed incorporation by reference into the Convention, mutatis mutandis, the 1995 UN Fish Stocks Agreement. The United States and Canada supported this approach, whereas the EU, Japan, and most of the other Contracting Parties were not very sympathetic. The focus of the meeting then shifted to an EU paper distributed at the last intersessional meeting which proposed the possibility of disputing parties choosing binding dispute settlement under the 1995 UN Fish Stocks Agreement, UNCLOS or an ad hoc NAFO procedure. Out of this discussion came a Chairman=s Consolidated Text which included provisions for which there was general consensus and bracketed text for which there was not consensus.

At the 2000 NAFO Annual Meeting, Contracting Parties disagreed widely on the utility of continuing the DSP Working Group. Canada adopted the new position that NAFO should simply wait for the UN Agreement on Straddling and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks (UNFSA) to enter into force, instead of attempting to devise a separate NAFO procedure. Other Contracting Parties, most notably the EU, felt strongly that the working group should continue. They continued to argue that the UNFSA procedures were too slow to resolve a dispute within a single fishing season and would not apply to NAFO-regulated discrete stocks. The June 2001 DSP WG meeting saw further work on the heavily-bracketed Consolidated Text. The resulting document (Consolidated Text 2001~DSP W.G. W.P. 01/7 Rev2) reflects the current state of agreement and views expressed within the WG to date. At the end of this meeting, the EU tabled its own version of a Dispute Settlement Procedures text (DSP W.G. W.P. 01/10), indicating that it might table this version as a possible compromise text at the 2001 Annual Meeting. Due to the cancellation of the 2001 Annual Meeting, this issue was deferred until the 2002 Annual Meeting.

In discussions at the 2002 Annual Meeting, considerable concern was expressed from a number of Parties (particularly Canada and the United States) regarding the status of the European Union text and the work of the Dispute Settlement Working Group in general. The United States once again made its view clear that NAFO dispute settlement procedures should be based strongly on those in UNFSA. Since there was little agreement regarding appropriate next steps for the Working Group, the General Council agreed that there should be a consultation between interested Parties (primarily Canada, the European Union and the United States) to determine the usefulness of a further Working Group meeting during 2003. Provisions were made so that, if interested Parties agree on the need, such a meeting could take place.

At the 2003 Annual Meeting, there was general agreement that the Working Group consultations had continued to move the issue forward, but that further work is necessary before a resolution can be reached. After discussions on the sidelines of the annual meeting, the Parties involved in the 2003 consultations recommended that another intersessional meeting take place during 2004. This recommendation was adopted by the General Council, but no date for this meeting was set. At the 2004 Annual Meeting, discussion on this issue was deferred until the 2005 Annual Meeting. This issue has been subsequently integrated into the NAFO Reform process.

**Future Meetings**

The 2007 NAFO Annual Meeting will be held September 24-26, 2007, in Portugal.

**Staff Contacts***NOAA Fisheries:*

Patrick Moran  
Office of International Affairs (OIA)  
1315 East-West Highway, Room 13117  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-2276  
Fax: (301) 713-2313  
E-mail: pat.moran@noaa.gov

Alison McHale  
NMFS Northeast Regional Office  
One Blackburn Drive  
Gloucester, MA 01930  
Telephone: (978) 281-9103  
Fax: (978) 281-9394  
E-mail: Alison.McHale@noaa.gov

*Department of State:*

Deirdre Warner-Kramer  
Office of Marine Conservation (OES/OMC)  
U.S. Department of State  
2201 C Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20520-7818  
Telephone: (202) 647-2883  
Fax: (202) 736-7350

## **PACIFIC OCEAN**

## **Agreement on the International Dolphin Conservation Program (AIDCP)**

### **Basic Instruments**

Agreement on the Conservation of Dolphins (La Jolla Agreement), 1992  
Panama Declaration, 1995

### **Implementing Legislation**

International Dolphin Conservation Program Act of 1997 (11 Stat. 1122; 16 U.S.C. 1361 et seq.)

### **Member Nations**

Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, European Union, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, the United States, Vanuatu and Venezuela.

### **Secretariat Headquarters**

Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission  
8604 La Jolla Shores Drive  
La Jolla, California 92037-1508

Director of Investigations: Dr. Robin Allen  
Telephone: (858) 546-7100  
Fax: (858) 546-7133  
Web Address: <http://www.iattc.org/IDCPENG.htm>

### **Budget**

The expenses of the International Dolphin Conservation Program are shared by the Parties. Article XV of the AIDCP provides that the Parties “shall contribute to the expenses necessary to achieve the objectives of this Agreement through the establishment and collection of vessel fees, the level of which shall be determined by the Parties, without prejudice to other voluntary financial contributions.” A unique feature of the fishery is that since 1995 one hundred percent of trips by large purse seine vessels (i.e., vessels in excess of 400 short tons, 362.8 metric tons, carrying capacity) are covered by observers. However, 100% observer coverage is a substantial expense. Previously, only owners of large purse seine vessels were required to pay observer fees. In order to cover the cost of the AIDCP’s On-Board Observer Program, the scope of vessels required to pay annual observer fees, or vessel assessments, expanded in 2003 to all vessels under the jurisdiction of a Party and listed on the register of vessels authorized to purse seine for tuna in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean (ETP). The AIDCP budget for FY 2006 was projected to be \$2,108,684; the United States’ tuna purse seine fleet has contributed approximately \$45,502 in vessel assessments for 2006.

While vessel assessments cover the majority of AIDCP costs, a portion of the AIDCP budget is derived from the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC). The expenses of the IATTC are also shared by the Contracting Parties, according to the proportion of the total catch by each Party from the fisheries covered by the IATTC Convention and the portion of the catch utilized by each Party. The Party proportions are calculated from statistics compiled by IATTC staff for calendar years previous (approximately 3 years) to the Fiscal Year (FY) budget in question. Historically, the United States paid 80-90 percent of the IATTC’s budget. Since the U.S. tuna market became “dolphin-safe” in mid-1994, U.S. utilization of the catch has greatly diminished, causing a decrease in the U.S. contribution to IATTC. Further, the Department of State has indicated that future U.S. contribution will

likely be further reduced. The IATTC budget for FY 2007 is \$5,336,109; it was agreed that the United States would contribute \$1,746,553.

### **Description**

#### A. Mission/Purpose:

The goals of the AIDCP are:

“(1) to progressively reduce incidental dolphin mortalities in the tuna purse-seine fishery in the Agreement Area to levels approaching zero, through the setting of annual limits; (2) with the goal of eliminating dolphin mortality in this fishery, to seek ecologically sound means of capturing large yellowfin tunas not in association with dolphins; and (3) to ensure the long-term sustainability of the tuna stocks in the Agreement Area, as well as that of the marine resources related to this fishery, taking into consideration the interrelationship among species in the ecosystem, with special emphasis on, inter alia, avoiding, reducing and minimizing bycatch and discards of juvenile tunas and non-target species.”

#### B. Organizational Structure:

The AIDCP consists of National Parties, regional economic integration organizations, and a Secretariat headed by a Director of Investigations, which is shared with the IATTC. Approval of decisions, resolutions, recommendations and publications is achieved by consensus of all Parties to the AIDCP. The Director of Investigations is appointed by the Parties and is responsible for drafting programs of investigations, budget formulation, accounting and administrative support, directing technical staff, coordinating the AIDCP with other organizations and preparing administrative, scientific, and other reports of the AIDCP.

International Review Panel: The International Review Panel (IRP) follows a general procedure for monitoring compliance by vessels with measures established by the AIDCP for minimizing the mortalities of dolphins during fishing operations and reporting on compliance to appropriate governments. The IRP reviews data collected by observers of the On-Board Observer Program related to compliance with the AIDCP, and identifies possible infractions of that Agreement. Lists of these possible infractions are submitted by the Secretariat to the governments of the Parties in which the vessels are registered for investigation and possible action. The governments report back to the Secretariat on actions taken regarding these possible infractions. The IRP publishes an annual report that summarizes the activities, actions, and decisions of the IRP, and lists the possible infractions identified for the various national fleets.

The Permanent Working Group on Tuna Tracking (PWGTT) was established by the Parties to the AIDCP in 1999 as a component of the IRP. The AIDCP requires that all Parties have an approved tuna tracking and verification system. The purpose of the system is to ensure the dolphin-safe status of tuna harvested in the ETP. The first task undertaken by the Working Group was to develop an international tuna tracking and verification system template that each Party could use to prepare a national tuna tracking system consistent with AIDCP requirements. In addition, the PWGTT has encouraged and assisted in the development of national plans as requested by AIDCP Parties. The PWGTT provides a forum for discussing and solving problems encountered in operating the national tuna tracking systems, and from time to time, recommends improvements to the system. At its meeting in El Salvador in June 2001, the PWGTT developed an international dolphin-safe Certification Program to provide a method of documenting the dolphin-safe status of ETP tuna in the world market. The international certification program and system for tracking and verifying tuna are reviewed and amended as necessary.

#### C. Programs:

To fulfill its mission, the Parties carry out an extensive research and data collection program. This program is conducted by a permanent, internationally recruited staff selected and directed by the Director of Investigations, who is responsible to the Parties. In addition, the Parties to the AIDCP have established work groups to address specific management and organizational issues.

### **Dolphin Conservation**

In the 1950's, fishermen discovered that yellowfin tuna in the ETP aggregated beneath schools of dolphin stocks. Since that discovery, the predominant tuna fishing method in the ETP has been to encircle schools of dolphins with a fishing net to capture the tuna concentrated below. Hundreds of thousands of dolphins died in the early years of this fishery. U.S. participation in the ETP tuna fishery has greatly decreased since the inception of the fishery, coming to a virtual standstill by the early 1980's. However, foreign participation in the ETP fishery has continued to increase. Annual dolphin mortality is down from over 133,000 in 1986 to approximately 2,000 dolphins since 1998. Preliminary dolphin mortality data for 2005 indicate that observed mortality was less than 1,400 dolphins, a total reduction in dolphin mortality of greater than 99%.

In the fall of 1992, the nations participating in the ETP tuna fishery signed the La Jolla Agreement, which placed voluntary limits on the maximum number of dolphins that could be incidentally killed annually in the fishery, decreasing the maximum each year over seven years, with a goal of eliminating dolphin mortality in the fishery. The United States and nine other nations fishing in the ETP negotiated the Panama Declaration in 1995. The Panama Declaration established conservative species/stock-specific annual dolphin mortality limits and represented an important step toward reducing bycatch in commercial fisheries with sound ecosystem management. It contained provisions for additional protection for individual stocks of dolphins and for other living marine resources to achieve an ecosystem approach to management of the fishery. Due to the efforts of the nations that negotiated the Panama Declaration and the IATTC, the yellowfin tuna fishery in the ETP has had 100% observer coverage since 1995. The signatory nations envisioned that, as a result of their actions in reducing dolphin mortality, the United States would amend its laws so their participation in the AIDCP would satisfy comparability requirements of the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) and result in the lifting of embargoes on yellowfin tuna and yellowfin tuna products.

Congress amended the MMPA in 1997 to: (1) allow for lifting the embargoes for countries fishing in compliance with the AIDCP, (2) lift the ban on the sale of tuna that is not dolphin-safe, and (3) change the definition of dolphin-safe to include tuna caught in accordance with the AIDCP. In 1997, Congress amended the MMPA with the IDCPA to implement the AIDCP and in response to the Panama Declaration.

In February 1998, the nations participating in the tuna purse seine fishery in the ETP negotiated the AIDCP, a legally-binding instrument for dolphin conservation and ecosystem management in the ETP. The IDCPA is intended to give force domestically to the AIDCP, which was designed to strengthen dolphin protection measures already in place and afford nations harvesting tuna in the ETP in compliance with those measures access to the lucrative U.S. market for their tuna.

Despite successes in reducing observed dolphin mortality in the ETP purse seine fishery, the three stocks of dolphin that interact to the greatest degree with the fishery, the eastern spinner dolphin (*Stenella longirostris orientalis*), northeastern offshore spotted dolphin (*Stenella attenuata*) and coastal spotted dolphin (*Stenella attenuata graffmani*), are currently categorized as depleted under the MMPA. These stocks of dolphin are not recovering at a rate of population increase that is consistent with the drastic reduction in observed dolphin mortality in the ETP purse seine fishery. Investigations into the potential causes of this apparent lack of recovery are ongoing.

It is important to note that the dolphin-safe standard established by the AIDCP differs from that currently implemented in the United States. Under the AIDCP, dolphin-safe means "tuna captured in sets in which there is no mortality or serious injury of dolphins." The current dolphin-safe standard in the U.S. is that "no tuna were caught on the trip in which such tuna were harvested using a purse seine net intentionally deployed on or to encircle dolphins, and no dolphins were killed or seriously injured during the sets in which the tuna were caught."

**Other Conservation and Administration Issues:** The Parties have taken a proactive position in fishery management and dolphin conservation in recent years. There are or have been two work groups dealing with specific management issues: (1) fishing by non-parties to the AIDCP and (2) vessel assessments and financing the AIDCP.

The Joint AIDCP / IATTC Working Group on Fishing by Non-Parties was established in 2001 to monitor compliance with the AIDCP and IATTC by non-parties and distinguish between cooperating and non-cooperating non-parties. The joint working group addresses issues related to illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing activities and develops measures to deter fishing by non-cooperating non-parties.

The Working Group on Vessel Assessments and Financing was established and met for the first time in 2002. The Working Group was created with the objective of addressing the long-term budget issues faced by the AIDCP. In 2006, the Parties adopted a new approach to collect vessel fees, or assessments. The previous approach, established in 2003, connected calculation of vessel assessments with the IATTC Capacity Resolution of 2002, requiring that owners of all vessels listed on the register of vessels authorized to purse seine for tuna in the ETP, whether the vessel is active or inactive, pay annual assessments. The 2006 assessments mirror the approach used prior to 2003, where only Class 6 purse seine vessels required to carry observers (i.e., in excess of 400 shorts tons, 362.8 metric tons, carrying capacity) pay assessments. The projected AIDCP expenditures for FY 2006 total \$2,108,684. The projected AIDCP revenues for FY 2006 total \$2,047,479, leaving a projected deficit of \$61,205. This projected deficit would bring the total accumulated deficit of the AIDCP to \$516,654. The Secretary has asked parties to consider allowing the AIDCP retain charges from assessments for inactive and sunk vessels in order to alleviate the deficit. These charges are currently reimbursed to the national observer programs.

As mentioned in the previous paragraph, the AIDCP currently does not require that vessels in size classes 1-5 (i.e., of 400 short tons, 362.8 metric tons, carrying capacity or less) carry observers. However, in light of the concern that some Class 1-5 vessels are setting purse-seine nets on dolphins, in contravention of the AIDCP, the Parties adopted measures to require purse-seine vessels identified by the IRP to have intentionally set on dolphins to carry observers on subsequent trips. An observer was placed on a Class 1-5 purse seine vessel for the first time under this resolution in late 2004. In addition, the Parties are engaged in ongoing discussions to develop indicators (e.g., gear) for identifying Class 1-5 vessels that may be harvesting tuna by intentionally setting purse seine nets on dolphins

### **Staff Contacts**

#### *NOAA Fisheries:*

Rod McInnis  
Administrator, Southwest Region (F/SWR)  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
501 W. Ocean Boulevard, Suite 4200  
Long Beach, CA 90802-4213  
Telephone: (562) 980-4001  
Fax: (562) 980-4018

Office of Protected Resources (F/PR3)  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
1315 East-West Highway  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-1401  
Fax: (301) 427-2523

#### *Department of State:*

David Hogan  
Senior Foreign Affairs Specialist  
Office of Marine Conservation (OES/OMC)  
U.S. Department of State  
2201 C. Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20520-7818  
Telephone: (202) 647-2337  
Fax: (202) 736-7350

## **Convention for the Establishment of an Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC)**

### **Basic Instrument**

Convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Costa Rica for the establishment of an Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, 1949 (TIAS 2044)

### **Implementing Legislation**

Tuna Conventions Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 777), as amended (16 U.S.C., 951-961)

### **Member Nations**

Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Guatemala, Japan, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, the Republic of Korea, Spain, the United States, Vanuatu, and Venezuela.

### **Cooperating Non Parties**

Belize, Canada, China, Chinese Taipei, Cook Islands, the European Union, and Honduras

### **Commission Headquarters**

Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission  
c/o Scripps Institute of Oceanography  
8604 La Jolla Shores Drive  
La Jolla, California 92037-1508

Director of Investigations: Dr. Robin Allen  
Telephone: (858) 546-7100  
Fax: (858) 546-7133  
Web Address: <http://www.iattc.org>

### **Budget**

As defined by the Tuna Conventions Act, the expenses of the Commission are to be shared by the Contracting Parties in relation to the proportion of the total catch by each Party from the fisheries covered by the Convention and the portion of the catch utilized by each Party. "Utilized" is defined as eaten fresh, or processed for internal consumption or export. Thus, tunas landed by a Party and subsequently exported in the round are not included in computing that Party's contribution, but those which are exported canned are included. The Party proportions are calculated from statistics compiled by Commission staff for calendar years previous (about 3 years) to the Fiscal Year (FY) budget in question. Historically, the United States has paid the bulk (80-90 percent) of the Commission's budget. However, U.S. utilization of the catch, as defined by the Convention, from the eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO) has greatly diminished since the U.S. tuna market became "dolphin-safe" in mid-1994, thereby causing the U.S. required contribution to be diminished. Further, the Department of State has indicated that the U.S. contribution will be reduced, and the IATTC is developing a new framework for determining contributions. The IATTC budget for FY 2007 and FY 2008 is \$5,336,109 and \$5,503,347 respectively. The United States agreed to contribute \$1,746,553 for FY 2007.

**U.S. Representation**

## A. Appointment Process:

The Tuna Conventions Act of 1950 provides that the United States shall be represented by a total of not more than four Commissioners, of which at least one must be an officer of NOAA, one must be chosen from a nongovernmental conservation organization, and not more than one can reside elsewhere than in a state whose vessels maintain a substantial fishery in the area of the Convention. The Commissioners are appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the President.

## B. U.S. Commissioners:

Rodney R. McInnis  
Regional Administrator  
Southwest Region  
NOAA Fisheries Service  
501 W. Ocean Boulevard, Suite 4200  
Long Beach, CA 90802

Patrick Rose  
5469 Linea Del Cielo - Box 7242  
Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92067  
(858) 756-2733

Robert Fletcher  
1084 Baylor Street  
San Diego, CA 92106  
(619) 226-6455

Scott Burns  
201 Lennox Ave.  
Severna Park, MD 21146  
(202) 351-1937

## C. Advisory Structure:

The Tuna Conventions Act as amended by the International Dolphin Conservation Program Act of 1997 provides that the Department of State charter a General Advisory Committee (Committee) and a Scientific Advisory Subcommittee (Subcommittee) to advise the U.S. Section regarding policy and science issues and U.S. positions associated with IATTC conservation and management measures. The first meeting of the Committee was convened in September 2003. All interested sectors - commercial and recreational fishing and environmental organizations - are well represented on the Committee. Membership to the Subcommittee has not yet been named, as we are not able to garner the required minimum of 5 eligible persons. The terms of the advisory committees are fixed at 2 years by the charters. Each member may reapply and there are no term limits. The advisory committees are invited to attend all non-executive meetings and given opportunity to examine and to be heard on all proposed programs, reports, recommendations, and regulations of the Commission.

**Description**

## A. Mission/Purpose:

The IATTC was established to "(1) study the biology of the tunas and related species of the EPO with a view to determining the effects that fishing and natural factors have on their abundance, and (2) to recommend appropriate conservation measures so that the stocks of fish can be maintained at levels which will afford maximum sustainable catches." The Commission's duties were broadened in 1976 to include work on the issues arising from the tuna-dolphin relationship in the EPO. In 2003, the IATTC adopted a resolution that approved the Antigua Convention, a major revision of the original convention establishing the IATTC. This new text brings the convention current with respect to internationally accepted laws on the conservation and management of oceanic resources, including a mandate to take a more ecosystem-based approach to management. The revised convention was the subject of a signing ceremony in November 2003. The U.S. Senate provided advice and consent to ratification of the Antigua Convention on November 17, 2005. Implementing legislation packages for the Antigua convention have been sent to the House International Relations Committee and the Senate Commerce Science and Transportation Committee.

## B. Organizational Structure:

The IATTC consists of a Commission composed of national sections of member nations and a Secretariat headed by a Director of Investigations. The principal duties of the Commission are (1) to study the biology of the tropical tunas, tuna baitfish, and other kinds of fish taken by tuna vessels in the EPO and the effects of fishing and natural factors upon them, and (2) to recommend appropriate conservation measures, when necessary, so that these stocks of fish can be maintained at levels which will afford the maximum sustained catches. Approval of decisions, resolutions, recommendations and publications is only by consensus of all Parties to the Commission. National sections may consist of from one to four members appointed by the governments or the respective Contracting Parties. Each national section may establish an advisory committee which is invited to attend non-executive sessions of the Commission meetings. The Director of Investigations is appointed by the Commission and is responsible for drafting programs of investigations, budget formulation, accounting and administrative support, directing technical staff, coordinating Commission work with other organizations and preparing administrative, scientific, and other reports of the Commission.

## C. Programs:

To fulfill its mission, the Commission carries out an extensive research and data collection program. This program is conducted by a permanent, internationally recruited staff selected and directed by the Director of Investigations, who is responsible to the Commission. In addition, the IATTC has established a number of work groups to address specific management and organizational issues and has expanded the scope and nature of its management recommendations in recent years.

## **Fisheries Conservation and IATTC Management**

Yellowfin Tuna: The IATTC recommends proposals for joint action by the member governments aimed at maintaining yellowfin tuna resources at a high level (generally at maximum sustainable yield). From 1966 through 1979, the Commission set annual catch quotas on yellowfin tuna, usually below 200,000 mt, and member nations implemented them. Beginning in 1979, this conservation program was effectively nullified, in large part, because several important member countries, including Mexico, withdrew from the Commission. As a result, the remaining member nations became reluctant to agree to implement a total catch quota when there was no assurance that non-member fishing countries, such as Mexico, would abide by the quota. Nevertheless, the Commission continued to recommend an annual international yellowfin tuna catch quota within the Commission Yellowfin Regulatory Area (CYRA) as the basis for all participants in the fisheries to evaluate the conservation needs of the resource.

Member countries agreed to resume implementing the annual yellowfin tuna quota system in 1998, in part because of the resolution of the tuna-dolphin issue (discussed below) allowed the Commission to refocus on fishery management. Since 2004, parties must also choose to implement a 6-week purse seine closure for the entire Convention Area beginning either August 1 or November 20 of each year. However, IATTC scientific staff has indicated that despite these conservation measures, overfishing of yellowfin tuna is occurring in the Convention Area. The Commission is currently considering a range of additional conservation measures for 2008.

Bigeye Tuna: In 2004, the Commission agreed that Parties would limit their future longline catches of bigeye tuna to 2001 levels. In 2006, the Commission amended this approach to limit Parties to annual bigeye catches equivalent to catch levels in 2001 or 500 metric tons, whichever is greater. The Commission also prohibits the use of tender vessels and the at-sea transfer of purse seine-caught tuna. These actions were taken to limit effective fishing capacity and reduce the risk of overcapacity and overfishing. Such harvests could result in long-term damage to the productivity of the bigeye tuna stock. Despite these measures, IATTC scientific staff has indicated overfishing of bigeye tuna is occurring in the Convention Area. The Commission is currently considering a range of additional conservation measures for 2008.

Other Conservation and Administration Issues: The Commission has been taking a proactive position in fishery management in recent years. There are or have been five work groups dealing with specific fishery management issues: (1) bycatch, (2) control of the fishery on floating objects/FADs, (3) fleet capacity, (4) compliance, and (5) the joint working group on Illegal, Unreported, Unregulated fishing.

In 2000, a pilot project was agreed to for 2001 under which all tuna brought on board a purse seine vessel would be retained. This was intended to prevent waste associated with discard of dead juvenile fish and possibly result in vessels aborting sets and releasing live fish rather than having to retain low value fish on board. The Commission has extended the full retention requirement through the end of 2007.

While no specific restrictions on FAD fishing have been instituted, the IATTC has considered limiting the number of FADs a vessel may carry and once implemented the bigeye tuna quota by prohibiting floating object (including FAD) sets after the quota was reached. This tool remains available if needed in the future. As noted above, the IATTC also has banned tender vessels and at-sea transshipments from purse seine vessels, which effectively limit some FAD fishing.

In 2002, the IATTC adopted an overall purse seine fleet capacity agreement under which purse seine vessels that were not on the IATTC vessel register would not be authorized to fish for tuna in the Convention Area. This effectively establishes upper limits on capacity in this sector. This is the first known instance of a regional fishery management organization establishing a fleet capacity limit. The IATTC also has a long-term capacity management plan intended to ultimately reduce purse seine capacity to about 135,000 mt carrying capacity, which is thought to be consistent with the long-term maximum yields of the tuna stocks.

A Compliance Working Group was established and met for the first time in 2000 with the goal of promoting more complete and uniform implementation of compliance with IATTC and AIDCP management recommendations. In 2003, this working group was presented with reports on the extent of compliance and on the steps being taken by members to enforce the recommendations of the IATTC. The lack of compliance by certain non-members was a critical element in the IATTC agreement in 2003 that Parties would not engage in trade in any tuna caught in contravention of time or area closures agreed to by the IATTC. In 2006, the Commission adopted a resolution on trade measures to promote compliance. This resolution requires all Parties and co-operating non-parties to examine import and landing data for fish products covered by the IATTC. The resolution also provides a process for identifying fishing entities that whose activities undermine the effectiveness of the IATTC conservation and management measures. If the identified entity fails to take corrective action, the Commission may encourage Parties to adopt non-discriminatory trade restrictive measures.

The Commission also adopted a resolution establishing a program regulating transshipment by large-scale tuna fishing vessels (large-scale longline vessels and associated carrier vessels). The resolution establishes conditions relating to in-port transshipment of species covered by the IATTC. Following the establishment of a registry of vessels authorized to receive transshipments at sea by July 1, 2008, and an IATTC observer program for transshipment vessels by January 1, 2009, transshipment at sea will be limited to vessels that are both on the registry and carrying an IATTC observer.

As noted above, the Antigua Convention, the culmination of more than 4 years of work by the Negotiations Work Group, was agreed to by the Commission at its annual meeting in June 2003. The Antigua Convention shall enter into force and effectiveness 15 months after the deposit of the seventh instrument of ratification or accession of the Parties to the 1949 Convention establishing the IATTC. Thus far, thirteen Parties to the 1949 Convention have signed the Antigua Convention and only two, Mexico and El Salvador, have deposited their instrument of ratification or accession with the depositary.

The Finance Working Group has yet to agree on a formula, for determining the annual contributions of the Parties. Recent finance resolutions, including the financing resolution for FY 2007, itemize what each Nation's dues towards the IATTC budget. The Finance Working Group continues to work towards a permanent, transparent formula for determining annual budget contributions.

**Staff Contacts**

*NOAA Fisheries - Southwest Region:*

Rodney R. McInnis  
Acting Administrator, Southwest Region (F/SWR)  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
501 W. Ocean Boulevard, Suite 4200  
Long Beach, CA 90802-4213  
Telephone: (562) 980-4001  
Fax: (562) 980-4018

*Department of State:*

David Hogan  
Deputy Director, Office of Marine Conservation (OES/OMC)  
U.S. Department of State  
2201 C. Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20520-7818  
Telephone: (202) 647-2335  
Fax: (202) 736-7350

**Convention for the Preservation of the Halibut Fishery  
of the Northern Pacific Ocean and Bering Sea  
(Basic Instrument for the International Pacific Halibut Commission -- IPHC)**

**Basic Instrument**

Convention for the Preservation of the Halibut Fishery of the Northern Pacific Ocean and Bering Sea, 1953 (TIAS 2900).

**Implementing Legislation**

Northern Pacific Halibut Act of 1982 (as amended: 50 Stat. 325; 67 Stat. 494; 79 Stat. 902; 97 Stat. 78).

**Member Nations**

The United States and Canada.

**Commission Headquarters**

International Pacific Halibut Commission  
P.O. Box 95009  
University Station  
Seattle, WA 98145-2009

Director: Dr. Bruce Leaman  
Telephone: (206) 634-1838  
Fax: (206) 632-2983  
Web address: <http://www.iphc.washington.edu>

**U.S. Representation**

A. Appointment Process:

The United States is represented on the IPHC by three Commissioners who are appointed by the President for a period of 2 years (with eligibility for reappointment). Of these Commissioners, one must be a NOAA official, one must be a resident of Alaska, and one must be a nonresident of Alaska. In addition, one of these three Commissioners must be a voting member of the North Pacific Fishery Management Council. The Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, may designate from time to time Alternate U.S. Commissioners to the IPHC.

B. U.S. Commissioners:

James Balsiger, Ph.D.  
Administrator, Alaska Region  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
P.O. Box 21668  
Juneau, AK 99802

Ralph Hoard  
Executive Vice President  
Icicle Seafoods, Inc.  
4019 21st Avenue West  
P.O. Box 79003  
Seattle, WA 98119

Philip Lestenkof (Interim)  
P.O. Box 127  
St. Paul Island, AK 99660

#### C. Advisory Structure:

There are no formal provisions for a U.S. Advisory Committee to IPHC, although informal groups made up of U.S. and Canadian industry representatives, known as the IPHC Conference Board and the Processor Advisory Group, do attend and provide recommendations to annual Commission meetings.

### **Description**

#### A. Mission/Purpose:

The IPHC was created to conserve, manage, and rebuild the halibut stocks in the Convention Area to those levels that would achieve and maintain the maximum sustainable yield from the fishery. The yield definition was changed to optimum sustainable yield by the amending 1979 Protocol.

The halibut resource and fishery have been managed by the IPHC since 1923. The IPHC was established by a Convention between the United States and Canada, which has been revised several times to extend the Commission's authority and meet new conditions in the fishery. The most recent change, a protocol, was concluded in 1979, and involved an amendment to the 1953 Halibut Convention.

"Convention waters" are defined as the waters off the west coasts of Canada and the United States, including the southern as well as the western coasts of Alaska, within the respective maritime areas in which either Party exercises exclusive fisheries jurisdiction. For purposes of the Convention, the "maritime area" in which a Party exercises exclusive fisheries jurisdiction includes without distinction areas within and seaward of the territorial sea or internal waters of that Party.

#### B. Organizational Structure:

The IPHC consists of a Commission and staff. The Commission consists of six members; three representatives appointed by each Contracting Party. All decisions of the Commission are made by a concurring vote of at least two of the Commissioners of each Contracting Party. The research programs and regulatory actions of the Commission are coordinated by the IPHC staff, in consultation with the Commissioners. The IPHC staff currently consists of 27 permanent employees, including fishery biologists, administrative personnel and support staff.

In addition, the Commission is advised by a Conference Board, a Processor Advisory Group (PAG), and a Research Advisory Board. The Conference Board is a panel representing U.S. and Canadian commercial and sport halibut fishers. Created in 1931 by the Commission, the Board provides the industry/sport/native harvesters' perspectives on Commission proposals presented at Annual Meetings. Members of the Board are designated by union, vessel owner, recreational harvester, Native American, and Canadian First Nations organizations from both nations. Created in 1996, the Processor Advisory Group (PAG) represents halibut processors. Like the Conference Board, the PAG lends its opinion regarding Commission proposals and offers recommendations at IPHC Annual Meetings. In 1999, the IPHC Director created the Research Advisory Board (RAB), which consists of both harvesters and

processors who offer suggestions to the Director and staff on content, design, conduct, and evaluation of Commission research programs.

#### C. Programs:

Under the Protocol to the Convention, the Commission retains a research staff and recommends, for the approval of the Parties, regulations designed to achieve the purpose of the Convention. The Protocol provides for: (1) the setting of quotas in the Convention Area, and (2) joint regulation of the halibut fishery in the entire Convention Area under Commission regulations. Neither U.S. nor Canadian halibut fishing vessels are presently allowed to fish in the waters of the other country. In 1991, Canada implemented an individual vessel quota (IVQ) system; a similar, individual fishing quota (IFQ) system for Alaska was implemented by the United States in 1995.

#### D. Conservation and Management Measures:

The International Pacific Halibut Commission completed its Eighty-third Annual Meeting in Victoria, B.C., with Dr. Laura J. Richards of Nanaimo, B.C. presiding as Chair. The Commission is recommending to the governments of Canada and the United States, catch limits for 2007 totaling 65,170,000 pounds, a 6.7% decrease from the 2006 catch limit of 69,860,000 pounds.

The Commission staff reported on the 2006 Pacific halibut stock assessment which implemented a coast-wide estimation of biomass, compared with previous assessments which assessed stock biomass for each individual IPHC regulatory area. The total stock biomass identified by the coast-wide assessment is approximately the same as the sum of that from the regulatory area assessments. However, the Commission believed that further examination of options for partitioning the coast-wide biomass estimate into estimates of biomass for each regulatory area was required before it adopted the new approach. Accordingly, the Commission relied on the previous methodology of separate regulatory area assessments as the basis for determining catch limits. Lower catch rates in the eastern area of the halibut stock prompted the Commission to recommend more restrictive catch limits for this portion of the stock. Pending recruitment from the 1994 and 1995 year classes appears to be relatively strong in most areas, although Area 4B is showing a notably lower level of recruitment of these same year classes compared with other regulatory areas.

For 2007, the Commission continued with a 22.5% harvest rate for use in Areas 2A through 3A and a rate of 20% for Areas 3B through 4E. Low levels of recruitment and lower estimated levels of productivity in Areas 4B and 4CDE continued to support harvest rates lower than 20% for these areas. Accordingly, the Commission adopted catch limits based on a harvest rate of 15% for Areas 4B and 4CDE. The IPHC conducted additional research projects in Areas 4CDE during 2006 and the results provided an improved assessment base for these areas, however the survey catch rate on the eastern Bering Sea shelf is still estimated to be low, compared with other commercial fishing areas.

#### **Seasons and Catch Limits**

The Commission received regulatory proposals for 2007 from the scientific staff, Canadian and United States harvesters and processors, and other fishery agencies. The Commission will recommend to the governments the following catch limits for 2007 in Area 2A (California, Oregon, and Washington), Area 2B (British Columbia), Area 2C (southeastern Alaska), Area 3A (central Gulf), Area 3B (western Gulf), Area 4A (eastern Aleutians), Area 4B (western Aleutians), Area 4C (Pribilof Islands), Area 4D (northwestern Bering Sea), and Area 4E (Bering Sea flats):

## 2007 Catch Limits

Regulatory Area	Catch Limit (pounds)
Area 2A	
Non-treaty directed commercial (south of Pt. Chehalis)	227,955
Non-treaty incidental catch in salmon troll fishery	40,227
Non-treaty incidental catch in sablefish longline fishery (north of Pt. Chehalis)	70,000
Treaty Indian commercial	461,000
Treaty Indian ceremonial and subsistence (year-round)	33,000
Sport – North of Columbia River	239,636
<u>Sport – South of Columbia River</u>	<u>268,182</u>
Area 2A total	1,340,000
Area 2B (includes sport catch allocation)	11,470,000
Area 2C	8,510,000
Area 3A	26,200,000
Area 3B	9,220,000
Area 4A	2,890,000
Area 4B	1,440,000
Area 4C	1,866,500
Area 4D	1,866,500
<u>Area 4E</u>	<u>367,000</u>
Area 4 total	8,430,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>65,170,000</b>

The Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Canada (DFO) will allocate the adopted Area 2B catch limit between sport and commercial fisheries.

The IPHC sets biologically-based catch limits for Areas 4A, 4B, and a combined Area 4CDE. The catch limits for Regulatory Areas 4C, 4D, and 4E reflect the catch-sharing plan implemented by the North Pacific Fishery Management Council (NPFMC). The catch-sharing plan allows Area 4D Community Development Quota (CDQ) harvest to be taken in Area 4E.

The catch-sharing plan implemented by the Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) for Area 2A was adopted by the Commission and is reflected in the catch limits adopted for the Area 2A fisheries. In Area 2A, seven 10-hour fishing periods for the non-treaty directed commercial fishery are recommended: June 27, July 11, July 25, August 8, August 22, September 5, and September 19, 2007. All fishing periods will begin at 8:00 a.m. and end at 6:00 p.m. local time, and will be further restricted by fishing period limits announced at a later date.

Area 2A fishing dates for an incidental commercial halibut fishery concurrent with salmon troll fishing seasons, and the incidental commercial halibut fishery during the sablefish fishery north of Point Chehalis, will be established under United States domestic regulations by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). The remainder of the Area 2A catch-sharing plan, including sport fishing seasons and depth restrictions, will be determined under regulations promulgated by NMFS. For further information of the depth restrictions in the commercial directed halibut fishery, incidental halibut during the sablefish fishery, and the sport fisheries, call the NMFS hotline (1-800-662-9825).

After reviewing staff information and proposals from the harvesting and processing sector, the Commission approved a season opening date of March 10. The Saturday opening date is to facilitate marketing. Therefore, seasons will

commence at 12 noon local time on March 10 and terminate at 12 noon local time on November 15, 2007 for the following fisheries and areas: the Canadian Individual Vessel Quota (IVQ) fishery in Area 2B, and the United States Individual Fishing Quota (IFQ) and CDQ fisheries in Areas 2C, 3A, 3B, 4A, 4B, 4C, 4D, and 4E. All Area 2A commercial fishing including the treaty Indian commercial fishery will fall within March 10 – November 15, 2007.

### **Regulatory Changes and Issues**

The Commission approved regulations to change the California sport fishery possession limit as part of the catch sharing plan. The sport fishery possession limit on land and on the water in California will be one daily bag limit.

For Area 2B, the Commission adopted a regulation to allow the retention of halibut in sablefish trap gear during the halibut IQ season, provided that harvesters had obtained halibut quota shares for the mortality and retention of halibut. This was passed to assist DFO with the Integrated Groundfish Fisheries Plan, which is a three-year pilot program. The regulation will be reviewed at the 2009 IPHC Annual Meeting to determine if retention of halibut in sablefish traps should continue to be allowed.

For Alaska, the Commission agreed to revise the regulation which prohibits the processing or mutilation of sport caught halibut that prevents the determination of the minimum size or number of fish. The regulation change limits the application to on board the catcher vessels only, so that halibut may be subsequently cut up as necessary off of the vessel.

The Commission agreed to change the recording date from December 1 to November 1 for the CDQ managers to report the amount of sub-legal-sized halibut retained in Area 4E and 4D CDQ fisheries.

IPHC regulations require that halibut caught in the commercial fishery that are not retained shall be immediately released outboard of the roller and returned to the sea with minimum of injury. The Commission agreed to revise the regulation to allow halibut to be measured on board the vessel to determine if they meet the legal-size limit and to then be returned to the sea with minimal injury.

The Commission noted that Guideline Harvest Levels (GHL) approved by the NPFMC for the charter/guided recreational halibut fishery in Areas 2C (southeast Alaska) and 3A (central Gulf of Alaska) were exceeded in recent years, substantially so in Area 2C (over 40% higher than the GHL in 2006). Commission staff initiated dialogue with the NPFMC to determine what control measures would be enacted by the Council to constrain harvest to the GHLs in 2007. The NPFMC indicated that, although it is committed to management of this fishery to the GHL limits, it would not be able to complete analyses and develop a regulatory framework to effect control of this fishery until 2008. The Commission, with the support of its advisory bodies, therefore passed a regulation for a one-fish halibut bag limit for sport guided charter fishing in Area 2C from June 15 - July 31, 2007 and for Area 3A from June 15 - 30, 2007. These bag limit regulations will be effective until the implementation by the U.S. government of domestic regulations to achieve halibut mortality reductions consistent with those that would be achieved by the IPHC recommendations. The Commission takes this action with some reluctance but believes the action to be necessary, given the magnitude by which the charter/guided catches exceeded the GHL limits and the belief that such over-harvesting puts at risk the achievement of IPHC management goals for the halibut stock.

### **Other Actions**

The Commission spent considerable time discussing migration, coast-wide stock assessment versus closed-area stock assessment, and apportionment among regulatory areas. The Conference Board and Commission staff recommended a workshop be held to allow the industry and agencies to better understand the coast-wide stock assessment model. The Commission staff was tasked with determining the best method for the workshop and review, in consultation with the respective agencies.

In addition, the Conference Board requested a report on the effects of hook straightening and careful release in relation to halibut viability. The Commission staff will complete a report prior to next year's Annual Meeting. The Commission will continue its research in Areas 4B and 4CDE, which was also highlighted by the Conference Board.

The Commission honoured Mr. Dylan Hardie of Courtenay, B.C. as the fifth recipient of the IPHC Merit Scholarship. Mr. Hardie was presented with a certificate and plaque, as well as the scholarship of \$2,000 (U.S.). The Commissioners expressed their continued support for the scholarship program and commended the Scholarship Committee for their efforts in assessing the candidates.

The recommended regulations for the 2007 halibut fishery will become official as soon as they are approved by the Canadian and United States Governments. The Commission will publish and distribute regulation pamphlets.

The next Annual Meeting of the Commission is planned for Oregon, at or near Portland, from January 22 to 25, 2008. The United States Government Commissioner, Dr. James W. Balsiger of Juneau AK, was elected Chair for the coming year. The Canadian Government Commissioner, Dr. Laura J. Richards of Nanaimo B.C., was elected Vice-Chair. Other Canadian Commissioners are Clifford Atleo (Port Alberni, B.C.) and Gary Robinson (Vancouver, B.C.). The other United States Commissioners are Ralph Hoard (Seattle, WA) and Phillip Lestenkof (St. Paul, AK). Dr. Bruce M. Leaman is the Executive Director of the Commission.

### **Staff Contacts**

#### *NOAA Fisheries:*

Patrick Moran  
Office of International Affairs  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
1315 East-West Highway, Room 13137  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-2276  
Fax: (301) 713-2313  
E-mail: pat.moran@noaa.gov

#### *Department of State:*

Amanda Johnson-Miller  
Office of Marine Conservation (OES/OMC)  
U.S. Department of State  
2201 C Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20520  
Telephone: (202) 647-4824  
Fax: (202) 736-7350  
E-mail:JohnsonMillerAX@state.gov

## **Convention for the Conservation of Anadromous Stocks in the North Pacific Ocean (Basic Instrument for the North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission - NPAFC)**

### **Basic Instrument**

Convention for the Conservation of Anadromous Stocks in the North Pacific Ocean, 1992 (hereafter referred to as the "Convention," Senate Treaty Document 102-30, 102d Congress, 2d Session).

### **Implementing Legislation**

The North Pacific Anadromous Stocks Act of 1992 (Title VIII of Public Law 102-567).

### **Member Nations**

Canada, Japan, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, and the United States.

### **Commission Headquarters**

North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission  
Suite 502, 889 West Pender Street  
Vancouver, B.C., Canada V6C 3B2

Executive Director: Mr. Vladimir Fedorenko  
Telephone: (604) 775-5550  
Fax: (604) 775-5577  
E-mail: [secretariat@npafc.org](mailto:secretariat@npafc.org)  
Web address: <http://www.npafc.org/>

### **Budget**

The approved NPAFC budget for Fiscal Year (FY) 2006/2007 (July 1, 2006-June 30, 2007) is CAD\$748,800, with each Party contributing CAD\$145,000. The budget estimate for FY 2007/2008 is CAD\$822,000 with each Party contributing CAD\$145,000.

### **U.S. Representation**

#### **A. Appointment Process:**

The United States is represented on the Commission by not more than three U.S. Commissioners who are appointed by the President and serve at his pleasure. Each U.S. Commissioner is appointed for a term not to exceed 4 years, but is eligible for reappointment. Of the three Commissioners, one must be an official of the U.S. Government, one a resident of the State of Alaska, and the third a resident of the State of Washington. Candidates for the non-Federal Commissioner positions must be knowledgeable or experienced concerning anadromous stocks and ecologically-related species of the North Pacific Ocean.

In addition, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, may designate from time to time Alternate U.S. Commissioners to the NPAFC. The number of Alternate Commissioners that may be designated to a Commission meeting is limited to the number of authorized U.S. Commissioners that will not be present.

## B. U.S. Commissioners:

James W. Balsiger  
Administrator, Alaska Region  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
P.O. Box 21668  
Juneau, AK 99802-1668

Gary T. Smith  
Chairman, The Gallatin Group  
2107 Elliott Ave, Suite 310  
Seattle, WA 98121

Rowland R. Maw, Jr.  
P.O. Box 110001  
3<sup>rd</sup> floor, State Capitol  
Juneau, AK 99811-0001

## C. Advisory Structure:

The North Pacific Anadromous Stocks Act of 1992 established an Advisory Panel to the United States Section of the NPAFC. The Advisory Panel shall be composed of: (1) the Commissioner of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game; (2) the Director of the Washington Department of Fisheries and Wildlife; (3) one representative of the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission; and (4) 11 members (6 residents of the State of Alaska and 5 residents of the State of Washington) appointed by the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, from among a slate of 12 persons nominated by the Governor of Alaska and a slate of 10 persons nominated by the Governor of Washington. There must be at least one representative of commercial salmon fishing interests and one representative of environmental interests on each of the Governors' slates. As is the case with NPAFC Commissioners, Advisors must be knowledgeable of North Pacific anadromous stocks and ecologically related species. Advisors serve for a term not to exceed 4 years, and may not serve more than two consecutive terms. The current Advisory Panel members follow.

Washington Department of Fish And Wildlife

Guy Norman  
Regional Director (Director's Representative)  
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife  
Region 5 Office, 2108 Grand Blvd.  
Vancouver, WA 98661

Washington Members\*

Douglas Fricke  
110 Valley Rd  
Hoquiam, WA 98550

John Sproul  
Sproul & Associates  
1000 Edson St.  
Lynden, WA 98264-1441

Robert Kehoe  
General Counsel  
Purse Seine Vessels Owners Association  
1900 W. Nickerson Street, #320  
Seattle, WA 98119-1650

James W. Tuggle  
3092 Hampton Drive S.W.  
Tumwater, WA 98512-6258

Commissioner of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game

Steve Parker  
Fisheries Resource Management  
Yakima Indian Nation  
P.O. Box 151  
Toppenish, WA 98948

David Bedford (Commissioner's Representative)  
Deputy Commissioner  
Alaska Department of Fish & Game  
P.O. Box 25526  
Juneau, AK 25526

Alaska Members\*

Karen Gillis  
Bering Sea Fishermen's Association  
2510 Sebring Circle  
Anchorage, AK 99516

Robert Thorstenson, Jr.  
United Fishermen of Alaska  
410 Calhoun Ave. #205  
Juneau, AK 99801

James Kallander  
P.O. Box 2272  
Cordova, AK 99574

Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission

David Hanson (Executive Director's Representative)  
Deputy Director  
Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission  
45 SE 82nd Avenue, Suite 100  
Gladstone, OR 97027-2522

Jay Stinson  
President, Pelagic Resources, Inc.  
P.O. Box 3845  
Kodiak, AK 99615

\* All State of Washington and Alaska members of the Advisory Panel were appointed on October 6, 2004. Their appointments will expire on September 15, 2008.

Description

## A. Mission/Purpose:

The NPAFC serves as a forum for promoting the conservation of anadromous stocks and ecologically-related species, including marine mammals, sea birds, and non-anadromous fish, in the high seas area of the North Pacific Ocean. This area, as defined in the Convention, is "the waters of the North Pacific Ocean and its adjacent seas, north of 33° North Latitude beyond 200 nautical miles from the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea is measured." In addition, the NPAFC serves as the venue for coordinating the collection, exchange, and analysis of scientific data regarding the above species within Convention waters. It also coordinates high seas fishery enforcement activities by member countries (the Convention prohibits directed fishing for salmonids and includes provisions to minimize the incidental take of salmonids in other fisheries in the Convention area).

## B. Organizational Structure:

The NPAFC has three standing committees: the Committee on Enforcement, the Committee on Finance and Administration, and the Committee on Scientific Research and Statistics. The committees are responsible for providing accurate and timely advice to the Commission in the areas relating to the finances of the Secretariat and the scope of the enforcement activities and scientific research conducted under the auspices of the Commission.

## C. Programs:

The 14<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the NPAFC was held in Vancouver, B.C., Canada, on October 23-27, 2006. All of the Parties (Canada, Japan, Korea, Russia, and the United States) were represented. Dr. James Balsiger, NMFS Alaska Regional Administrator and U.S. Federal Commissioner, led the U.S. delegation. The plenary meeting was chaired by Mr. Guy Beaupré (Canada), President of the Commission. Representatives from Taiwan, the International Pacific Halibut Commission, the North Atlantic Salmon Conservation Organization, the North Pacific Marine Science Organization (PICES), the Pacific Salmon Commission, and PICES observed the meeting.

At NPAFC Annual Meetings, the majority of the work of the Commission takes place in its three standing committees: the Committee on Enforcement (ENFO), the Committee on Finance and Administration (F&A), and the Committee on Scientific Research and Statistics (CSRS). The recommendations of each Committee on its agenda items are presented in the form of a report to the Commission for its consideration. These reports are then formally adopted by the Commission at its final plenary session. Some of the major accomplishments of each committee are highlighted below.

### **ENFO Committee**

**Unauthorized Fishing**--As a result of the Parties' cooperative enforcement efforts in 2006, no vessels were detected engaged in illegal large-scale driftnet fishing for salmon in the NPAFC Convention Area. However, sightings, boardings, and fishing vessel seizures from 2003-2006 indicate that the high seas driftnet threat in the North Pacific Ocean may be increasing, and shifting fishing effort from salmon to squid and albacore tuna. At least 26 vessels suspected of high seas driftnet fishing were sighted in 2003, 22 vessels in 2004, 24 vessels in 2005, and 98 vessels in 2006. Unfortunately, the Parties were unable to investigate and positively identify many of these vessels because of their remote location. The Parties believe that the majority of the vessels were from the People's Republic of China (China) because of the type of vessel, the characteristic style of the Chinese characters used for vessel names, and because many Chinese-flagged squid jigging vessels were often sighted fishing in close proximity. There is some uncertainty as to whether the increased number of sightings represents a real increase in the occurrence of large-scale high seas driftnet fishing in the North Pacific Ocean or whether enforcement efforts have uncovered an existing illegal fishery.

Although the NPAFC has successfully deterred high seas salmon fishing and served as a forum for joint enforcement planning and coordination in the NPAFC Convention Area, it has limited enforcement authority against non-salmon non-Party high seas driftnet fishing threats. Because of the different target species and vessel flags involved, the NPAFC Parties agreed to work multilaterally through enforcement and diplomatic channels to bring pressure on these driftnet fishing vessels and their flag states to end operations in the NPAFC Convention Area.

In light of the continuing threat of unauthorized high seas salmon fishing in the Convention Area, Parties agreed to maintain 2007 enforcement efforts at levels similar to 2006 as a deterrent to unauthorized fishing activity. To assist in dealing with the threat of high seas driftnet fishing for salmon, the NPAFC recently drafted boarding guidelines for vessels of non-member countries that are observed targeting salmon in the Convention Area. The Parties agreed to hold the Committee's annual Enforcement Evaluation and Coordination Meeting in Busan, Korea, from 27 February-1 March 2007.

### **F&A Committee**

**Revised Current Fiscal Year (FY) 2006/2007 Budget and Estimate for FY 2007/2008 Budget**--At the recommendation of the F&A Committee, the Commission adopted a revised general fund budget of CAD\$748,800 for the current FY, which began on July 1, 2006. The Commission reviewed and adopted a revised budget estimate for FY 2006/2007 of CAD\$822,000. At this level of funding, each country's annual contribution to the Commission is CAD\$145,000 (approximately US\$124,000 at current exchange rates).

### **CSRS Committee**

The Parties submitted their scientific research plans for salmon, reported on the results of their 2006 scientific research, and presented statistical data on their catches and fry releases. Approximately 60 papers covering a broad range of issues concerning Pacific salmon stocks were discussed.

The catch of Pacific salmon by all producing countries in 2005 was 971,400 metric tons (t), the second highest in recent history. Previous high levels occurred in 1995 and 2003. Pink salmon accounted for 50 percent of the catch by weight, followed by chum, sockeye, coho, chinook, and cherry (masu) salmon. The largest catches were reported

by the United States (446,100 t), followed by Russia (258,900 t), and Japan (239,200 t). While it was too early to report definitive catches for 2006, Parties were encouraged that preliminary Russian catch estimates for 2006 were very similar to catches recorded in 2005. Preliminary 2006 Alaska catches showed major fluctuations in abundance. Returns of pink salmon in southeast Alaska were much lower than forecasted, while chum salmon returns were very strong. Complicating these fluctuations of abundance are the ongoing consequences of climate change on salmon production. Oceanographic conditions have undergone dramatic changes in the Bering Sea in recent years. These conditions are being monitored by the NPAFC Bering-Aleutian Salmon International Survey (BASIS). Vessels from Japan, Russia, and the United States are involved in an ecosystem study of salmon and associated marine fishes in the entire Bering Sea. Results from this research will be reported at the NPAFC Symposium on BASIS which will be held in the United States in 2008.

### **Other Issues**

**New Deputy Director:** Dr. Shigehiko Urawa (Japan) was selected by the Executive Director to be the next Deputy Director of the Commission. His term is for 3 years, beginning December 1, 2006.

**Future Meetings:** Russia will host the 15<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the NPAFC Vladivostok on October 8-12, 2007. The United States offered to host the 16<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting in 2008. Japan will host the 17<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting in 2009.

### **Staff Contacts**

#### *NOAA Fisheries:*

Paul Niemeier  
International Fisheries Affairs Division (F/IA1)  
Office of International Affairs  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
1315 East-West Highway, Room 12752  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-2276  
Fax: (301) 713-2313  
E-mail: paul.niemeier@noaa.gov

#### *Department of State:*

Amanda Johnson Miller  
Office of Marine Conservation (OES/OMC)  
U.S. Department of State  
2201 C Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20520-7818  
Telephone: (202) 647-2335  
Fax: (202) 646-7350  
E-mail: JohnsonMillerAX@state.gov

**Treaty Between the Government of the United States of America  
and the Government of Canada Concerning Pacific Salmon  
(Basic Instrument for the Pacific Salmon Commission - PSC)**

**Basic Instrument**

Treaty Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada Concerning Pacific Salmon, 1985.

**Implementing Legislation**

Pacific Salmon Treaty Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3631).

**Member States**

The United States and Canada.

**Commission Headquarters**

Pacific Salmon Commission  
1155 Robson Street, Suite 600  
Vancouver, British Columbia  
Canada V6E 1B5

Executive Secretary: Mr. Don Kowal  
Telephone: (604) 684-8081  
Fax: (604) 666-8707  
Web address: <http://www.psc.org/Index.htm>

**Budget**

Each Party contributed CAD\$1,746,783 to the approved Commission budget of CAD\$3,635,882 for Fiscal Year 2006-2007 (April 1, 2006-March 31, 2007). The budget for the fiscal year that begins April 1, 2007, is CAD\$3,600,234 and includes contributions of CAD\$587,969 from each Party.

**U.S. Representation**

A. Appointment Process:

The appointment process for U.S. members of the PSC includes several unique features. The legislation implementing the treaty specifies: "The United States shall be represented on the Commission by four Commissioners who are knowledgeable or experienced concerning Pacific salmon, to be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the President. Of these, one shall be an official of the U.S. Government who shall be a non-voting member of the U.S. Section; one shall be a resident of the State of Alaska and shall be appointed from a list of at least six qualified individuals nominated by the Governor of that State; one shall be a resident of the States of Oregon or Washington and shall be appointed from a list of at least six qualified individuals nominated by the Governors of those States; and one shall be appointed from a list of at least six qualified individuals nominated by the treaty Indian Tribes of the States of Idaho, Oregon, or Washington. Two of the initial appointments shall be for 2-year terms; all other appointments shall be for 4-year terms." Legislation also provides for the designation of an Alternate Commissioner for each Commissioner. In the absence of a Commissioner, the Alternate Commissioner may exercise all functions of the Commissioner.

## B. Commissioners:

Larry Rutter  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
Olympia Field Office  
510 Desmond Drive, S.E. Suite 103  
Lacey, WA 98503

David Bedford  
Deputy Commissioner  
Alaska Department of Fish and Game  
P.O. Box 25526  
Juneau, AK 99802-5526

Frank L. Cassidy, Jr  
Northwest Power and Conservation Council  
P.O. Box 2187  
110 Y Street  
Vancouver, WA 98661

W. Ron Allen  
Tribal Chairman  
Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe  
1033 Old Blyn Highway  
Sequim, WA 98382

## C. Alternate Commissioners:

David Balton  
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Oceans and Fisheries  
United States Department of State  
2201 C Street NW, Room 5806  
Washington, DC 20520

James E. Bacon  
1410 Tongass Avenue  
Ketchikan, AK 99901

Rollie Rousseau  
16420 N.W. Joscelyn  
Beaverton, OR 97006

Olney Patt Jr.  
Executive Director  
Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission  
729 N.E. Oregon St., Suite 200  
Portland, OR 97232

**Description**

## A. Mission/Purpose:

The PSC's mission is to serve as a forum for cooperation between the United States and Canada in the establishment of general fishery management regimes for the international conservation and harvest sharing of intermingling North Pacific salmon stocks. Implementation of the principles of the Pacific Salmon Treaty should enable the two countries, through better conservation and enhancement, to "prevent overfishing and provide for optimum production; and provide for each Party to receive benefits equivalent to the production of salmon originating in its waters." The Commission also serves as a forum for consultation between the Parties on their salmonid enhancement operations and research programs.

## B. Organizational Structure:

The Commission has a complex organizational structure which includes four regional Panels (Northern, Transboundary, Fraser River, and Southern) consisting of 23 U.S. Panel Members, 15 of whom are appointed by the Secretary of Commerce. Each Panel member on the Northern, Fraser River, and Southern Panels has an Alternate Member (9 total), who is also appointed by the Secretary of Commerce. The Northern Panel's stocks of concern are those originating in rivers between Cape Suckling in Alaska and Cape Caution in British Columbia. The Transboundary Panel's stocks of concern originate in rivers in British Columbia that flow to the sea through Southeast Alaska. The Fraser River Panel is the only panel with regulatory responsibility. It is responsible for stocks of sockeye and pink salmon originating in the Fraser River. The Southern Panel is concerned with stocks originating in rivers of Canada south of Cape Caution (not including Fraser River pink and sockeye salmon) and the rivers of Washington, Oregon and Idaho.

The Panels are responsible for providing advice to the Commission on the management regimes for the intercepting salmon fisheries in their respective regions, i.e., those in which one or both countries intercept salmon spawned in the other country. This is done by reviewing technical data on annual fishing plans, regulations, and the salmon enhancement programs of each country. Based on the advice provided by the Panels, the PSC formulates management recommendations, including catch limits and related regulations, to present to the two governments. These recommendations become effective upon approval by both governments.

### C. Programs:

On June 30, 1999, the United States and Canada signed a new Pacific Salmon Agreement. The agreement concluded 7 years of negotiations and establishes new fishing regimes under the 1985 Pacific Salmon Treaty to protect and rebuild salmon stocks. The long-term agreement secures a management and harvest-sharing framework for the next decade. Most of the new fishery arrangements will be in effect for 10 years, beginning in 1999. The arrangement concerning the management of Fraser sockeye and pink salmon will be in effect for 12 years, also beginning in 1999.

The agreement establishes abundance-based fishing regimes, based on run strength, for the major salmon intercepting fisheries in the United States and Canada. Larger catches will be allowed when abundance is higher and catches will be constrained in years when abundance is down. These regimes are designed to implement the conservation and harvest sharing principles of the Pacific Salmon Treaty.

Also under the agreement, two bilaterally-managed regional funds were established. The funds will be used to improve fisheries management and aid efforts to recover weakened salmon stocks. The United States contributed US\$75 million and US\$65 million to a northern and southern fund, respectively, over a 4-year period. The agreement highlights the importance of habitat protection and restoration in achieving the long-term objectives of the Parties relative to salmon. It also includes a commitment by the two countries to improve how scientific information is obtained, shared, and applied to the management of the resource.

### Overview of the Agreement's Current Fishing Regimes in Annex IV of the Treaty

Transboundary Rivers (Chapter 1): This agreement specifies arrangements for sockeye, coho, chinook, and pink salmon management for several rivers that flow from Canada to the Pacific Ocean through the Alaskan panhandle, including the Stikine, Taku and Alsek rivers. An attachment to the agreement describes programs and associated costs for joint enhancement of sockeye salmon in the Taku and Stikine rivers.

Northern British Columbia and Southeast Alaska (Chapter 2): This agreement addresses the management of sockeye, pink and chum salmon fisheries in southeast Alaska and northern British Columbia. It specifies how the fisheries will be managed to achieve conservation and fair sharing of salmon stocks that intermingle in the border area. The fixed catch ceilings contained in the expired agreements are replaced with abundance-based provisions that allow harvests to vary from year to year depending on the abundance of salmon. Of particular note, because they resolve long-contentious issues, are agreements governing the harvest of sockeye in Alaska's purse seine fisheries near Noyes Island (District 104) and the gillnet fishery at Tree Point (District 101), and Canada's various marine net fisheries for pink salmon and its troll fishery for pink salmon in specific Canadian fishing areas .

Chinook Salmon (Chapter 3): Because they pass through fisheries regulated by many jurisdictions in both Canada and the United States, Chinook salmon have been the focus of increasing concern and controversy in recent years. Although some Chinook populations are relatively healthy, particularly the "far north migrating stocks" that tend to migrate to the marine waters near Alaska to grow and mature, others have been so diminished in recent years that they have been listed by the U.S. Federal Government under the Endangered Species Act. The new Chinook regime encompasses marine and certain freshwater fisheries in Alaska, Canada, Washington, and Oregon. All Chinook fisheries will be managed based on abundance, replacing the fixed catch quotas that applied in previous regimes. Two types of fisheries have been designated: (1) those that will be managed based on the aggregate abundance of Chinook salmon present in the fishery, and (2) those that will be managed based on the status of individual stocks or

stock groups in the fishery.

The agreement provides a degree of flexibility to allow management agencies to decide how best to distribute the harvest impacts across their various fisheries to reflect domestic fishery priorities, provided the over-all reductions are achieved. For some Chinook stocks, the total reductions will have to be much greater than the general obligation, due to the need to provide extra protection for certain very depressed stocks. The general obligation will not apply to hatchery stocks or healthy natural stocks that are achieving escapement objectives and can support harvest. In addition to predetermined harvest schedules, the agreement contains provisions that specify conditions under which even greater harvest reductions will apply. These so-called "weak stock" provisions serve as a safety valve to afford additional protection to stocks that may fail to respond to the recovery programs.

Fraser River Sockeye and Pink Salmon (Chapter 4): Although much of the structure of the previous agreements relating to the Fraser River is retained, the new agreement requires a reduction of the U.S. share of Fraser sockeye, which was phased in by 2002. The U.S. share in Washington State is 16.5 percent of the total allowable catch. (By way of contrast, the U.S. share specified in the first 4 years of the Pacific Salmon Treaty was approximately 26 percent.) The U.S. share of Fraser pink salmon will be 25.7 percent of the total allowable catch.

Coho Salmon (Chapter 5): The coho agreement essentially provides a blueprint and specifications (biological criteria) for a conservation-based regime for border area fisheries in southern British Columbia and Washington State. The specifics of the regime were bilaterally developed and were agreed to in February of 2002. The new regime will include rules that will establish harvest limits in specified border area fisheries. The rules are designed to limit exploitation rates on natural coho stocks to sustainable levels, taking into account all fisheries affecting the stocks, thereby improving the long term prospects of sustainable, healthy fisheries in both countries.

Southern British Columbia and Washington State Chum Salmon (Chapter 6): This chapter incorporates certain refinements to the provisions that trigger fisheries directed at chum salmon in the Strait of Georgia and Puget Sound. These refinements will have only a minor impact on the allocations of catches, but will improve the effectiveness of the regime. Additionally, at the request of the United States, Canada agreed to require the live release of chum salmon in certain of its net fisheries in its southern boundary areas at those times of the year when "summer chum"--a species recently listed as threatened under the ESA--may be present in the areas. Both countries agreed to collect better data relating to these fish.

The 1999 agreement can be found at: [http://www.state.gov/www/global/oes/oceans/990630\\_salmon\\_index.html](http://www.state.gov/www/global/oes/oceans/990630_salmon_index.html).

**2007 Annual Meeting**: The PSC held its Annual Meeting on February 12-16, 2007, in Portland, Oregon. Among other things, the Commission planned and began exchanging questions and options that will lead to the renegotiation of the current Pacific Salmon Treaty fishing regimes which are set to expire in 2008.

Most of the fishing regimes contained in Annex IV of the Pacific Salmon Treaty are set to expire at the end of 2008 and will need to be renegotiated over the next year. The two sides have agreed that renegotiation of these fishing regimes should take place within the cooperative context of the PSC, rather than directly between the governments, to the extent possible. The Parties are discussing renegotiation procedures and are beginning to explore options for changes to three chapters of Annex IV of the Treaty.

In light of the fact that several of the fishing regimes have been recently updated, U.S. Commissioners believe that most of the regimes may only need "fine tuning," rather than the kind of major overhaul that occurred in 1999. Although generally agreeing with this assessment, Canada cautioned that it may be difficult to manage the expectations of all participants in the process, and that ultimately the Treaty in its totality must work for both Parties. Ideally, from the U.S. perspective, any necessary revisions to the majority of expiring fishing regimes should be discussed within, and recommended by, the appropriate PSC panels and technical committees, and then adopted by the Commission. The negotiations of Chapter 3, Annex IV Chinook provisions will be conducted at the Commission level. If the Commission agrees on changes to all the expiring fishing regimes, it will recommend those changes to

the U.S. and Canadian Governments, who will then exchange notes to bring the relevant amendments to Annex IV of the Treaty into force.

The PSC has established a scoping committee to develop the basic objectives, functions, committee makeup, costs and structure of a Habitat and Restoration Technical Committee that has been agreed to help the Commission implement Attachment E on Habitat Restoration of the 1999 Agreement to the Pacific Salmon Treaty. The Committee will operate similarly to the other PSC technical committees, and will report to the Commission on the status of habitats for salmon stocks affected by non-fishing factors. It will also identify for the Commission options for addressing habitat factors that limit production of those stocks. In October of 2007, the scoping group will report its findings to the PSC.

Perhaps the most controversial issue currently facing the PSC concerns the coast-wide harvest and conservation of Chinook salmon, many runs of which are listed under the U.S. Endangered Species Act. Chapter 3 of Annex IV of the Treaty Chinook addresses Chinook conservation and harvest sharing issues and is one of the fishing regimes that is scheduled to expire at the end of 2008. A PSC technical committee also has reported on the extent changes to the timing and scope of Canadian fisheries off the West Coast of Vancouver Island have caused a differential impact on U.S. ESA-listed Chinook. The United States is suggesting that, to the extent Canada shapes its fisheries to avoid catching Canadian stocks of concern, it should similarly seek to reduce impacts on threatened and endangered U.S. stocks.

The PSC continues to pursue a work plan to implement some of the recommendations of an Expert Panel convened to examine the coast-wide coded wire tag (CWT) program--one of the primary tools for research and data collection on the status of Pacific salmon stocks. Experts are concerned that the integrity and usefulness of the CWT program may be suffering from the effects of scarce resources to implement the program, fewer tag recoveries resulting from reduced fisheries, and the impacts of mass marking and mark-selective fisheries.

Future Meetings: The next regular meeting of the Pacific Salmon Commission will be held on October 16-18, 2007, in Coeur d'Alene, Idaho. The PSC Post Season Meeting will be held January 14-18, 2008, in Portland, Oregon, and the 23<sup>rd</sup> Annual Meeting will be held February 11-15, 2008, in Vancouver, British Columbia.

### **Staff Contacts**

#### *NOAA Fisheries:*

David Cantillon  
Pacific Salmon Treaty Section  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
7600 Sand Point Way  
Seattle, WA 98115-0070  
Telephone: (206) 526-4140  
Fax: (206) 526-6534  
E-mail: david.cantillon@noaa.gov

#### *Department of State:*

Amanda Johnson-Miller  
Office of Marine Conservation (OES/OMC)  
U.S. Department of State  
2201 C Street, NW, Room 2758  
Washington, D.C. 20520-7818  
Telephone: (202) 647-3228  
Fax: (202) 736-7350  
E-mail: JohnsonMillerAX@state.gov

## **Convention on the Conservation and Management of Pollock Resources in the Central Bering Sea**

### **Implementing Legislation**

There is no implementing legislation for the Convention.

### **Parties**

Japan, People's Republic of China (China), Republic of Korea (Korea), Republic of Poland (Poland), Russian Federation, and the United States.

### **Description**

#### A. Mission/Purpose:

The objectives of the Convention are:

- "1. to establish an international regime for conservation, management, and optimum utilization of pollock resources in the Convention Area [the high seas area of the Bering Sea beyond the U.S. and Russian 200-mile jurisdictions];
2. to restore and maintain pollock resources in the Bering Sea at levels which will permit their maximum sustainable yield;
3. to cooperate in the gathering and examining of factual information concerning pollock and other living marine resources in the Bering Sea; and
4. to provide, if the Parties agree, a forum in which to consider the establishment of necessary conservation and management measures for other living marine resources in the Convention Area as may be required in the future."

#### B. Organizational Structure:

The Convention does not provide for a commission. It does, however, specify that Parties will convene an Annual Conference and establish a Scientific and Technical (S&T) Committee. The functions of the Annual Conference are, among other things, to establish an annual allowable harvest level (AHL) for pollock in the Convention Area, establish an annual individual national pollock quota (INQ) for each Party, adopt appropriate pollock conservation and management measures, establish a Plan of Work for the S&T Committee, and discuss cooperative enforcement measures and receive enforcement reports from each Party. Parties may also use the Annual Conference to determine the scope of any cooperative scientific research on, and conservation and management measures for, living marine resources other than pollock covered by the Convention.

The S&T Committee has the charge to "compile, exchange, and analyze information on fisheries harvests, fish stocks, and other living marine resources covered by this Convention in accordance with the Plan of Work established by the Annual Conference, and shall investigate other scientific matters as may be referred to it by the Annual Conference." The S&T Committee also makes recommendations to the Annual Conference regarding the conservation and management of pollock, including the AHL.

### C. Advisory Body:

No formal U.S. advisory body has been legislated for the Convention. However, the U.S. Department of State has invited the 12-member "North Pacific and Bering Sea Fisheries Advisory Body," appointed to advise the U.S.

Representative to the U.S.-Russia Intergovernmental Consultative Committee (ICC), to serve informally as the advisory body. This group consists of the following individuals:

- The Director of the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife of the State of Washington;
- The Commissioner of the Department of Fish and Game of the State of Alaska;
- Five members appointed by the Secretary of State from a list of 10 nominees provided by the Governor of Alaska; and,
- Five members appointed by the Secretary of State from a list of 10 nominees provided by the Governor of Washington.

### D. Background:

The development in the mid-to-late 1980s of an extensive pollock fishery in the central Bering Sea area of the Aleutian Basin, beyond the U.S. and Russian 200-mile zones, was of great concern to U.S. and Russian fishing interests. The United States closed a domestic fishery as a result of the adverse impact this unregulated fishery was having on U.S. pollock stocks. Concern also extended to bycatch problems associated with the fishery.

The central Bering Sea pollock fishery was conducted by trawl vessels from China, Japan, Korea, Poland, and the former Soviet Union. Catch data submitted by these countries indicated that annual harvests in the area rose to approximately 1.5 million metric tons (t) in the years leading up to 1989. Largely due to drastic declines in catch and catch-per-unit-effort, leading to a total catch of under 300,000 t in 1991 and only 10,000 t in 1992, the governments involved agreed to a voluntary suspension of fishing in the area for 1993-94. During the 2-year suspension of fishing, an agreed scientific monitoring program was carried out that showed no evidence of the recovery of the resource.

On February 11, 1994, after 3 years of negotiations, the Parties initialed the Convention on the Conservation and Management of Pollock Resources in the central Bering Sea. Its major principles include: no fishing permitted in the Convention area unless the biomass of the Aleutian Basin stock exceeds a threshold of 1.67 million t (if the parties cannot agree on an estimate of the biomass, the estimate of the Alaska Fisheries Science Center and its Russian counterpart will be used); allocation procedures; 100 percent observer and satellite transmitter coverage; and prior notification of entry into the Convention area and of transshipment activities.

On June 16, 1994, the Convention was signed by China, Korea, the Russian Federation, and the United States. Japan and Poland signed it on August 4, 1994, and August 25, 1994, respectively. The Convention entered into force on December 8, 1995, for Russia, Poland, China, and the United States, on December 21, 1995, for Japan, and on January 4, 1996, for Korea.

### **Current Status**

Representatives of the United States, China, Japan, Korea, Poland, and Russia met in Warsaw, Poland, on September 5-8, 2006, for the 11<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Conservation and Management of Pollock Resources in the Central Bering Sea. The Conference was chaired by Mr. Zbigniew Karnicki, Science Director, Sea Fisheries Institute, Poland. Dr. Loh-Lee Low, Alaska Fisheries Science Center, led the U.S. delegation. September 5-6 were devoted to a Scientific and Technical (S&T) Committee meeting; plenary sessions were conducted on September 7-8.

The major functions of the Annual Conference are, among other things, to establish an allowable commercial harvest level (AHL) for pollock in the central Bering Sea for the following year, establish an annual individual national pollock quota (INQ) for each Party, establish a Plan of Work for the S&T Committee, and adopt appropriate pollock conservation and management measures for the Convention area.

**2007 AHL and INQs:** The pollock biomass for the Convention area was estimated at 400,000 t, based on the premise that the Bogoslof Island pollock spawning stock biomass (240,000 t) is equal to 60 percent of the biomass in the Convention Area. The Parties agreed that there was insufficient scientific and technical information to determine the pollock biomass of the whole Aleutian Basin and that the estimated biomass for the Convention Area is nowhere near the biomass target (1.67 million t) stated in the Convention necessary to trigger a commercial fishery. Nevertheless, China, Japan, and Korea submitted a proposal to establish an AHL for pollock in the central Bering Sea of 14,000 t, based on the indirect biomass estimate, an exploitation rate of 20%, and the fact that central Bering Sea represents 17% of the area of the Aleutian Basin. The United States and Russia supported setting the AHL at zero, given that the Aleutian Basin pollock stock biomass is still at historically low levels. As there was no consensus on an AHL, the 2007 AHL was set at zero using the fall-back formula in Part 1 of the Annex to the Convention. Consequently, the INQ was also set at zero. 2007 will mark the 14th year of a moratorium on commercial pollock fishing in the central Bering Sea.

**Trial Fishing:** Korea presented preliminary results of trial fishing efforts in 2006. Three Korean commercial fishing vessels conducted trial fishing in the Central Bering Sea from July 31 to August 8 to determine the geographical distribution of pollock in the area and to collect biological data. However, 11 trawl hauls produced only one pollock.

The Parties agreed to roll over the terms and conditions for trial fishing adopted in 1999 for 2007. Korea plans to conduct trial fishing with two vessels in 2007. Japan is considering conducting trial fishing with one vessel in 2007.

**Work Plan for the S&T Committee:** The Parties agreed to continue cooperative research efforts to determine the causes of continued low pollock stock levels in the Convention Area, and to move forward with plans to convene a workshop on pollock stock genetics.

**Enforcement:** The Parties did not observe any unauthorized pollock fishing in the Convention Area in 2006.

**Transparency:** The Parties agreed to the same interim observer rules for 2007 that have been employed since 1998. These rules do not address attendance by non-governmental observers--only observers from regional and intergovernmental organizations.

**Future Meetings:** China agreed to host the 12<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference of the Parties in Beijing on September 4-7, 2007. Russia announced preliminary plans to host the 13<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference in Kaliningrad.

The NMFS Alaska Fisheries Science Center has made the reports of the 2006 Annual Conference and the S&T Committee available on the internet at [http://www.afsc.noaa.gov/refm/cbs/convention\\_description.htm](http://www.afsc.noaa.gov/refm/cbs/convention_description.htm).

**Staff Contacts***NOAA Fisheries:*

Paul E. Niemeier  
International Fisheries Affairs Division (F/IA1)  
Office of International Affairs  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
1315 East-West Highway, Room 12752  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-2276  
Fax: (301) 713-2313  
E-mail: paul.niemeier@noaa.gov  
Region:

James W. Balsiger, Administrator  
Alaska Region (F/AK)  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
P.O. Box 21668  
Juneau, AK 99802-1668  
Telephone: (907) 586-7221  
Fax: (907) 586-7249  
E-mail: jim.balsiger@noaa.gov

*Department of State:*

Amanda Johnson-Miller  
Office of Marine Conservation (OES/OMC)  
U.S. Department of State  
2201 C Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20520-7818  
Telephone: (202) 647-2335  
Fax: (202) 736-7350  
E-mail: JohnsonMillerAX@state.gov

**Treaty Between the Government of the United States of America  
and the Government of Canada on  
Pacific Coast Albacore Tuna Vessels and Port Privileges**

**Implementing Legislation**

Implementing legislation was signed on April 13, 2004, as Public Law 108-219, 118 Stat. 615.

**Parties**

The United States and Canada.

**Description**

The Treaty entered into force in 1982. In 2001, at the request of the U.S. albacore fishing industry, the United States requested consultations with Canada for the purpose of discussing limitations on the catch or effort by fishing vessels of one Party operating in the jurisdiction of the other Party. Following initial consultations, three subsequent negotiating sessions culminated in agreement in April, 2002, to amend the Treaty. The U.S. Senate gave its advice and consent to the Treaty amendments, and Congress enacted H.R. 2584 (Public Law 108-219) on March 29, 2004, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to issue regulations to implement the amended Treaty. The President signed H.R. 2584 into law on April 13, 2004. Proposed regulations to allow the United States to implement the amendments to the Treaty were published in April, 2004 and final regulations followed in June, 2004.

The United States and Canada agreed to allow fishing vessels of the other Party to fish for albacore tuna in waters under its fisheries jurisdiction beyond 12 nautical miles during a fishing season which occurs from June through October in most years. The Treaty requires that the United States and Canada annually exchange lists of fishing vessels which may fish for albacore tuna in each other's waters. The vessels agree to abide by the provisions of the Treaty, which include: vessel marking; hail-in, hail-out procedures; recordkeeping; reporting. The Treaty also allows the fishing vessels of each Party to enter designated fishing ports of the other Party to:

1. land their catches of albacore without payment of duties, and
2. transship them in bond under the supervision of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to any port of the flag state, or
3. sell them for export in bond, or
4. sell them locally on payment of the applicable customs duty and
5. obtain fuel, supplies, repairs, and equipment on the same basis as albacore tuna vessels of the other Party.

Under the amended Treaty, the United States and Canada also agree to:

1. Establish limits on reciprocal fishing by vessels of one Party in the other Party's waters which will have the effect of decreasing such fishing effort over a three-year period.
2. Develop mechanisms to monitor vessel movements across boundaries and to exchange information on such movements to assure that the fishing limits are enforced;
3. Conduct an ongoing scientific and fishery information exchange between the Parties;
4. Conduct annual Treaty consultations.

**Current Issues**

The first fishing season conducted under the amended Treaty occurred during the summer of 2004. Both Parties worked diligently to put the new requirements of the Treaty into force in their respective fishing areas. Reports exchanged during the months following the fishing season indicate that most of the new requirements worked well and were respected by fishers of both Parties. Discussion of improvements to the procedures undertaken and to achieve information exchange requirements, the Parties held annual consultation meetings as required by the Treaty on April 26-27, 2005, in Long Beach, California, and April 24-25 in Vancouver, British Columbia.

At the 2006 meeting, it was agreed that both countries would meet again later in December to review international and scientific developments related to the shared albacore resource, to preliminarily review vessel month usage for the 2006 season, and to continue the discussion initiated in April of potential limitation regimes for 2007 and beyond. That meeting was held in La Jolla, California, on December 5. At this meeting, it was agreed that the default provision in the Treaty, which allows each Party to continue fishing for albacore tuna in each others waters at a level no more than 75 percent of the limit applicable during the last year of the regime (i.e., 94 vessels or 375 vessels months), would be used for 2007. The United States believes that this arrangement serves as the best answer to maintain the Treaty for the near term while both countries explore options for the longer term. The United States also made it clear that they are open to having consultations for 2008 and beyond and do not see the default level as the preferred long term solution. The Parties agreed to meet again in Victoria, Canada on April, 25-26, 2007 to complete the annual exchange of information and to discuss arrangements for the 2008 fishing season.

**Staff Contacts***NOAA Fisheries:**Southwest Region*

Mark Helvey, Assistant Regional Administrator for Sustainable Fisheries  
501 West Ocean Boulevard, Suite 4200  
Long Beach, CA 90802-4213  
Telephone: (562) 980-4040  
Fax: (562) 980-4047  
E-mail: mark.helvey@noaa.gov

*Headquarters*

Dean Swanson  
Chief, International Fisheries Division  
National Marine Fisheries Service, F/SF4  
1315 East-West Highway  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-2276  
Fax: (301) 713-2313  
E-mail: dean.swanso@noaa.gov

## **Treaty on Fisheries Between the Governments of Certain Pacific Island States and the Government of the United States of America (South Pacific Tuna Treaty -- SPTT)**

### **Implementing Legislation**

South Pacific Tuna Act of 1988 as amended ( U.S.C. 973 et seq.).

### **Parties**

The United States, Australia, Cook Islands, Federates States of Micronesia , Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, New Zealand, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, and Samoa.

### **Description**

The SPTT entered into force in 1988. After an initial 5-year agreement, the SPTT was extended in 1993 and again in March 2002, when the Parties agreed to amend and extend the Treaty and to extend the related Economic Assistance Agreement between the United States and the Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) beyond the June 2003 expiration date, for a term of 10 years. The 2002 extension provides licenses for up to 40 U.S. purse seiners, with an option for 5 additional licenses reserved for joint venture arrangements, to fish for tuna in the EEZ's of the Pacific Island Parties. It also contains a number of amendments to the Treaty and its annexes, such as updating the methods available for reporting; a revised procedure for amending the annexes; a revised observer program fee formula; provisions on the use of a vessel monitoring system (VMS); and general provisions on fishing capacity, revenue sharing, and linkages between the Treaty and the Western and Central Pacific Tuna Convention (WCPTC), among others. The SPTT agreement expires on June 14, 2013.

The Treaty is said to be working efficiently and to the benefit of all involved. It has been viewed as a model of international and fishery cooperation. Issues that arise typically are addressed in formal annual consultations between U.S. Government and Pacific Island States representatives, or during informal discussions which also have taken place on an annual basis. The Department of State has specific authority to act for the United States.

### **Budget**

Of the total cost for access under the SPTT, the U.S. tuna industry, as coordinated by the American Tunaboat Owners Association , provides up to \$3 million each year to the Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) located in Honiara, Solomon Islands. The FFA Director and staff act as the SPTT Administrators for the Pacific Island Countries party to the agreement. The FFA deducts a small amount (approx. \$500,000) for treaty administration, after which 15 percent of the revenue is divided equally among FFA members, with the remaining balance (85 percent) distributed on a *pro rata* basis depending on the weight of tuna landed in each respective EEZ. The Director of the FFA is currently Taniela Sua (telephone: 677-21124; fax: 677-23995).

Also associated with the SPTT is an Economic Assistance Agreement between the U.S. Government (U.S. Agency for International Development) and the FFA. The U.S. Government pays \$18 million annually, subject to the availability of appropriated funds for this purpose, into an economic development fund administered by the FFA. The FFA ensures that the fund is used to support economic development programs in the region. Payments to the Pacific Island Countries under the Economic Assistance Agreement are now the only significant source of U.S. economic support for the stability and security of the region outside the assistance provided to the Freely Associated States. Under the terms of the SPTT, both the U.S. tuna industry and the U.S. Government annual payments must be made before any fishing licenses will be issued (renewed annually on June 15th). In addition to paying access fees, the U.S. tuna industry also pays the FFA costs associated with observer coverage (including training), vessel monitoring system deployment and associated recurring costs, and a regional registration fee. Under the new agreement, the overall costs of the industry supported observer fund will be based on 15 vessels making an average of five trips and an average observer placement cost of an estimated \$4,500 per trip. Also included are newly agreed

costs for program management (\$30,000) and training (\$17,000) resulting in an estimated total cost to the U.S. industry of approximately \$.90,000 annually.

### **U.S. Administration**

U.S. operational, administrative, and enforcement commitments under the SPTT are carried out by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). These responsibilities are implemented by the NMFS Pacific Islands Regional Office located in Honolulu, Hawaii.

### **Future Meetings**

The Pacific Island Countries confirmed that the next formal consultation would be held in Vanuatu in mid-March 2007 and that an informal meeting of representatives of the FFA, some PICs, the U.S. purse seine vessel owners and relevant US Government officials, will occur in the last quarter of 2007 in San Diego, California.

### **Staff Contacts**

#### *NOAA Fisheries:*

Bill Robinson, Administrator  
Pacific Islands Region  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
2570 Dole Street, Room 106  
Honolulu, HI 96822-2396  
Telephone: (808) 973-2937  
Fax: (808) 973-2941  
E-mail: Bill.Robinson@noaa.gov

## **The Convention on the Conservation and Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean (WCPFC)**

### **Basic Instrument**

Convention on the Conservation and Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean

### **Implementing Legislation**

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Convention Implementation Act, 2007. Pub. L. 109-479, 120 Stat.3575

### **Member Nations**

Australia, Canada, China, Cook Islands, European Community, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, France (extends to French Polynesia, New Caledonia and Wallis and Futuna), Japan, Kiribati, Korea, Marshall Islands, Nauru, New Zealand (extends to Tokelau), Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu and the fishing entity of Chinese Taipei (Taiwan). As of March 2007, The United States and Indonesia are Cooperating Non-Members.

### **Commission Headquarters**

WCPFC Secretariat  
Kaselehlie Street  
PO Box 2356  
Kolonja, Pohnpei State 96941  
FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA

Executive Director: Mr. Andrew Wright  
Telephone: + (691) 320-1992  
Fax: + (691) 320-1108  
Email: [wcpfc@mail.fm](mailto:wcpfc@mail.fm)  
Web address: <http://www.wcpfc.int>

### **Budget**

Each member of the Commission shall contribute to the budget in accordance with the following formula determined according to article 18, paragraph 2, of the Convention:

- (a) a 10 per cent base fee divided in equal shares between all members of the Commission;
- (b) a 20 per cent national wealth component based upon an equal weighting of proportional gross national income (calculated on a three-year average) per capita and proportional gross national income (calculated on a three-year average); and
- (c) a 70 per cent fish production component based upon a three-year average of the total catches taken within exclusive economic zones and in areas beyond national jurisdiction in the Convention Area of all the stocks covered by the Convention for which data are available (including the main target tuna species, as well as the four main billfish species (black marlin, blue marlin, striped marlin and swordfish)), subject to a discount factor of 0.4 being applied to the catches taken within the EEZ of a member of the Commission which is a developing State or territory by vessels flying the flag of that member.

Adopting the Commission budget for 2007 was very difficult. An ad-hoc working group on finance and administration met twelve times, the last two at the direction of the Chairman after the group reported that it could not reach agreement. In the end, the Ad-hoc working group refused to recommend a 2007 budget to the Commission, instead presenting an option for a \$3,006,000 budget, based on an objectionable financing plan, which the Commission adopted. The adopted budget cuts \$200,000 from the administrative expenses of the Secretariat (10%), draws \$38,000 from the working capital fund, and relies on \$215,000 from the Japanese Trust fund to support travel costs by small island developing states to attend three future WCPFC-related meetings.

### **U.S. Representation**

#### A. Appointment Process:

The Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Convention Implementation Act, 2007 provides that the United States shall be represented by five Commissioners. Individuals shall be appointed to serve on the Commission at the pleasure of the President. In making the appointments, the President shall select Commissioners from among individuals who are knowledgeable or experienced concerning highly migratory fish stocks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean, one of whom shall be an officer or employee of the Department of Commerce, and one of whom shall be the chairman or a member of the Western Pacific Fishery Management Council and the Pacific Fishery Management Council. The Commissioners shall be entitled to adopt such rules of procedures as they find necessary and to select a chairman from among members who are officers or employees of the United States Government.

#### B. Current U.S. Commissioners:

Appointment of U.S. Commissioners has not yet taken place (as of March 2007).

#### C. Advisory Body:

The Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Convention Implementation Act, 2007 provides that there is to be established an advisory committee which shall be composed of:

- (i) not less than 15 nor more than 20 individuals appointed by the Secretary of Commerce in consultation with the United States Commissioners, who shall select such individuals from various groups concerned with the fisheries covered by the WCPFC Convention, providing, to the maximum extent practicable, an equitable balance among such groups;
- (ii) the chair of the Western Pacific Fishery Management Council's Advisory Committee or the chair's designee; and
- (iii) officials of the fisheries management authorities of American Samoa, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands (or their designees).

### **Description**

#### A. Mission/Purpose:

The objective of the Convention is to ensure, through effective management, the long-term conservation and sustainable use of highly migratory fish stocks in the western and central Pacific Ocean in accordance with the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and the 1995 UN Fish Stocks Agreement. For this purpose, the Convention establishes a Commission for the Conservation and Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean.

The Convention applies to all species of highly migratory fish stocks (defined as all fish stocks of the species listed in Annex I of the 1982 Convention occurring in the Convention Area and such other species of fish as the Commission may determine ) within the Convention Area, except sauries. Conservation and management measures under the Convention are to be applied throughout the range of the stocks, or to specific areas within the Convention Area, as determined by the Commission.

#### B. Organizational Structure:

The WCPFC consists of a Commission composed of member nations and a Secretariat headed by an Executive Director. The Commission's primary sub-bodies are the Scientific Committee, Technical and Compliance Committee, and Northern Committee. In addition to these permanent bodies the Commission also employs *ad hoc* working groups as required. *Ad hoc* working group have been established for data and the regional observer program.

### **Fisheries Conservation and Management**

The Third Annual Meeting of the Commission (WCPFC3) was held December 11-15, 2006 in Apia, Samoa. The WCPFC3 considered a full agenda, which included recommendations from its three subsidiary bodies.

**Bigeye and yellowfin tuna:** The Commission's Scientific Committee (SC) found that these two stocks require reductions in fishing mortality of 25 percent and 10 percent, respectively, in order to maintain the capacity to produce maximum sustainable yield. The Commission agreed on measures for the purse seine fishery on the high seas, but was unable to agree on a package of specific measures that responded fully to the SC advice due to divergent views on how the issue should be addressed. While the final measure falls far short of achieving the reductions in fishing mortality called for by the SC, it should, if implemented by all members, curtail further increases.

The resulting agreement supplements the 2005 conservation and management measure for bigeye and yellowfin, which established limits on purse seine fishing effort in areas of national jurisdiction and limits on longline catches of bigeye tuna. The new 2006 measure: (1) puts a cap on fishing capacity in "other" commercial fisheries (i.e. other than longline and tropical purse seine); (2) limits purse seine fishing effort on the high seas; (3) calls for members and cooperating non-members (CCMs) to undertake various work aimed at reducing the amount of juvenile bigeye tuna and yellowfin tuna caught by purse seine when setting on fish aggregating devices (FADs); (4) calls for CCMs to develop plans to require purse seine vessels to retain and land all captured skipjack, yellowfin, and bigeye tuna except fish unfit for human consumption; and (5) requires CCMs, as port states, to prohibit the landing, transshipment, and sale of tuna produced in contravention of the Commission's conservation and management measures.

**Swordfish and striped marlin:** The Commission adopted conservation and management measures for swordfish and striped marlin stocks in the southwest Pacific Ocean (SWPO). The measures establish limits on the numbers of vessels that may fish for the two stocks, and in the case of swordfish, limits on catches.

**Sharks, sea turtles and seabirds:** The last Commission meeting resulted in conservation and management measures for sharks and seabirds and language in the meeting report that calls for CCMs to provide all results of their sea turtle mitigation research to the SC and Technical and Compliance Committee (TCC) so that the Commission can develop a conservation and management measure at its next annual meeting.

In order to reach agreement, it was necessary to restrict the finning-related element in the shark measure to vessels greater than 24 meters in length and provide for a one-year phase in period before the measure becomes binding. The seabird measure, which aims to reduce seabird interactions in longline fisheries, includes mitigation requirements similar to those recommended by the SC, but again it was necessary to build in phase-in periods for implementation (e.g., one year for large vessels in South Pacific, one-and-a-half years for large vessels in North Pacific, and three years for small vessels in South Pacific), and the measure does not apply to small vessels in the North Pacific.

**Regional observer program:** An inter-sessional working group has been established and tasked with developing various aspects of the program in time for the Commission's next annual meeting. This will delay the development and implementation of the observer program further (well into 2008); hampering efforts by the Commission to both monitor compliance with agreed measures and collect much needed scientific data on target stocks and bycatch.

**Vessel monitoring system (VMS):** The VMS will commence on January 1, 2008 but only for certain parts of the Convention Area (south of 20N and east of 175E) and for vessels larger than 24 meters in length. The VMS will apply to vessels smaller than 24 meters in length on January 1, 2009. Activation of the VMS in the area north of 20N and west of 175E will be determined by the Commission at a later date. The phased implementation (both in timing, size class of vessels, and area) was necessary to address the concerns expressed by Asian distant water fishing nations. The Commission has adopted minimum standards for automatic location communicators (ALCs) to

be used in the Commission VMS.

**Boarding and inspection:** The Commission adopted a set of specific boarding and inspection procedures which will apply to the boarding and inspection of fishing vessels on the high seas within the WCPFC convention area. These procedures were designed to be consistent with, and to give full effect to, Articles 21 and 22 of the United Nations Fish Stocks Agreement (UNFSA). During the course of the meeting, final details regarding several issues were agreed upon, including resolution of participation by Fishing Entities in boarding and inspection activities, use of force provisions, and the definition of serious violations. The successful adoption of these procedures represents the culmination of over five years of negotiations among CCMs and, most notably, is the first set of boarding and inspection procedures to be adopted by a RFMO since the adoption of the UNFSA.

**Catch documentation programs:** The Commission considered two proposals for catch/trade documentation schemes – one that would establish a trade documentation scheme similar to those being implemented by the other tuna RFMOs, and one that called for a more comprehensive catch documentation scheme akin to that used in the Convention for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR). The Commission decided to pursue considering this issue further based on the later proposal but took no other action at the 2006 annual meeting.

**IUU vessel list:** The Commission adopted a proposal to establish a list of vessels presumed to have carried out illegal, unregulated, and unreported fishing activities in the WCPO that is very similar to those adopted in other tuna RFMOs. The proposal outlines procedures for creating the list, removing vessels or modifying the list, and publicity. Those vessels listed on would face punitive actions by CCMs such as inter alia prohibitions on imports and landings and other commercial transactions, as well as prohibitions on transshipment, chartering, and resupply activities. The proposal will be reviewed by the Technical and Compliance Committee in 2007 and may be revised.

#### **2007 meetings**

Scientific Committee, August 13-24, Honolulu, HI. USA.

Northern Committee, September 11-13, Tokyo, Japan.

Technical and Compliance Committee, September 27-October 2, Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia.

WCPFC 4, December 3-7, Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia.

#### **Staff Contacts**

##### *NOAA Fisheries, Pacific Islands Region:*

William L. Robinson  
Regional Administrator, Pacific Islands Region  
(F/PIR)  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
Pacific Islands Regional Office  
1601 Kapiolani Boulevard, Suite 1110  
Honolulu, HI. 96814  
Telephone: (808) 944-2200  
Fax: (808) 973-2941  
Email: pirohonolulu@noaa.gov

##### *Department of State:*

William Gibbons-Fly  
Deputy Director, Office of Marine Conservation  
(OES/OMC)  
U.S. Department of State  
2201 C. Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20520-7818  
Telephone: (202) 647-2335  
Fax: (202) 736-7350

## **SOUTHERN OCEAN**

## **Convention for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (Basic Instrument for the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources – CCAMLR)**

### **Basic Instrument**

Convention for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (TIAS 10240),1982.

### **Implementing Legislation**

Antarctic Marine Living Resources Convention Act of 1984 (16 U.S.C.2431).

### **Member Nations**

Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, European Community, France, Germany, India, Italy, Japan, Republic of Korea, Namibia, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Russian Federation, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Bulgaria, Canada, Peoples Republic of China, Cook Islands, Finland, Greece, Mauritius, Netherlands, Peru and Vanuatu have acceded to the Convention, but are not Members of the Commission.

### **Commission Headquarters**

Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources  
P.O Box 7002  
North Hobart 7002  
Tasmania, Australia

Executive Secretary: Denzil Miller  
Telephone: 61 3 6210 1111  
Fax: 61 3 6224 8744  
E-mail: [ccamlr@ccamlr.org](mailto:ccamlr@ccamlr.org)  
Web address: [www.ccamlr.org](http://www.ccamlr.org)

### **Budget**

The Commission approved an expenditure budget (less budgeted income) for 2007 of Australian \$2,726,700 (approximately U.S. \$2,133,547). The United States share for the budget was requested at \$A 112,865 (\$US 88,313).

### **U.S. Representation**

#### **A. Appointment Process:**

The Secretary of State, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Commerce and the Director of the National Science Foundation, appoints an officer or employee of the United States as the U.S. representative to the Commission. The Secretary of Commerce and the Director of the National Science Foundation, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, designates the U.S. representative to the Scientific Committee.

**B. U.S. Representative to the Commission:**

Evan Bloom  
Deputy Director, Office of Ocean Affairs  
OES/OA, DOS - Room 5801  
Washington, D.C. 20520  
Telephone: (202) 647-3925

**Alternate U.S. Representative to the Commission**

Robin Tuttle  
Foreign Affairs Specialist  
NOAA/NMFS/ST  
1315 East-West Highway Avenue  
Room 12350  
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-2282

**U.S. Representative to the Scientific Committee:**

Rennie Holt  
Director, Antarctic Ecosystem Research Group  
NOAA/NMFS/SWC  
P.O. Box 271  
La Jolla, CA 92038  
Telephone: (858) 546-5601

**C. Advisory Structure:**

The U.S. Representative to the Scientific Committee is responsible for providing scientific advice to the Commissioner on the operation of the U.S. Antarctic Marine Living Resources (AMLR) directed research program; on the status of krill, finfish, squid, marine mammal, and bird populations; on data requirements; on the long-term program of work of the Scientific Committee; and on recommendations for conservation and management measures.

The Commission also receives advice from its two standing committees, the Standing Committee on Compliance and Inspection (SCIC) and the Standing Committee on Administration and Finance (SCAF).

Permanent Working Groups on Fish Stock Assessment (WG-FSA) and Ecosystem Monitoring and Management (WG-EMM) have been constituted to develop and review research proposals and results.

The Commission is also assisted by an ad hoc Working Group on Incidental Mortality Associated with Fishing (WG-FSA-IMAF), a Subgroup on Acoustic Survey and Analysis Methods (SG-ASAM), and a Subgroup on Assessment Methods (WG-FSA-SAM).

**Description****A. Mission/Purpose:**

The 1982 Convention established CCAMLR for the purpose of protecting and conserving the marine living resources in the waters surrounding Antarctica. The Convention is based upon an ecosystem approach to the conservation of marine living resources and incorporates standards designed to ensure the conservation of individual populations and species and the Antarctic marine ecosystem as a whole.

The Convention applies to the Antarctic marine living resources of the area south of 60° South latitude and to the Antarctic marine living resources of the area between that latitude and the Antarctic Convergence which form part of the Antarctic marine ecosystem. The Antarctic Convergence is deemed to be a line joining the following points along parallels of latitude and meridians of longitude: 50°S, 0°; 50°S, 30°E; 45°S, 30°E; 45°S, 80°E; 55°S, 80°E; 55°S, 150°E; 60°S, 150°E; 60°S, 150°E; 60°S, 50°W; 50°S, 50°W; 50°S, 0°.

#### B. Organizational Structure:

CCAMLR is comprised of the Commission, Executive Secretary, and the Scientific Committee. The Commission consists of one representative from each member nation and is responsible for facilitating research, compiling data on the status of and changes in Antarctic marine living resources, ensuring the acquisition of catch and effort data, publishing information, identifying conservation needs, adopting conservation measures, and implementing a system of observation and inspection. The Executive Secretary handles the administrative matters for the Commission. The Scientific Committee is comprised of scientific advisors from the member nations. It sponsors the permanent working groups and recommends research programs and conservation and other measures to the Commission. These are WG-FSA and WG EMM.

U.S. participation on the Scientific Committee and on WG-FSA and WG-EMM is supported by the activities of the U.S. Antarctic Marine Living Resources (AMLR) Directed Research Program, conducted by the National Marine Fisheries Service's Antarctic Ecosystem Research Group (AERG), Southwest Fisheries Science Center, La Jolla, California.

#### C. Conservation and Management Measures:

The Commission adopted its first conservation and management measures during its 1984 session (CCAMLR III). The conservation and management measures adopted by the twenty-fifth (2006) meeting of the Commission include measures previously adopted by the Commission and remaining in force; measures adopted for the 2006/2007 fishing season to restrict overall catches, research catch and bycatch of certain species of fish, krill and crab; limit participation in several exploratory fisheries; restrict fishing in certain areas and to certain gear types; and set forth: fishing seasons fishery-by-fishery, revisions to previously adopted measures; new measures, and new resolutions. The Commission also adopted a list of vessels suspected to be engaged in illegal, unregulated or unreported fishing in the Convention Area.

##### *Prohibitions on Directed Fishing*

The Commission retained the continuing prohibitions for directed fishing for finfish in Statistical Subareas 48.1 and 48.2; for *Notothenia rossii* in Statistical Subareas 48.1, 48.2 and 48.3; for *Gobionotothen gibberifrons*, *Chaenocephalus aceratus*, *Pseudochaenichthys georgianus*, *Lepidonotothen squamifrons* and *Patagonotothen guntheri* in Statistical Subareas 48.3; for *Lepidonotothen squamifrons* in Statistical Division 58.4.4; for *Dissostichus* species in Statistical Division 58.4.4 outside areas of national jurisdiction; for *Dissostichus eleginoides* in Statistical Subarea 58.6; for *Dissostichus eleginoides* in Statistical Subarea 58.7; for *Dissostichus eleginoides* in Statistical Division 58.5.1 outside areas of national jurisdiction; for *Dissostichus eleginoides* in Statistical Division 58.5.2 east of 79°20'E and outside of the EEZ to the west of 79°20'E; for *Dissostichus* species in Statistical Subarea 88.2 north of 65° S; for *Dissostichus* species in Statistical Subarea 88.3; and for *Electrona carlsbergi* in Statistical Subarea 48.3. The Commission prohibited directed fishing for *Dissostichus* species in Subarea 48.5 during the 2006/2007 fishing season.

##### *Shark species*

The Commission adopted a new measure that prohibits directed fishing on shark species in the Convention Area, other than for research purposes. Shark fishing will be prohibited at least until the status of shark populations and the

effects of fishing are assessed. The Commission adopted a measure requiring that bycatch of sharks, especially juveniles and gravid females, taken accidentally in other fisheries will, as far as possible, be released alive.

#### *Bycatch*

The Commission agreed to extend the existing bycatch limits in Division 58.5.2 into the 2006/2007 season. The Commission also agreed to extend the existing bycatch limits and move-on rules for exploratory fisheries into the 2006/2007 season, taking account of the revised catch limit for Dissostichus species in Subareas 88.1 and 88.2 and the consequential change to the bycatch limits in those subareas.

#### *Seabirds*

The Commission revised its resolution promoting international actions to reduce the incidental mortality of seabirds to further address fishing outside the CCAMLR Convention Area. The Commission requested that Contracting Parties engage with other Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMO), strengthen input into RFMO meetings by including seabird experts on delegations and become involved in the development and implementation of seabird resolutions and other measures to reduce bycatch of albatrosses and petrels within RFMO jurisdictions. Such resolutions and measures might include mitigation measures, sharing information, exchanging observer-collected data on seabird mortalities, establishing of bycatch working groups, and evaluating fishery impacts on seabird populations. The Commission urged Contracting Parties to implement measures to reduce or eliminate seabird incidental mortality in fisheries outside the CCAMLR Convention Area; require their flagged vessels fishing in these areas to collect and report rates of incidental mortality of seabirds associated with each fishery, details of the seabird species involved, and estimate of total seabird mortality; and report to the CCAMLR Secretariat annually on the implementation of mitigation measures, including their effectiveness in reducing seabird incidental mortality.

#### *New and Exploratory Fishing*

Twelve Members submitted notifications for longline exploratory fisheries for toothfish in 2006/2007 in Subareas 48.6, 88.1, 88.2 and Divisions 58.4.1, 58.4.2, 58.4.3a and 58.4.3b. There were no notifications for new fisheries or for fisheries in closed areas.

The Commission revised the general measures for exploratory fisheries for Dissostichus species in the Convention Area for the 2006/2007 season by requiring the Flag State of the vessel fishing for Dissostichus species to assume the responsibility for tagging, tag recovery and correct reporting. The Commission clarified that the fishing vessel must cooperate with the CCAMLR scientific observer in undertaking the tagging program and further elaborated the requirements of the tagging program.

The Commission amended its measures on new and exploratory fisheries to clarify that the use of bottom trawls in high seas areas of the Convention Area is considered a new or exploratory fishery. The Commission now requires that information on the known and anticipated impacts of bottom trawls on vulnerable marine ecosystems, including on the benthos and benthic communities, must be included in the notifications of new or exploratory fisheries.

#### *Icefish*

The Commission adopted area specific conservation measures for Champscephalus gunnari for the 2006/2007 season. The Commission set the overall catch limit for the C. gunnari trawl fishery in Subarea 48.3 for the November 15, 2006 to November 14, 2007 season at 4,337 tons, limited the catch of this total to 1,084 tons during the spawning period (March 1, 2007 through May 31, 2007) and continued previously adopted restrictions on the fishery. The Commission endorsed the Scientific Committee's recommendation that vessels in this fishery be encouraged to use net binding as a means to reduce seabird interaction and potential incidental mortality. The Commission set the catch limit for the C. gunnari trawl fishery within defined areas of Division 58.5.2 for the

2006/2007 season at 42 tons and retained previously adopted restrictions on, and reporting requirements for, the fishery.

#### *Crab*

The Commission set the total allowable catch level for the pot fishery for crab for the 2006/2007 fishing season at 1,600 tons and continued to limit participation to one vessel per member country conducted as an experimental harvest regime.

#### *Squid*

The Commission set the total allowable catch limit for the exploratory jig fishery for Martialia hyadesi for the 2006/2007 fishing season at 2,500 tons.

#### *Krill*

The Commission carried forward the precautionary catch limits for krill in Statistical Area 48 at 4.0 million tons overall and, as divided by subareas, at 1.008 million tons in Subarea 48.1, 1.104 million tons in Subarea 48.2, 1.056 million tons in Subarea 48.3, and 0.832 million tons in Subarea 48.4.

#### *Dissostichus Species*

The Commission set a combined catch limit of 3,554 tons for the longline and pot fisheries for D. eleginoides in the Shag Rocks and South Georgia areas of Subarea 48.3 in the 2006/2007 season. The Commission closed the West Shag Rocks area and set bycatch limits on other species.

The Commission set a combined catch limit of 2,427 tons of D. eleginoides in Division 58.5.2 west of 79°20' E from December 1, 2006, to November 30, 2007, for trawl and pot fishing and from May 1, 2007, to August 31, 2007, for longline fishing. The Commission extended the season to September 30 for vessels which complete longline sink rate testing using CCAMLR testing protocols.

The Commission designated several Dissostichus fisheries as exploratory fisheries for the 2006/2007 fishing season.

These fisheries are total allowable catch fisheries and are open only to the flagged vessels of countries that notified CCAMLR of an interest by named vessels to participate in the fisheries.

The exploratory fisheries for Dissostichus species authorized by the Commission for the 2006/2007 fishing season are: (1) longline fishing in Statistical Subarea 48.6 by no more than one vessel per country at any time by Japan, Republic of Korea, New Zealand and Norway; (2) longline fishing in Statistical Division 58.4.1 by Australia (one vessel), Republic of Korea (two vessels), Namibia (one vessel), New Zealand (three vessels), Spain (one vessel) and Uruguay (one vessel); (3) longline fishing in Statistical Division 58.4.2 by Australia (one vessel), Republic of Korea (three vessels), Namibia (one vessel), New Zealand (two vessels), Spain (one vessel) and Uruguay (one vessel); (4) longline fishing in Statistical Division 58.4.3a (the Elan Bank) outside areas under national jurisdiction to no more than one vessel per country at any time by Japan, Republic of Korea and Spain; (5) longline fishing in Statistical Division 58.4.3b (the BANZARE Bank) outside areas of national jurisdiction to no more than one vessel per country at any time by Australia, Republic of Korea, Namibia, Spain and Uruguay; (6) longline fishing in Statistical Subarea 88.1 by Argentina (two vessels), Republic of Korea (three vessels), New Zealand (four vessels), Norway (one vessel), Russia (two vessels), South Africa (one vessel), Spain (one vessel), United Kingdom (two vessels), and Uruguay (five vessels); and (7) longline fishing in Statistical Subarea 88.2 by Argentina (two vessels), New Zealand (four vessels), Norway (one vessel), Russia (two vessels), Spain (one vessel), United Kingdom (two vessels), and Uruguay (four vessels).

*Environmental Protection*

The Commission consolidated the environmental protection provisions of its annual fishery measures into a single conservation measure of continuing application. The new conservation measure applies to all directed fishing. These measures include provisions: (1) prohibiting the use on fishing vessels of plastic packaging bands to secure bait boxes; (2) prohibiting the use of other plastic packaging bands for other purposes on fishing vessels which do not use onboard incinerators (closed systems); (3) requiring packaging bands once removed from packages to be cut so that they do not form a continuous loop and then incinerated at the earliest opportunity in an onboard incinerator; (4) requiring that all plastic residue be stored on board the vessel until reaching port and in no case discarded at sea; (5) prohibiting vessels fishing south of 60° S from dumping or discharging: oil or fuel products or oily residues into the sea (except as permitted under Annex I of MARPOL 73/78), garbage, food wastes not capable of passing through a screen with openings no greater than 25 mm, poultry or parts (including egg shells), sewage within 12 n miles of land or ice shelves, sewage while the ship is traveling at speeds of less than 4 knots, offal or incineration ash. Live poultry or other living birds may not be brought into areas south of 60° S and any dressed poultry not consumed must be removed from those areas. Requirements in previously adopted conservation measures prohibiting or regulating the discharge of offal in areas of the Convention north of 60° S were retained in the measures on incidental mortality of seabirds and marine mammals in longlines and trawls.

*Interim Prohibitions on the Use of Certain Gear*

The Commission adopted a measure restricting the use of bottom trawling gear in the high seas areas within the Convention Area through the 2007/08 fishing season. The Scientific Committee will review scientific evidence available by 2007 in order to establish relevant criteria to determine the impacts of bottom trawl fishing on oceanic ecosystems and, in particular, vulnerable bottom marine ecosystems in the Convention Area. The Commission revised existing measures regulating new fisheries and exploratory fisheries to require approval by the Commission of new or exploratory bottom trawling fishing operations before such operations can occur within the Convention Area.

The Commission adopted a measure imposing an interim prohibition on the use of gillnets, for purposes other than scientific research, in the Convention Area. Gillnets are defined by the measure as strings of single, double or triple netting walls, vertical, near by the surface, in midwater or on the bottom, in which fish will gill, entangle or enmesh. Gillnets have floats on the upper line (headrope) and, in general, weights on the ground-line (footrope). Gillnets consist of single or less commonly, double or triple netting (known as “trammel net”) mounted together, on the same frame ropes. Several types of nets may be combined in one gear (for example, trammel net combined with gillnet). These nets can be used either alone or, as is more usual, in large numbers placed in line (“fleets” of nets). The gear can be set, anchored to the bottom or left drifting, free or connected with the vessel. The use of gillnets in the Convention Area is prohibited until the Scientific Committee has investigated and reported on the potential impacts of this gear.

*Fishing Vessel Reporting*

The Commission revised its measure on the licensing and inspection obligations of Contracting Parties to require that fishing vessels licensed by the Contracting Party report, where possible, sightings of fishing vessels and support vessels in the Convention Area. The report must include as much information as possible on the name and description of the vessel; the vessel call sign; the registration and Lloyd’s/IMO number of the vessel; the Flag State of the vessel; photographs of the vessel to support the report; and any other information regarding the observed activities of the sighted vessel. The report must be forwarded by the master of the vessel licensed by the Contracting Party to its Flag State as soon as possible.

The Commission revised its measure on automated satellite-linked vessel monitoring systems to require that for vessels intending to enter an area of the Convention Area closed to fishing, or an area of the Convention Area for which it is not licensed to fish, the Flag State shall provide notification to the Secretariat of the vessel’s intention.

The Flag State may permit or direct that such notifications be provided by the vessel directly to the CCAMLR Secretariat.

#### *Contracting Party Data Reporting*

The Commission adopted a measure requiring that all Contracting Parties intending to fish for krill in the Convention Area notify the Secretariat no later than four months in advance of the regular annual meeting of the Commission, immediately prior to the season in which they intend to fish.

The Commission revised its measure on automated satellite-linked vessel monitoring systems to require that when the CCAMLR Secretariat receives VMS data that indicates the presence of a vessel (1) in an area or subarea for which no license details have been provided by the Flag State to the Secretariat, or (2) in any area or subarea for which the Flag State or fishing vessel has not provided prior notification, the Secretariat shall notify the Flag State and require an explanation. The explanation will be forwarded to the Secretariat for evaluation by the Commission at its next annual meeting.

#### *Catch Documentation Scheme*

The Commission revised its measure on the Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS) to include a procedure for cooperation with CCAMLR by non-Contracting Parties involved in the trade of Dissostichus species. The Commission also revised the CDS measure to clarify that only government officials may request and examine the documentation of each shipment of Dissostichus species imported into or exported from its territory to verify that it includes validated documents.

#### *Illegal, Unregulated and Unreported Fishing*

The Commission approved a combined list of Contracting Party Vessels and non-Contracting Party Vessels suspected of illegal, unregulated or unreported fishing or trading (the IUU Vessel List). A number of vessels on the combined IUU Vessel List have been identified on previous lists by other names and flags. The combined list is posted on the public section of the CCAMLR website ([www.ccamlr.org](http://www.ccamlr.org)). A vessel on the IUU Vessel List will not be permitted to participate in exploratory fisheries. Contracting Parties are urged to prohibit trade with the vessels on the CCAMLR IUU Vessel List.

The Commission adopted a resolution urging Contracting Parties to pursue diplomatic and other actions with non-Contracting Parties to combat IUU fishing.

#### *Denial of Port Access*

The Commission revised the schemes to promote compliance by Contracting Party and non-Contracting Party vessels with CCAMLR conservation measures. As revised the schemes now require that Contracting Parties deny port access to vessels on the IUU Vessel List unless for the purpose of enforcement action or for reasons of *force majeure* or for rendering assistance to vessels, or persons on those vessels, in danger or distress. Vessels allowed entry to a Contracting Party port are to be inspected in accordance with CCAMLR conservation measures on inspection. Where port access is granted to such vessels Contracting Parties are required to examine documentation and other information, including Dissostichus Catch Documents, with a view to verifying the area in which the catch was taken. Where the origin of the catch cannot be adequately verified, Contracting Parties are required to detain the catch or refuse any landing or transshipment of the catch. When catch is found to be in contravention of CCAMLR conservation measures, Contracting Parties should, where possible, confiscate the catch; and prohibit all support to vessels with such catch, including non-emergency refueling, resupplying and repairs.

*Contracting Party Nationals*

The Commission adopted a new scheme to promote compliance by Contracting Party nationals with CCAMLR conservation measures. The scheme requires Contracting Parties to take appropriate measures to verify if any natural or legal persons subject to their jurisdiction are engaged in IUU fishing activities and take appropriate actions, including seeking cooperation by industries within their jurisdiction. Contracting Parties are required to submit reports on actions taken with respect to the scheme to the CCAMLR Secretariat and to Contracting Parties and non-Contracting Parties cooperating with CCAMLR for purposes of implementing the CDS. The scheme will be binding on Contracting Parties beginning July 1, 2008.

## D. Activities and Meetings

The CCAMLR Scientific Committee will hold the following intersessional meetings:

Subgroup on Acoustic Survey and Analysis Methods

April 30 – May 2, 2007

Cambridge, United Kingdom

Steering Committee for CCAMLR- International Polar Year Activities

May 2 – 4, 2007

Cambridge, United Kingdom

Working Group Ecosystem Monitoring and Management

July 9 -13,2007

Christchurch, New Zealand

Subgroup on Stock Assessment Methods

July 16 -17, 2007

Christchurch, New Zealand

Workshop to Develop Methods of Incorporating Ecosystem Models in finfish Assessments

July (one day) 2007

Christchurch, New Zealand

CCAMLR Bioregionalization Workshop

August 13 –17, 2007

Brussels, Belgium

Ad hoc Working Group on Incidental Mortality Associated with Fishing

October 8 12, 2007

Hobart, Tasmania, Australia

Working Group on Fish Stock Assessment

October 8 - 19,2007

Hobart, Tasmania, Australia

Scientific Committee  
October 22-26, 2007  
Hobart, Tasmania, Australia

The next annual meeting of the Commission is October 22-November 2, 2007 in Hobart, Tasmania, Australia.

**Staff Contacts**

*NOAA Fisheries:*

Robin Tuttle  
Office of Science and Technology (F/ST3)  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
1315 East-West Highway, Room 12643  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-2282, ext. 199

*Department of State:*

Evan Bloom  
Deputy Director, Office of Ocean Affairs (OES)  
U.S. Department of State  
2201 C Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20520  
Telephone: (202) 647-3925

## **Convention for the Conservation of Antarctic Seals (CCAS)**

### **Basic Instrument**

Convention for the Conservation of Antarctic Seals (29 UST 441, TIAS 8826)

### **Implementing Legislation**

None.

### **Member Nations**

Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Chile, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, Norway, Poland, South Africa, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America.

### **Commission Headquarters**

The Convention did not establish a Commission. The United Kingdom serves as the Depository Government.

### **Budget**

None.

### **U.S. Representation**

The United States is represented at Meetings of Contracting Parties to the Convention by a delegation, headed by the Department of State and including representatives of the National Marine Fisheries Service, the Marine Mammal Commission, and the environmental community.

### **Description**

#### A. Mission/Purpose

The Convention for the Conservation of Antarctic Seals was signed in London on February 11, 1972. It entered into force on March 11, 1978, and calls for Contracting Parties to meet within 5 years of entry into force, and at least every 5 years thereafter, to review the operation of the Convention. The purpose of the Convention is to promote and achieve the objectives of protection, scientific study and rational use of Antarctic seals, and to maintain a satisfactory balance within the ecological system.

The Convention applies to the seas south of 60° South Latitude, in respect of which the Contracting Parties affirm the provisions of Article IV of the Antarctic Treaty.

#### B. Organizational Structure

There is no Commission. The Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR) of the International Council of Scientific Unions, through its Group of Specialists on Seals, receives reports from and advises the Contracting Parties on the number of seals killed or captured, the status of stocks, and the need, if any, for conservation and management measures.

### C. Programs

Because there had been no commercial sealing in the Antarctic after the Convention entered into force in 1978, an offer by the United Kingdom, as Depositary Government, to host a 1983 meeting of Parties, was declined. The first and, to date, only meeting of Parties, held in 1988, was occasioned by a 1986/87 Soviet commercial sealing expedition and research cruise.

The 1988 meeting limited its recommendations to amendments to the Annex to the Convention or to Contracting Parties and other institutional action independent of the terms of the Convention. The Meeting agreed that Contracting Parties should restrict the number of seals killed or captured by special permit. It also agreed to encourage cooperative planning among holders of special permits for scientific research and detailed the scientific information which should be reported. The meeting recommended that the Annex be amended to increase the period of notification by a Contracting Party to other Contracting Parties prior to leaving home port for a commercial sealing expedition from 30 to 60 days. The final report of the meeting noted, however, that Contracting Party countries are unlikely to engage in commercial sealing in the foreseeable future.

In 1992, the United Kingdom proposed, but the Parties did not feel it necessary, to hold a further meeting. In October 1993, the United Kingdom hosted an informal meeting of the Parties to review the operation of the Convention. The meeting was held in the margins of the twelfth meeting of the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources. As a result, the Parties noted the need to: improve the submission and exchange of data; endorse scientific programs on seal research; provide SCAR with contact points of CCAS parties; and circulate copies of reports from the SCAR Group of Specialists to CCAS Parties. In response to an inquiry, the United Kingdom confirmed that the recommendations adopted by the 1988 Meeting of Parties entered into force on March 27, 1990.

#### **Staff Contacts**

##### *NOAA Fisheries:*

Robin Tuttle  
Office of Science and Technology, F/ST3  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
1315 East-West Highway, Room 12643  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-2282, ext. 199

##### *Department of State:*

Evan Bloom  
Deputy Director, Office of Ocean Affairs  
U.S. Department of State  
2201 C Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20520  
Telephone: (202) 647-3262

## **WESTERN HEMISPHERE**

## **Inter-American Convention (IAC) for the Protection and Conservation of Sea Turtles**

### **Basic Instrument**

Inter-American Convention for the Protection and Conservation of Sea Turtles

### **Member Nations**

Belize, Brazil, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Netherlands, Peru, United States, and Venezuela.

### **Description**

#### **A. Mission/Purpose:**

The Convention entered into force on May 2, 2001, with nine signatory nations ratifying--Brazil, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Honduras, Mexico, the Netherlands, Peru, the United States, and Venezuela. Nicaragua and Uruguay have signed, but have not yet completed their internal ratification processes and/or deposited instruments of ratification. Belize ratified the IAC on February 3, 2003, and Guatemala ratified on August 15, 2003, bringing the number of Parties to 11. The Convention is open for accession to all countries of the Inter-American region.

The IAC is the first regional agreement with broad coverage for protecting sea turtles and their habitats in the Western Hemisphere. The stated purpose of the Convention is "to promote the protection, conservation and recovery of sea turtle populations and of the habitats on which they depend, based on the best available scientific evidence, taking into account the environmental, socioeconomic and cultural characteristics of the Parties." The measures in the Inter-American Convention promote sub-regional management plans and accords. The Convention also places great importance on environmental conservation and the reduction of bycatch by developing more selective fisheries gear and requires the use of Turtle Excluder Devices (TEDs).

#### **B. Organizational Structure:**

The Convention provides for the creation of an Executive Secretary, a Consultative Committee of Experts, and a Scientific Committee. The Consultative Committee, among other things, reviews and analyzes information relating to the protection and conservation of populations of sea turtles and their habitats; examines reports concerning the environmental, socio-economic and cultural impact on affected communities resulting from the measures set forth or adopted pursuant to the Convention; and evaluates the efficiency of the different measures proposed to reduce the capture and incidental mortality of sea turtles, as well as the efficiency of different kinds of TEDs. The Scientific Committee examines and, as appropriate, may conduct research on sea turtles covered by the Convention, including research on their biology and population dynamics. As appropriate it may also evaluate the environmental impact on sea turtles and their habitats of activities such as fishing operations and the exploitation of marine resources, coastal development, dredging, pollution, clogging of estuaries and reef deterioration, among other things.

The identification and location of a permanent Secretariat for the new Convention has not yet been determined. Costa Rica is currently hosting the interim Secretariat. The official website for the organization is <http://www.iacseaturtle.org/iacseaturtle/>

### **Status**

The IAC's initial meeting of member countries--the First Conference of the Parties (IAC COP1)--took place in San José, Costa Rica on August 6–8, 2002. Delegates from all 11 signatory countries were present, along with 27 observers from 10 countries. The goal of COP1 was primarily to create procedural rules and

bylaws. Because there was not enough time to address all of the specific items set out in the Convention to be accomplished at the first COP, the Parties decided to suspend COP1 and resume it in August 2003 in San Jose. At this session, the Parties were able to come to agreement on the outstanding substantive items on the agenda--the rules of procedure and the terms of reference for the Consultative Committee of Experts and the Scientific Committee. Agreement was also reached with regard to guidelines for international cooperation and the 2004 work program for the pro tempore Secretariat.

Several delegations raised the issue of funding for the IAC. It was stressed that adequate and reliable sources of funding must be secured in order to ensure the continued operation of the pro tempore Secretariat and to assist Parties in implementing the provisions of the IAC. While it was recognized that most Parties contribute to the implementation of the IAC through their national efforts to protect and conserve sea turtles, financial contributions are necessary to support the work of the pro tempore Secretariat and the meetings of the Parties. To address this situation, Peru proposed that a minimum voluntary contribution from each Party in the amount of US\$2,000 be established. The Parties agreed, but several delegations noted that financial contributions to the IAC are voluntary and so Parties may not all be able to meet the minimum level each year.

The Second Conference of the Parties took place in Isla de Margarita, Venezuela, 16-18 November, 2004. Delegates from 10 of the 11 signatory countries were present (Ecuador did not attend), along with observer states Nicaragua and Panama, and observers representing the United Nations Environment Program, OLDEPESCA, and 11 non-governmental organizations. At COP2 the Parties constituted the Consultative Committee, finalized the format for the annual report form, extended the Secretariat Pro Tempore, continued discussions on the agreement of the structure of the Scientific Committee (SC), passed the IAC's first resolution (a largely advisory resolution on conservation of the leatherback sea turtle) and concluded its first Memorandum of Understanding between the IAC and the regional South American fisheries development organization OLDEPESCA. The IAC is now moving beyond procedural discussions to substantive consideration of sea turtle conservation.

The Third Conference of the Parties took place in September 2006 in Mazatlan, Mexico. Delegates from all signatory nations attended and, for the first time, Canada (non-signatory) sent an official observer. The primary issues discussed and decisions made included: rules of procedure for the Scientific Committee, establishment and funding of a permanent Secretariat, and revisions to the annual national report format. Two resolutions were adopted by the Parties, the first called for the convening of a meeting to discuss the status of the hawksbill in the wider Caribbean and the second calls for promotion of sea turtle bycatch avoidance and mitigation techniques adopted by FAO.

### **Future Meetings**

The Parties agreed to hold an inter-sessional meeting in 2007 to take up unresolved issues, including the issue of a Permanent Secretariat. This extraordinary meeting will convene dependent upon funding availability.

### **Staff Contacts**

#### *NOAA Fisheries:*

Alexis Gutierrez / Barbara Schroeder  
Office of Protected Resources, F/PR2  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
1315 East-West Highway  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-2332  
Fax: (301) 427-2522

#### *Department of State:*

Dave Hogan  
Office of Marine Conservation (OES/OMC)  
U.S. Department of State  
Washington, DC 20520-7818  
Telephone: (202) 647-2335  
Fax: (202) 736-735

## **GREAT LAKES**

**Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries Between the United States and Canada  
(Basic Instrument for the Great Lakes Fishery Commission – GLFC)**

**Basic Instrument**

Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries between the United States and Canada signed September 10, 1954; entered into force October 11, 1955. 6 UST 2836; TIAS 3326; 238 UNTS 97.

**Implementing Legislation**

Great Lakes Fisheries Act of 1956 (16 USC 932).

**Member Nations**

United States and Canada.

**Commission Headquarters**

Great Lakes Fishery Commission  
2100 Commonwealth Boulevard  
Suite 100  
Ann Arbor MI 48105-1563  
Telephone: (734) 662-3209  
Fax: (734) 741-2010  
Web address: <http://www.glfc.org>

**Budget**

The U.S. Congress provided \$14.677 million for the Great Lakes Fishery Commission in fiscal year (FY) 2006. The Commission approved a budget of \$24.5 million for FY 2005, of which the U.S. contribution will be \$14.4 million.

**U.S. Representation**

A. Appointment process:

The United States is represented by four Commissioners appointed by the President. Of the Commissioners, one is to be an official of the U.S. Government and three are individuals who reside in different Great Lakes States and who are knowledgeable regarding the fisheries of the Great Lakes; one of these three must be an official of a Great Lakes state. The term of office for Commissioners is 6 years, except for the Commissioner representing the U.S. Government, who is appointed “at pleasure.” The President also appoints an Alternate Commissioner who performs the duties of a Commissioner in the absence of a Commissioner, or when a Commissioner vacancy occurs. The Alternate-Commissioner is also appointed “at pleasure.” There are no set guidelines for the nomination process. The U.S. Commissioners do not receive compensation.

## B. U.S. Commissioners:

Mr. Gerry A. Barnhart  
Division Director  
Division of Fish, Wildlife, & Marine Resources  
NYSDEC  
625 Broadway  
Albany, NY 12233-4750  
(Appointed November 27, 2002)

Dr. Michael J. Hansen  
Professor  
University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point  
College of Natural Resources  
800 Reserve Street  
Stevens Point, WI 54481-3897  
(Appointed July, 2004)

David Ullrich  
Executive Director – Great Lakes and  
St Lawrence Cities Initiative  
177 North State Street  
Suite 500  
Chicago, IL 60601  
(Appointed April 2006)

Dr. William W. Taylor, Alternate  
Michigan State University  
Department of Fisheries and Wildlife  
13 Natural Resources Building  
East Lansing, MI 48824-1222  
(Approved November 27, 2002)

## C. Advisory structure:

The Great Lakes Fishery Act of 1956 requires establishment of an advisory committee for each of the Great Lakes. Appointments are proposed by governors of each Great Lakes state, giving due consideration to the interests of state agencies with fisheries management jurisdiction, the commercial fishing industry, sports fishing, and the public at large. Advisors are appointed by the U.S. Section. An extensive advisory network has been developed by the Commission (see “GLFC and Its Stakeholders” below).

**Description**

## A. Mission/Purpose:

The GLFC was established to provide research and recommendations to aid in the management of Great Lakes fisheries and to control and eradicate sea lamprey. Sea lamprey entered the Great Lakes from the Atlantic Ocean via canals constructed in the nineteenth century and quickly decimated important commercial and recreational fisheries. Specific responsibilities of the Commission are:

- 1) to formulate research programs to sustain maximum productivity of fish stocks in the Convention area that are of common concern to the United States and Canada, to coordinate research done pursuant to such programs, and, if necessary, to undertake such research itself;
- 2) to recommend appropriate measures to the Contracting Parties based on the findings of such research programs;
- 3) to formulate and implement a program for eradicating or minimizing sea lamprey populations in the Great Lakes basin; and
- 4) to publish the scientific findings obtained in the performance of its duties.

The Commission provides more specific statements of its approach to meeting these responsibilities in its *Strategic Vision for the First Decade of the New Millennium*. The Commission has defined specific milestones for healthy Great Lakes ecosystems, integrated sea lamprey management, and partnerships. Over the years, as new organizations and new ecological challenges have arisen, the state, provincial, tribal, and federal fisheries management agencies have signed the *A Joint Strategic Plan for the Management of Great Lakes Fisheries*, as their basis for cooperative science-based management of the fisheries resources in the Great Lakes. The Commission facilitates this multi-jurisdictional, cooperative process.

#### B. Organizational Structure:

The GLFC secretariat handles the day-to-day operations of the Commission. The Commission meets in plenary session annually, in early June. Commissioners convene an Interim Meeting in early December, and special meetings of the Commissioners take place as needed. Lake Committee meetings, convened by the Commission under *A Joint Strategic Plan for Management of Great Lakes Fisheries* are held in March of each year and as appropriate.

#### C. Programs:

**Lamprey Control:** The lamprey eradication and control mandate of the Commission consumes the bulk of the Commission's budget and is carried out by the Commission's "control agents" in the United States and Canada. The U.S. agent is the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). The Department of Fisheries and Oceans provides this function for Canada. The Commission contracts for the application of chemical lampricide by USFWS employees to tributaries to reduce the number of sea lamprey in the lakes, assessment to direct the application of control efforts and to monitor their success, and a program of alternative control methods including sterile-male release and barrier construction. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is a partner in construction of sea lamprey barriers and traps. The Commission also carries out research to support its existing program and to develop new alternative methods. The Commission contracts portions of this research program to the U.S. Geological Survey, Biological Resources Division and to universities and other research institutions.

**Re-registration:** The chief lamprey control chemicals (TFM and Bayluscide/niclosamide) have re-registration, required by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) under the 1990 amendments to the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act. This process ensures that the chemical does not have harmful environmental effects, and is a mandatory requirement of U.S. law. EPA has approved the registrations of both lampricides in the recently completed registration eligibility decisions (REDs). Both compounds were found to pose no unreasonable risks or adverse effects to humans or the environment when applied in accordance with the approved label. EPA may require further tests to determine any estrogenic affect of the compound. It is uncertain when this decision will be made. In Canada, Health Canada is undertaking a parallel process of re-registration of pesticides called re-evaluation. The Commission is working to consolidate U.S. and Canadian registrations of its lampricides with the USFWS.

**GLFC and Its Stakeholders:** The Commission operates through a broad-based, grass roots committee structure, with a basin-wide series of local level committees that cooperate with state and federal officials in monitoring fish (and lamprey) populations in local waters. This information is passed to "lake committees," as prescribed in the *Joint Strategic Plan*, which present reports to the Commission during its annual meeting. The Board of Technical Experts (BOTE) draws from academic and industry experts in environmental issues, biology and pesticide use. Other experts serve on a fish health committee. The Commission's Committee of Advisors provides citizen and state agency input to the Commission's decision-making process.

### **Commission Issues**

The Commission has mounted a major effort on the St. Mary's River, which produced more sea lampreys than all other Great Lakes areas combined. During FY 1999 the Commission completed the first full round of an integrated control strategy that is predicted to reduce sea lamprey populations in Lake Huron and northern Lake Michigan by at least 85 percent. Cost-effective sea lamprey control on the St. Mary's River was once thought to be impossible because of the size of the river and because of the widespread distribution of sea lamprey larvae. Nevertheless, state-of-the-art lamprey assessment and modeling technologies, combined with the development of new lampricide formulations, have provided the tools to accurately target concentrations of larval lampreys and to affect a significant level of control at the least possible cost. The control strategy integrates these targeted spot treatments with lampricides with an enhanced program of trapping and sterile-male release. Both of these latter alternative methods will be continued to reduce the recruitment of young larval sea lamprey to the river. An extensive assessment program is underway to monitor the effectiveness of the control strategy.

The GLFC is making progress towards reducing its dependency on lampricides, with a long-term milestone of a 50 percent reduction from 1990 levels targeted. Although the Commission already uses alternatives to lampricides to control lamprey, such as barrier dams and a program that-introduces sterile males into the lamprey population, they hope to improve and greatly expand these programs in the next few years. In a first step, changes to the Water Resources Development Act will allow the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to work with the Commission to fund and build new barrier to block and trap spawning sea lamprey.

Key to effective sea lamprey control is the development and application of new alternative methods. The GLFC faces the exciting possibility of using natural pheromones from the sea lampreys themselves as just such an alternative method. The GLFC's investment has led to discovery of two unique pheromones that are used by sea lampreys to migrate into the streams in which they spawn and to find their mates on the nesting grounds. These findings have been published in the most prestigious journals in the scientific world and represent a revolution in thinking about control of a vertebrate pest. Many questions have to be answered to get to the point where these pheromones can be used to disrupt reproduction of sea lampreys in the wild. Every effort is being made to accelerate field tests and critical studies on the synthesis of these pheromones to make the milestone of a new method by the end of the decade a reality.

The GLFC Secretariat estimates that the Commission has reduced TFM use by 30 percent since 1991, through a combination of refinements in the application process, improved stream selection, and investments in alternative controls. Virtually no TFM is being used in the St. Mary's River project. The primary control there is granular Bayluscide, which does not affect the entire water column and can be applied to discrete areas with remarkable precision.

The Commission is also partnering with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to protect and improve fish habitat in the Great Lakes. The authority for this program—known as the Great Lakes Fishery and Ecosystem Restoration program, found in the *Water Resources Development Act of 2000*—allows the Commission and its *Joint Strategic Plan* partners to work together to identify, prioritize, and cost-share projects relating to fish habitat. This major new initiative is just getting off the ground and the Commission has been working closely with the Corps and the states and tribes to ensure its success.

After years of level funding, the United States increased its annual contribution in FY 2000 to continue the St. Mary's River project, and increased the funding in FY 2001 and 2002 to restore sea lamprey control and to accelerate the development and deployment of alternative control techniques. The Commission put a high priority on additional funds for sea lamprey control and alternative control research. Canada has recently increased its contribution. A recent report by the Auditor General recommends that "Fisheries and Oceans should establish stable funding to support the Great Lakes Fishery Commission."

**Staff Contact***Department of State:*

Deirdre Warner-Kramer  
Senior Atlantic Affairs Officer  
Office of Marine Conservation (OES/OMC)  
U.S. Department of State  
Washington, DC 20520-7818  
Telephone: (202) 647-2335  
Fax: (202) 736-7350

**GLOBAL**

## **Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP)**

### **Basic Instrument**

Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels, 2001

### **Member Nations**

Argentina, Australia, Chile, Ecuador, France, New Zealand, Norway<sup>1</sup>, Peru, South Africa, Spain and the United Kingdom. Brazil is a signatory, but has not ratified.

### **Secretary Headquarters**

Warren Papworth  
Executive Director  
Interim Secretariat  
Suite 25-26, Salamanca Square, GPO Box 824  
Hobart, Tasmania 7001, Australia  
Phone: +61 3 6233 3123  
Fax: +61 3 6233 5497  
Email: warren.papworth@acap.aq  
Website: www.acap.aq

### **Budget**

ACAP's current annual budget is \$350,000, based upon ACAP's membership fee schedule, which assigns dues (up to a maximum of 20%), proportionally based upon nations' GDPs. As the United States is currently not a member, it does not pay dues at this time. However, it is estimated that joining ACAP would require the United States to pay membership dues of approximately \$70,000 annually.

### **Organizational Structure**

Annex 1 of the Agreement contains a list of species identified as in need of conservation action by ACAP Parties. This list is comprised of: 21 albatrosses and 7 petrel species with known fisheries interactions. Annex 2 of ACAP contains an "Action Plan", which outlines the major conservation elements of the Agreement. The Action Plan emphasizes several major conservation strategies that Parties must undertake to conserve seabirds. ACAP's conservation provisions are implemented by its Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee meets annually and oversees the activities of four working groups: 1) the Breeding Sites Working Group; 2) the Taxonomy Working Group; 3) Status and Trends Working Group; and 4) the Seabird Bycatch Working Group.

### **U.S. Representation**

Nations and Regional Economic Integration Organizations may participate in ACAP as either Parties or Observers. The United States, via NOAA Fisheries and the U.S. Department of States, has participated in ACAP meetings as an Observer due to its interest in seabird conservation and its status as a Range State under ACAP. This participation has granted the United States influence over some ACAP proceedings, although only full Parties have voting rights, the ability to Chair any of ACAP's working groups, or may propose amendments to the Agreement. NOAA Fisheries has been asked to participate on the recently established Seabird Bycatch Working Group. This group will hold its first meeting in summer 2007.

---

<sup>1</sup> Norway has taken all domestic action necessary to ratify the Agreement, although their instrument of ratification has not yet been received by the depositary. This is expected to happen soon.

### **Programs**

ACAP's working groups have made significant progress in reviewing the population status and trends of threatened seabird species, addressing taxonomic issues, collecting information on breeding sites and assessing threats to species from factors associated with these sites, and has begun to devise strategies for addressing seabird bycatch and engaging Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMOs). In particular, the ACAP Secretariat, on behalf of its member nations, has participated as an observer at key RFMO meetings to offer expertise and assistance to help RFMOs address seabird bycatch. The Secretariat also works with non-governmental organizations, such as BirdLife International, to develop informational materials detailing seabird distribution and its overlap with specific fisheries for discussion at RFMO and other relevant meetings.

### **Recent Activities**

ACAP entered into force in 2004, and is now the only multilateral agreement that coordinates international activity to mitigate known threats to albatross and petrel populations. ACAP held its first Meeting of the Parties in 2005. A major outcome of that meeting was the establishment of an Advisory Committee to guide the implementation of the Agreement. The 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of the Parties was held in New Zealand in November 2006. Major outcomes of this meeting included the finalization of arrangements for the ACAP Secretariat, agreement on a budget for the next three years, and the Parties' endorsement of the newly established Seabird Bycatch Working Group. Since ACAP's inception, its Parties have sought to expand its membership and efforts. They have actively recruited new members from the Northern Hemisphere and South America, where many imperiled seabird species breed, forage, and interact with fisheries. For example, a recent ACAP meeting was held in Brazil to encourage representatives of Brazil and other South American nations to attend. ACAP will hold the third meeting of its Advisory Committee in 2007 in Valdivia, Chile, where items related to the working groups and criteria for listing new species to ACAP will be considered, among other issues.

### **Staff Contacts**

*NOAA Fisheries:*

Nicole Le Boeuf  
NOAA Fisheries Office of International Affairs  
1315 East-West Highway  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-9090, ext. 184

Kim Rivera  
NOAA Fisheries Alaska Region  
P.O. Box 21668  
Juneau, AK 99802  
Telephone: (907) 586-7424

:  
*Department of State*

Gustavo Bisbal, Ph.D.  
Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental  
and Scientific Affairs  
2201 C Street, NW, HST, Rm. 2665  
Washington, DC 20520  
Telephone: (202) 647-6927

## **Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)**

### **Basic Instrument**

The Convention was opened for signature at the United Nations Convention on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro, June 1992; signed by President Clinton on June 4, 1993, and transmitted it to the Senate for advice and consent, along with an interpretive statement to clarify how the United States understands certain provisions that have caused concern. The treaty entered into force on December 29, 1993.

### **Implementing Legislation**

The CBD is awaiting Senate ratification. No implementing legislation to carry out the terms of the treaty was sent to the Congress, because current law was considered sufficient to meet the U.S. obligations.

### **Member Nations**

As of January 2007, 190 nations had ratified or acceded to the CBD. The United States has signed but not yet ratified the Convention. The Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety has been ratified or acceded to by 140 nations. The Protocol entered into force on September 11, 2003. As a non-Party to the Convention, the United States cannot become Party to the Protocol.

### **Secretariat Headquarters**

World Trade Centre 393 St Jacques Street, Office 300, Montréal, Québec, Canada H2Y 1N9  
Tel: +1-514-288-2220  
Fax: +1-514-288-6588  
Email: [secretariat@biodiv.org](mailto:secretariat@biodiv.org)  
Web address: <http://www.biodiv.org>

Executive Secretary: Mr. Hamdallah Zedan

### **Budget**

The Conference of the Parties at its Sixth Meeting (COP-7) in February 2004, approved a core budget of US\$10,497,800 for the year 2005 and of US\$10,918,500 for the year 2006. The United States is not yet a Party and therefore currently is not obligated to contribute directly to the Convention Budget, it has however made voluntary contributions.

In addition to the CBD budget, the implementation of the Convention in developing countries is funded through a Financial Mechanism. The Global Environment Facility (GEF) is the institution designated by the Conference of the Parties to operate the Financial Mechanism on an interim basis. The United States pledged US\$500 million to the current replenishment of the GEF (year 2003-2006). For more details on the GEF see description below.

### **U.S. Representation**

The Department of State is the lead U.S. agency to the CBD negotiations. The Department of Commerce (including NOAA), Department of the Interior, Department of Agriculture, Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Agency for International Development, and a number of other Agencies participate actively in the interagency process and on delegations to CBD negotiations.

NOAA Office of International Affairs is the lead for NOAA. NOAA Fisheries Service works in close consultation with NOAA International in the development of position papers and the review of information documents.

## **Description**

### A. Mission/Purpose:

The objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) are:

- (1) the conservation of biological diversity,
- (2) the sustainable use of its components, and
- (3) the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources.

### B. Organizational Structure:

The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) is governed by a Conference of the Parties (COP) made up of all the Parties to the Convention. During the first three years (1994-1996) the COP met annually. COP-4 met in May 1998, in Bratislava, Slovakia, COP-5 met in June 2000 in Nairobi, Kenya, COP-6 met in April 2002 in Hague, Netherlands, and COP-7 met in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia in February 2004. Brazil will host the next COP in May of 2006. At the COP, countries report on steps taken, and consider further measures for implementing the provisions of the Convention.

In addition to the COP, a Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical, and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) has been established to provide advice to the COP. The SBSTTA is also composed of representatives of governments that are Parties and has its own Bureau. SBSTTA generally meets annually, and can request assistance for its work inter-sessionally of *ad hoc* technical expert groups or liaison groups on specific issues.

A Secretariat, located in Montreal, Canada, provides administrative support to the Convention under the auspices of the United Nations Environment Program. The Secretariat also manages an electronic clearing-house mechanism to promote and facilitate technical and scientific cooperation (<http://www.biodiv.org/>).

The CBD is far reaching and the COP has the capacity to set up standing or *ad hoc* committees to deal with specific issues. The CBD can also serve as a framework for binding protocols. The first such protocol is the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

The Conference of the Parties to the CBD adopted a supplementary agreement to the Convention known as the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety on 29 January 2000, which later came into force on September 11, 2003. The Protocol seeks to contribute to the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms (LMOs) - such as genetically engineered plants, animals, and microbes - that cross international borders. Although the United States is not a Party to the CBD and therefore, cannot become a Party to the Biosafety Protocol, the U.S. participated in the negotiation of the text and the subsequent preparations for entry into force under the Intergovernmental Committee on the Cartagena Protocol. The Protocol provides countries the opportunity to obtain information before new biotech organisms are imported. It acknowledges each country's right to regulate bio-engineered organisms, subject to existing international obligations. It also creates a framework to help improve capacity of developing countries to protect biodiversity.

The Protocol establishes an Internet-based "Biosafety Clearing-House" to help countries exchange scientific, technical, environmental and legal information about living modified organisms. It creates an advance informed agreement (AIA) procedure that in effect requires exporters to seek consent from importers before the first shipment of LMOs meant to be introduced into the environment (such as fish for release). It requires bulk shipments of LMO commodities intended for direct use as food, feed or for processing, to be accompanied by documentation stating that such shipments "may contain" living modified organisms and are "not intended for intentional introduction into the environment." The Protocol establishes a process for considering more detailed identification of LMO commodities in international trade.

**General Provisions of the Treaty:** The Convention on Biological Diversity affirms that conservation of biodiversity is a common concern of humankind and reaffirms that nations have sovereign rights over their own biological resources. Implementation depends principally on action by Parties at the national level. In this respect, the Convention provides general guidance on best practices, but does not currently include any sanctions for countries that do not adhere to these practices. The Convention covers *both* terrestrial and marine biota, and Parties are explicitly required to implement the CBD consistent with the rights and obligations of States under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

The major commitments made by Parties to the Convention encompass nearly all aspects of NOAA Fisheries work and responsibilities. These commitments include:

To develop national strategies, plans, etc., for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity; and to integrate, as far as possible and appropriate, the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity into relevant sectoral or cross-sectoral plans (Art. 6).

To identify and monitor the components of biodiversity and activities which have or might have significant adverse impacts (Art. 7).

To establish protected areas or areas where special measures are needed and to regulate or manage biological resources important to biodiversity; to promote protection of ecosystems and natural habitats; and to promote environmentally sound and sustainable development in areas adjacent to protected areas; to prevent introduction of species from outside a country that could threaten native ecosystems or species; to develop or maintain necessary legislation and other regulatory provisions for protection of threatened species and populations; and to establish means to regulate, manage or control risks associated with use and release of living modified organisms from biotechnology with likely adverse environmental effects (Art. 8).

To adopt measures for the *ex-situ* conservation of components of biological diversity (Art. 9).

To integrate consideration of the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity resources into national decision-making; adopt measures relating to the use of biological resources to avoid or minimize adverse impacts on biological diversity; to preserve and maintain knowledge and practices of indigenous and local communities embodying traditional lifestyles that are compatible with conservation or sustainable use requirements; support remedial action in degraded areas; and encourage cooperation between the government and private sector to develop methods for sustainable use (Art. 10).

To adopt economically and socially sound measures that act as incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of components of biological diversity (Art. 11)

To establish programs for scientific and technical education and training in identification, conservation, sustainable use of biodiversity and promote research that contributes to biodiversity (Art. 12).

To promote programs for public education and awareness (Art. 13).

To require environmental impact assessments that address impacts on biodiversity and to minimize such impacts. (Art. 14).

To create conditions to facilitate access to genetic resources on mutually agreed terms, recognizing sovereign rights of States over their natural resources; and to share in a fair and equitable way the results of research, development, and the commercial utilization of genetic resources with contracting Parties providing such resources (Art. 15).

To encourage access to, and transfer of, technology relevant to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity or that makes use of genetic resources and does not cause significant damage to the environment (Art. 16).

To facilitate the exchange of information and scientific and technical cooperation in the field of the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity (Art. 17&18).

To encourage biotechnology research, especially in developing countries; ensure the fair and equitable sharing of benefits from biotechnology; and address safety concerns related to the transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms (Art. 19).

In addition to these general provisions, developed country Parties are required to provide “new and additional financial resources” to assist developing country parties meet the incremental costs of implementing measures that fulfill the obligations of the CBD. These resources are provided through the GEF (Art. 20 & 21).

**Marine and Coastal Biodiversity:** The Second Conference of the Parties (COP) in November 1995 adopted the Ministerial Statement on the Implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity, which referred to the new global consensus on the importance of marine and coastal biological diversity as the “*Jakarta Mandate on Marine and Coastal Biodiversity*”. The Ministerial Statement (re)affirmed the critical need for the Parties to address the conservation and sustainable use of marine and coastal biological diversity and urged Parties to initiate immediate action to implement COP decisions on the issue.

The program of work on marine and coastal biological diversity was approved by the COP in a decision in 1998, and further elaborated in decisions in 2000 and 2002. The work program identifies important operation objective and priority activities within the framework of five key program elements reflecting global priorities:

- (1) Promoting integrated marine and coastal area management as the framework for addressing human impacts on biological diversity.
- (2) Establishing and maintaining marine and coastal protected areas.
- (3) Using fisheries and other marine and coastal living resources sustainably. This was the most controversial recommendation, including issues of overcapacity, subsidies and bycatch.
- (4) Ensuring that mariculture practices are environmentally sustainable.
- (5) Preventing the introduction of, and controlling or eradicating, alien species that threaten ecosystems, habitats or species.

The CBD program of work on Marine and Coastal biodiversity aims to assist the implementation of the Jakarta Mandate at the national, regional and global level. It identifies key operational objectives and priority activities within the five key program elements, namely: implementation of integrated marine and coastal area management, marine and coastal living resources, marine and coastal protected areas, mariculture and alien species and genotypes. It also provides a general element to encompass the coordination role of the Secretariat, the collaborative linkages required and the effective use of experts, as well as enabling activities to assist Parties in overcoming obstacles to implementation.

**Staff Contacts***NOAA Fisheries:*

Elizabethann English  
Office of International Affairs  
Foreign Affairs Specialist  
1315 East-West Highway, Room 12626  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301)713-2276  
Fax: (301) 713-2313  
Web address: <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/ia/>

*Department of State:*

Christine L. Dawson  
Senior Conservation Officer  
U.S. Department of State  
Office of Ecology and Terrestrial Conservation (OES/ETC)  
2201 C Street, N.W., Room 4333  
Washington, D.C. 20520  
Telephone: (202) 647-4683  
FAX (202) 736-7351  
E-mail: [dawsoncl@state.gov](mailto:dawsoncl@state.gov)  
Web address: <http://www.state.gov/www/global/oes>

## **Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES)**

### **Basis Instrument**

Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (27 UST 1087, TIAS 8249)

### **Implementing Legislation**

Endangered Species Act (16 USC 1531-43)

### **Member Nations**

There are currently 169 Parties: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalem, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, People's Republic of, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Congo, Democratic Republic of, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Korea, Kuwait, Republic of, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Lybian Arab Jamahiriya, former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tanzania, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

### **Secretariat Headquarters**

CITES Secretariat  
International Environment House  
Chemin des Anémones  
CH-1219 Châtelaine, Geneva  
Switzerland  
Tel: (+4122) 917-8139/40  
Fax: (+4122) 797-3417  
Email: [cites@unep.ch](mailto:cites@unep.ch)  
Web address: <http://www.cites.org/>

### **Budget**

The average annual budget for the triennium 2006-2008 approved by the 13<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Conference of the Parties was US\$4,750,000. According to United Nations scale, the U.S. contribution is 22%.

### **U.S. Representation**

The Endangered Species Act designates the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of Interior, with the assistance of the Department of State, to implement the Convention. FWS is also responsible for inspections of shipments of wildlife through designated ports of entry. The bulk of CITES-listed species are under the management jurisdiction of FWS. However, many species are managed by NMFS, including all the great whales, all the dolphins, all the marine turtles, six seal species, coelacanths, all sturgeon species, basking sharks, great white sharks, whale sharks, seahorses, queen conch and all hard coral species listed either on Appendix I or II.

The National Marine Fisheries Service draws on the expertise of its regional offices and science centers in order to participate fully in the inter-agency collaboration necessary to implement CITES in both scientific and management concerns.

The Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service of the Department of Agriculture inspects imports of plant species listed on the treaty.

### **Description**

#### A. Mission/Purpose:

Provides for international co-operation for the protection of certain species of wild fauna and flora against over-exploitation through international trade.

#### B. Organizational Structure:

The CITES framework includes a Standing Committee meetings annually to conduct the administrative matters of the Convention and to recommend policy actions to the Parties. In addition, there are separate committees on Animals and Plants, which meet annually to review scientific matters, including management questions, and make recommendations to the Standing Committee.

All the committees meet approximately once a year on their own schedules. Meetings of the Conference of the Parties (COPs) are convened approximately every two years.

#### C. Programs:

Under CITES, species are listed in Appendices according to their conservation status. In addition, listed species must meet the test that trade is at least in part contributing to their decline. Appendix I species, for which there is no international trade permitted, are "threatened with extinction." Appendix II species are "not necessarily threatened with extinction," but may become so unless trade is strictly regulated. This regulation usually takes the form of a requirement for documentation from the country of export, monitoring of imports and, in some cases, export quotas. Imports from countries which are not CITES members still require what is called "CITES-equivalent documentation." Appendix III includes all species which any Party identifies as being subject to regulation within its jurisdiction for the purpose of preventing or restricting exploitation, and as needing the co-operation of other Parties in the control of trade.

In order to determine whether such limitation is necessary, the Animals and Plants Committees of CITES undertake reviews of Appendix II species for which there are significant amounts of international trade, from which recommendations for conservation of the species are made in order that they might avoid being listed in Appendix I.

Of special interest to NOAA Fisheries are significant trade studies for queen conch and hard corals, discussion of the implementation of CITES Appendix II for commercially-exploited marine fish species, cooperative efforts with the

International Whaling Commission to control illegal trade in whales, and recent efforts by the Government of Cuba to re-open international trade in hawksbill turtle shells.

### **Recent Activities**

At the most recent CITES meeting (COP13, 2-14 October 2004, Bangkok, Thailand), the following decisions concerning marine species were taken:

- Irrawaddy dolphin (*Orcaella brevirostris*) listed in Appendix I;
- great white shark (*Carcharodon carcharias*), humphead wrasse (*Cheilinus undulatus*), European date mussel (*Lithophaga lithophaga*) listed in Appendix II;
- great whales retained their status in Appendix I;
- revised criteria for evaluating species proposals that include specific guidelines for evaluation of marine fish species were adopted at the meeting;
- the Animals Committee of CITES was directed to continue their review of shark species affected by international trade and to consider and review progress with the implementation of FAO's International Plan of Action for Sharks;
- the CITES Standing Committee was directed to convene a workshop to consider implementation, legal and technical issues associated with listing marine fish species in the CITES Appendices.

Note: Decisions of substance need a 2/3 majority for passage.

Follow-up will be necessary to implement many of these accomplishments. In addition, efforts to improve implementation for species, such as queen conch and corals, which have been listed in Appendix II will be of top priority to NOAA-Fisheries.

### **Future Meetings**

The next Conference of the Parties (CoP14) will be convened in 3-15 June 2007 in the Netherlands.

### **Staff Contacts**

#### *NOAA Fisheries:*

Nancy K. Daves  
Office of International Affairs (F/IA)  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
1315 East-West Highway  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-9090  
Fax: (301) 713-0376

#### *U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service:*

Dr. Roddy Gabel (Acting)  
Office of Management Authority  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
4401 N. Fairfax Drive  
Arlington, VA 22203  
Telephone: (703) 358-2095  
Fax: (703) 358-2280

Dr. Rosemarie Gnam (Acting)  
Office of Scientific Authority  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
4401 N. Fairfax Drive  
Arlington, VA 22203  
Telephone: (703) 358-1708  
Fax: (703) 358-2276

## **International Whaling Commission (IWC)**

### **Basic Instrument**

International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling, 1946, (TIAS 1849); Protocol amending 1956 (TIAS 4228).

### **Implementing Legislation**

Whaling Convention Act of 1949 (64 Stat. 421, 16 U.S.C. 916-9161).

### **Member Nations**

There are currently 73 member nations: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Brazil, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, People's Republic of China, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominica, Finland, France, Gabon, The Gambia, Germany, Grenada, Guatemala, Republic of Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Kiribati, Luxembourg, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts & Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent & the Grenadines, San Marino, Senegal, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Togo, Tuvalu, United Kingdom, and the United States.

### **Commission Headquarters**

International Whaling Commission  
The Red House  
135 Station Road  
Impington  
Cambridge, CB4 9NP, United Kingdom  
Secretary: Dr. Nicky Grandy  
Phone: +44-1223-233-971  
Fax: +44-1223 232-876  
e-mail: [iwc@iwcoffice.org](mailto:iwc@iwcoffice.org)  
Web address: <http://www.iwcoffice.org/>

### **Budget**

The Commission approved a budget of £1,656,050 (British Pounds) for 2006-2007. The United States contribution amounts to approximately US \$155,371 for 2006-2007.

### **U.S. Representation**

#### A. Appointment Process:

The Commissioner is appointed by the President, on the concurrent recommendations of the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce, and serves at his pleasure. The President may also appoint a Deputy U.S. Commissioner.

**B. U.S. Commissioner:**

Dr. William T. Hogarth  
Assistant Administrator for Fisheries  
Department of Commerce  
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
Silver Spring, MD 20910

**Deputy U.S. Commissioner:**

Dr. Douglas DeMaster  
Science and Research Director  
Alaska Fisheries Science Center  
Department of Commerce  
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
Seattle, WA 98115

**C. Advisory Structure:**

U.S. representation in the IWC has no formal (legislated) advisory structure. The IWC Commissioner does consult, however, with the "IWC Interagency Committee," which includes representatives of the Department of State, the Marine Mammal Commission, other Federal agencies, conservation organizations, Native organizations, and other interested parties.

**Description****A. Mission/Purpose:**

The 1946 Convention has as its objective the proper conservation of world whale stocks, thus making possible the orderly development of the whaling industry. The Convention established the IWC to provide for a continuing review of the condition of whale stocks and for such additions to or modifications of the agreed conservation measures as might appear desirable.

**B. Organizational Structure:**

The IWC consists of the Commission, Secretariat, and subject area committees. The Commission is composed of one member from each Contracting Government, may be accompanied by one or more experts and advisors. Each member government has one vote. Decisions of the Commission are by simple majority of those members voting, except that a three-fourths majority of those members is required for actions to amend the provisions of the Schedule (which contains the binding decisions of the Commission). The Commission can determine its own rules of procedure and may appoint its own Secretary and staff. The Committees may be set up by the Commission from its own members and experts or advisors to perform such functions as it may authorize. At the 2006 IWC annual meeting, the Commissioner from the United States, William Hogarth, was elected to Chair the IWC and the Commissioner from Japan, Mr. Minoru Morimoto, was elected as the Vice-Chair for the next three years.

**C. Programs:**

The IWC normally meets once a year to review the condition of whale stocks and to modify conservation measures as appropriate. The Commission has used various means of regulating commercial whaling including the fixing of open and closed seasons, open and closed areas, protected species, size limits for each species, and limits on the

catch of whales in any one season. The IWC recognizes two distinct types of whaling: commercial whaling and aboriginal subsistence whaling.

Past actions by the IWC include establishment of a whale sanctuary in the Indian Ocean area and in the Southern Ocean (in most of the waters south of 40° S. latitude), prohibition on the use of cold grenade (non-exploding) harpoons to kill whales for commercial purposes, a moratorium on all commercial whaling from the beginning of the 1985-86 pelagic and 1986 coastal seasons, and the adoption of a separate and distinct management scheme for aboriginal subsistence whaling. Criteria for evaluating research involving the killing of whales under special permits were established because of concerns that some countries would use special permits for scientific research as a means of circumventing the zero catch limits for commercial whaling. The 1946 Convention allows countries to issue special permits authorizing the taking of whales for scientific research.

The Chair's summary of the annual meeting can be found on the IWC Secretariat's website [www.iwcoffice.org](http://www.iwcoffice.org).

The 59<sup>th</sup> annual meeting will be held in Anchorage, Alaska in May 2007.

### **Staff Contacts**

#### *NOAA Fisheries:*

Cheri McCarty  
IWC Coordinator  
Office of International Affairs (F/IA)  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
1315 East-West Highway  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-9090

#### *Department of State:*

John Field  
Foreign Affairs Officer  
Office of Ocean Affairs (OES/OA)  
U.S. Department of State  
2201 C Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20520-7818

## **PART II. BILATERAL CONSULTATIVE ARRANGEMENTS**

## NORTH AMERICA

### **Informal Fisheries Consultations Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada**

#### **Basic Instrument**

None

#### **Authorities**

Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act, 16 U.S.C. 1822(a), which authorizes the Secretary of State to negotiate international fisheries agreements, and 16 U.S.C. 1855(d), which authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to promulgate regulations necessary to carry out the Magnuson Act.

#### **Member Nations**

United States and Canada.

#### **Meetings**

Parties meet annually, alternating meetings between the United States and Canada. This meeting generally takes place in late July or early August.

#### **Description**

The Parties have agreed that informal consultations on bilateral, multilateral and global fisheries conservation and management issues are of benefit to both Parties. These consultations are designed to provide broad coordination on issues of concern as opposed to negotiation of final agreements. Discussions on bilateral issues generally focus on improving communication and coordination with regard to conservation and management of shared stocks (such as Pacific albacore, Pacific hake, and species of mutual concern in the Gulf of Maine). In many cases, separate negotiations are underway on these species, and this meeting allows officials on both sides to discuss avenues for future progress.

Additionally, the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO) takes up a portion of the agenda for the consultations. As NAFO Contracting Parties, the United States and Canada share many of the same concerns and goals for this Organization. Thus, time is spent during the consultations on strategies for improving conservation and management in NAFO. Discussions in this regard focus primarily on progress made during the intersessional period and goals for the NAFO annual meeting, which occurs annually in September. Other multilateral organizations of interest to the United States and Canada (such as the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC), and the APEC Fisheries Working Group) are also discussed.

Global fisheries issues of interest to the United States and Canada include various international fisheries management agreements and initiatives (such as the FAO International Plans of Action for Seabirds, Sharks, Capacity and IUU Fishing and the UN Fish Stocks Agreement). The consultations are used to trade information on the status of implementation of these instruments, as well as to discuss ways to encourage their implementation by other countries. In addition, Parties discuss species of mutual concern at the global level, such as sea turtles.

**Recent Activities**

The most recent Informal Fisheries Consultations Between the United States and Canada were on July 26, 2006, in Silver Spring, Maryland. Discussions at this meeting centered on updates on Canadian and U.S. domestic and international fisheries management priorities and discussions relating to specific bilateral multilateral issues.

**Upcoming Meeting:**

The next informal consultation will take place in Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, during July 2007.

**Staff Contacts***NOAA Fisheries:*

Patrick E. Moran  
Office of Sustainable Fisheries (F/SF4)  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
1315 East-West Highway  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-2276  
Fax: (301) 713-2313  
E-mail: pat.moran@noaa.gov

*Department of State:*

Deirdre Warner-Kramer  
Office of Marine Conservation (OES/OMC)  
Department of State  
2201 C Street, NW, Room 5806  
Washington, D.C. 20520-7818  
Telephone: (202) 647-2883  
Fax: (202) 736-7350  
E-mail: Warner-KramerDM@state.gov

## **Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada on Fisheries Enforcement**

### **Basic Instrument**

Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada on Fisheries Enforcement of September 26, 1990 (House Document 102-22, 102d Congress, 1st Session).

### **Authorities**

Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act, 16 U.S.C. 1822(a), which authorizes the Secretary of State to negotiate international fisheries agreements, and 16 U.S.C. 1855(d), which authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to promulgate regulations necessary to carry out the Magnuson Act.

### **Member Nations**

United States and Canada.

### **Meetings**

The US/Canada Bilateral Enforcement meeting took place in Vancouver, Canada on 10/26/06. It was attended by representatives from NOAA Enforcement, USCG, and Canada's DFO.

### **Description**

The Parties have agreed to take appropriate measures consistent with international law to ensure that their nationals, residents and vessels do not violate, within the waters and zones of the other Party, the national fisheries laws and regulations of the other Party. Such measures shall include prohibitions on violating the fisheries laws and regulations of the other Party respecting gear stowage, fishing without authorization, and interfering with, resisting, or obstructing in any manner, efforts to enforce such laws and regulations; and may include such other prohibitions as each Party deems appropriate.

Bilateral enforcement meetings are held to review past practices and discuss new standards, policies, and strategies for enforcement cooperation. Communications, prosecution practices, evidentiary requirements, regulation interpretation, notification procedures, and hot pursuit comprise the core of discussions.

### **Recent Activities**

#### **West coast:**

Information was shared on issues of mutual concern pertaining to investigations of fishing vessels as well as potential avenues for trafficking illegal sport & commercial fish between countries. Discussions took place surrounding the coordination of intelligence sharing and possible multi-agency patrol vessel efforts. Informal discussions also took place on the possibility of US agents attending the multi-agency training in Comox on licensing fish buying stations/processors and regulations affecting B.C. processors.

Atlantic Coast:

Two joint law enforcement operations were conducted with NOAA Office for Law Enforcement (OLE), Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Canada, U.S. Customs and Border Protection and Maine Marine Patrol. A total of 44 cases were documented and prosecuted.

Other Issues:

A meeting of the International MCS Network was held in Vancouver, Canada. The meeting involved 12 countries and 28 participants. The participating countries elected, Director of NOAA OLE, Dale Jones as the new MCS Chairmen and approved the MCS enhancement project. The enhancement project will include several new positions, a coordinator, fisheries analyst and a training officer.

DFO and NOAA are committed to working closely together to coordinate and ensure the effective delivery of fishery law enforcement programs along the international boundaries. Representatives from both agencies expressed the need to continue sharing information that will improve the effectiveness of enforcement programs.

Future Meetings

The US/Canada Bilateral Enforcement meeting will be sometime in the 2nd quarter of 2008.

Staff Contacts*NOAA Fisheries:*

Dale Jones  
Director, Office for Law Enforcement (F/EN)  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
8484 Georgia Avenue, Suite 415  
Silver Spring, MD 20910-5612  
Telephone: (301) 427-2300  
Fax: (301) 427-2055  
E-mail: dale.jones@noaa.gov

*Department of State:*

LCDR Kevin Riddle, USCG Liaison  
Office of Marine Conservation (OES/OMC)  
U.S. Department of State  
2201 C Street, NW, Room 5806  
Washington, D.C. 20520-7818  
Telephone: (202) 647-3177  
Fax: (202) 736-7350

## CENTRAL AMERICA

### United States-Mexico Fisheries Cooperation Program

#### **Basic Instrument**

There is no formal instrument establishing the United States-Mexico Fisheries Cooperation Program. The U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries Service) and the predecessor agency to the Mexican Secretaría de Medio Ambiente, Recursos Naturales, y Pesca (SEMARNAP) informally agreed in 1983 to meet annually to review the broad range of issues involved in the bilateral fisheries relationship. There are three memoranda of understanding (MOU) since agreed to by NOAA Fisheries Service and SEMARNAP to formalize different aspects of the fisheries relationship: (1) MEXUS-Gulf research program, (2) MEXUS-Pacífico research program, and (3) information exchange. The research MOUs have proven highly effective, but NOAA Fisheries Service has been unable to arrange continuing reciprocal exchanges under the information exchange MOU, and it is currently inactive.

#### **Implementing Legislation**

The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Act), particularly 16 U.S.C. 1822(a), authorizes the negotiation of international fishery agreements to further the purposes, policy, and provisions of the Act.

#### **Member Nations**

The United States and Mexico.

#### **Budget**

There are no funds specifically budgeted for the program; costs are assumed in the operating budgets of the participating NOAA Fisheries offices. Annual costs of the program including staff time, travel, translation services, and miscellaneous expenses total about \$60,000 annually. This does not include the cost of various working group meetings, such as the annual MEXUS-Gulf and MEXUS-Pacífico meetings or special meetings.

#### **Representation**

The annual Fishery Cooperation Talks (FCTs) are coordinated by NOAA Fisheries and Mexico's Subsecretaría de Pesca (PESCA). Both agencies often invite other agencies to participate in the meetings. NOAA Fisheries has invited representatives from other NOAA line offices, the Food and Drug Administration, Department of Interior (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service), U.S. Coast Guard, and the Department of State, as well as state government officials. PESCA has invited other government units such as the Instituto Nacional de Pesca, and the Procurator General para el Ambiente (PROFEPA), the Secretaría de Comercio, the Secretaría de Salud, and the Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores.

#### **Description**

##### A. Mission/Purpose:

The participants have agreed to periodically review the United States-Mexican fisheries relationship. The FCT discussions serve to reinforce the longstanding cooperative relationship between the United States and Mexico on fishery issues. Formal and informal sessions provide opportunities to exchange information and discuss major issues.

## B. Programs:

NOAA Fisheries and PESCA normally meet annually, alternating meetings between the United States and Mexico. Working group meetings are held as needed. The two science working groups, MEXUS-Gulf and MEXUS-Pacífico, meet annually. Other working group meetings are held as required on such matters as enforcement, management, aquaculture, and other issues.

Initially, the participants decided to omit the most contentious issues and focus on those issues where it was possible to reach some agreement on mutually beneficial projects. As a result, considerable progress was made during the 1980s in expanding cooperative research programs and better understanding each country's fishery laws and policies. The relationship matured during the 1990s; recent meetings have included discussions on management, enforcement, recreational fisheries, marine mammals and endangered species. The meetings help to inform participants of national programs affecting the other country. The participants in recent years have widened the scope of some research projects to include coordinated management and other issues.

## C. Conservation and Management Measures:

Conservation and management issues are generally the major topics discussed at the meetings. The protection of marine mammals and endangered species (especially turtles and mammals) were for several years the focus of discussions. More recently, there have been information exchanges and a sharing of management experiences on various fishery resources. Shark and shrimp management and bycatch reduction in particular have been discussed in some detail. Mexico has taken the initiative in pursuing possible cooperation on Gulf of Mexico shrimp management.

## D. Meetings

No FCT meetings occurred from 2001-2003. Recent FCT meetings were held on March 10-11, 2004, in Mazatlan, Sinaloa and on October 13-14, 2005, in La Jolla, California. The Mexican delegations included officials from National Aquaculture and Fisheries (CONAPESCA), the National Fisheries Institute (INF), and the Secretariats of Agriculture, Livestock, Rural Development, Fisheries, and Food (SAGARPA), Foreign Relations (SRE), and Environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT). The U.S. delegations included officials from the NMFS, U.S. Department of State, and the U.S. Coast Guard.. The delegations discussed sustainable fisheries management, the protection and conservation of species such as dolphins and sea turtles, fisheries-related trade issues, enforcement cooperation, aquaculture, collaborative scientific research in the framework of the MEXUS-Gulf and MEXUS-Pacific bilateral agreements, and the participation of the two countries in fisheries-related international organizations. Parties agreed to exchange information and to work together in these areas. No FCT meeting occurred in 2006, but future meetings are planned for summer/fall 2007.

### **Staff Contact**

#### *NOAA Fisheries:*

Brad Wiley  
International Fisheries Division  
Office of International Affairs  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
1315 East-West Hwy  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-2276  
Fax: (301) 713-2313

## SOUTH AMERICA

### United States-Chile Fisheries Cooperation Program

#### **Basic Instrument**

The basic instrument establishing the United States-Chile Cooperation Program is a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries Service) and the Chilean Servicio Nacional de Pesca (SERNAPESCA) signed in 1995 and extended in 2004.

#### **Implementing Legislation**

The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Act), particularly 16 U.S.C. 1822(a), authorizes the negotiation of international fishery agreements to further the purposes, policy, and provisions of the Act.

#### **Member Nations**

The United States and Chile

#### **Budget**

There are no funds specifically budgeted for the program; costs are assumed in the operating budgets of the participating NOAA Fisheries Service offices. Annual expenditures for the program including staff time, travel, translation services, and miscellaneous expenses total about \$50,000 annually.

#### **Representation**

The meetings are coordinated by NOAA Fisheries Service and SERNAPESCA. Both agencies often invite other agencies to participate in the meetings. NOAA Fisheries Service has invited representatives from other NOAA line offices, the Food and Drug Administration, U.S. Coast Guard, and the State Department. SERNAPESCA routinely invites other units of the Ministerio de Economía (the Subsecretaría de Pesca and the Instituto de Fomento Pesquero) as well as industry representatives. SERNAPESCA has also invited representatives of the Chilean Navy and Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores (Foreign Ministry) to attend some sessions.

#### **Description**

##### A. Mission/Purpose:

The participants have agreed to periodically review the United States-Chilean fisheries relationship. The resulting Fishery Cooperation Talks (FCT) provide a forum for U.S. and Chilean fishery officials to review fishery issues of mutual concern. Formal and informal sessions provide opportunities to exchange information and discuss major issues, resulting in a frank exchange of views and information.

##### B. Programs:

NOAA Fisheries and SERNAPESCA agreed to hold annual meetings during the first few years of the cooperative program. The two Parties now intend to meet every 18-24 months. Recent meetings have included discussions on management, enforcement, recreational fisheries, marine mammals and endangered species, research, environment, aquaculture, and information exchange. The meetings help to inform participants of national programs affecting the other country.

### C. Conservation and Management Measures:

Conservation and management issues are generally the major topics discussed at the meetings. The protection of marine mammals was initially the primary focus of the meetings and continues to be an important element. NOAA Fisheries Service has additionally raised some concerns about Pacific sea turtles, especially leatherbacks. Other important conservation and management issues discussed include enforcement, management strategies and systems, and recreational fishing. Discussions on these issues as well as information exchanges and visits have enabled NOAA Fisheries and Chilean fishery agencies to exchange ideas and experiences in formulating domestic policies as well as to work further on species of mutual interest.

### D. 2006 Meeting:

The most recent (Eighth) Fishery Cooperation Talks between fishery officials of the United States and Chile were convened in Punta Arenas, Chile, January 24-26, 2006. The Chilean delegation included representatives of different units of the Fisheries Under-Secretariat (SUBPESCA), the National Fisheries Service (SERNAPESCA), the Fisheries Development Institute (IFOP), and the Chilean Navy (General Directorate of Maritime Territory and the Merchant Marine). The U.S. Delegation included participants from various NOAA Fisheries Service and NOAA National Ocean Service offices. The discussions explored cooperative efforts in six major issue areas: (1) research, (2) enforcement, (3) administrative/management, (4) multilateral initiatives, (5) aquaculture, and (6) environment. At the conclusion of the session, the two Parties agreed to update the MOU that provides the framework for their cooperation.

### **Future Meetings**

The United States will host the next meeting in Seattle, Washington, at a time to be determined.

### **Staff Contact**

#### *NOAA Fisheries:*

Nancy K. Daves  
Office of International Affairs  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
1315 East-West Hwy  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-9090  
Fax: (301) 713-2313

## ASIA

### United States-Japan Consultative Committee on Fisheries

#### **Basic Instrument**

There is no formal instrument per se. The two countries agreed to the Consultative Committee via an exchange of diplomatic notes on January 27, 1992.

#### **Implementing Legislation**

None.

#### **Member Nations**

The United States and Japan.

#### **Meetings**

The Committee meets periodically, in the United States or Japan. The venue for the Committee is decided prior to each meeting.

#### **U.S. Representation**

The Committee consists of one representative from each Government, as well as support staff and advisors. The current U.S. Representative is Ambassador David Balton, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and Space, Department of State.

#### **Description**

The U.S.-Japan Consultative Committee on Fisheries was formed to promote bilateral cooperation in the field of fisheries and fisheries research. It replaced the more formal Governing International Fisheries Agreement (GIFA) between the United States and Japan that expired on December 31, 1991. The Consultative Committee holds periodic high-level bilateral consultations on fishery issues of mutual concern.

#### **Recent Activities**

Representatives of the United States and Japan held the 9<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Consultative Committee on Fisheries in Tokyo, Japan, on January 19-20, 2004. The U.S. delegation was led by Mr. David Balton, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and Fisheries, and the Japanese side was led by the Director-General of the Fisheries Agency of Japan, Mr. Fumio Tahara. Dr. Rebecca Lent, Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, represented NOAA Fisheries at the meeting.

The two delegations exchanged views on the most important fisheries issues in the U.S.-Japan fisheries relationship. Prominent on the agenda were issues related to cooperation between the two countries at regional fisheries management organizations, and in particular the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC), the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT), the Convention on the Conservation and Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific (WCPFC), and the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO). The two countries discussed a number of FAO issues--the FAO Technical Consultation on Sea Turtles to be held in Bangkok, Thailand, in November 2004; fishing capacity and combating illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing; fishing subsidies; and shark conservation and management. Other

issues on the agenda included CITES, the Interim Scientific Committee (ISC) for Tuna and Tuna-like Species in the North Pacific Ocean, the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) Fisheries Working Group, and fishing on sea mounts. The delegations of both countries reaffirmed the value of maintaining and further strengthening the long-standing cooperation between the United States and Japan on these and other fisheries issues.

### **Next Meeting**

The United States and Japan have not held a comprehensive fisheries bilateral meeting since the 2004 meeting in Tokyo. However, the two countries have met bilaterally on specific fishery issues, as necessary, each year since 2004. The United States will host the next comprehensive Consultative Committee meeting at a time and place to be mutually determined.

### **Staff Contacts**

#### *NOAA Fisheries:*

Paul E. Niemeier  
International Fisheries Affairs Division (F/IA1)  
Office of International Affairs  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
1315 East-West Highway, Room 12752  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-2276  
Fax: (301) 713-2313  
E-mail: paul.niemeier@noaa.gov

#### *Department of State:*

Amanda Johnson-Miller  
Office of Marine Conservation (OES/OMC)  
Department of State  
2201 C Street, Room 2758  
Washington, D.C. 20520-7818  
Telephone: (202) 647-2335  
Fax: (202) 736-7350  
E-mail: JohnsonMillerAX@state.gov

## United States-People's Republic of China Bilateral Fisheries Consultations

### **Basic Instrument**

There is no formal instrument.

### **Implementing Legislation**

None.

### **Member Nations**

The United States and the People's Republic of China (China).

### **Meetings**

The countries meet periodically in the United States or China. The venue is decided prior to each meeting.

### **U.S. Representation**

Delegations consist of one representative from each Government, as well as support staff and advisors. The current U.S. Representative is Ambassador David Balton, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and Space, Department of State.

### **Description**

From 1995 to 2004, the United States and China maintained a bilateral fisheries relationship under terms of a Governing International Fisheries Agreement (GIFA). Although the GIFA expired in July 2004, the two countries have continued to collaborate on fisheries and other marine science programs through a bilateral science and technology agreement, and on high seas driftnet fisheries enforcement via a *Memorandum of Understanding Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the People's Republic of China on Effective Cooperation and Implementation of United Nations General Assembly Resolution 46/215 of December 20, 1991*, known more generally as the U.S.-PRC Shiprider Agreement.

### **Recent Activities**

Representatives of the U.S. and Chinese Governments last met in Beijing on May 8-10, 2002, for a comprehensive discussion of fisheries issues of mutual concern. The U.S. delegation was led by Ambassador Mary Beth West, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Oceans and Fisheries, U.S. Department of State. Representatives from NOAA Fisheries and the U.S. Coast Guard were included on the delegation. The Chinese delegation was headed by Li Jianhua, Deputy Director General of the Bureau of Fisheries, Ministry of Agriculture, led the Chinese delegation. In opening comments, both sides noted the importance of continuing already productive bilateral cooperation on fisheries.

The two sides discussed reducing fishing capacity; China's ratification of the United Nations (UN) Fish Stocks and Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) Compliance Agreements; implementation of the FAO International Plans of Action on capacity, shark finning, seabird by-catch, and illegal, unregulated, and unreported fishing; issues of mutual concern, including stock management, compliance, and non-member fishing, in the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tuna; cooperation on negotiations for the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Convention; effective implementation of the UN General Assembly Resolution 46/215 (high seas driftnet

moratorium) in the North Pacific Ocean pursuant to the terms of the U.S.-PRC Shiprider Agreement; cooperation on the Central Bering Sea Pollock Convention; support for U.S. oceans and fisheries initiatives at the World Summit on Sustainable Development; and China's full membership in the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Living Marine Resources.

**Next Meeting:** The two countries have not yet scheduled the next fisheries consultations.

**Staff Contacts**

*NOAA Fisheries:*

Paul Niemeier  
International Fisheries Affairs Division (F/IA1)  
Office of International Affairs  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
1315 East-West Highway, Room 12752  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-2276  
Fax: (301) 713-2313  
E-mail: paul.niemeier@noaa.gov

*Department of State:*

Amanda Johnson-Miller  
Office of Marine Conservation (OES/OMC)  
Department of State  
2201 C Street, NW, Room 2758  
Washington, D.C. 20520-7818  
Telephone: (202) 647-2335  
Fax: (202) 736-7350  
E-mail: JohnsonMillerAX@state.gov

**Memorandum of Understanding Between the  
American Institute in Taiwan and the  
Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States  
Concerning Cooperation in Fisheries and Aquaculture**

**Basic Instrument**

The basic instrument establishing U.S.-Taiwan cooperation in fisheries and aquaculture is the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Between the American Institute in Taiwan (AIT) and the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States Concerning Cooperation in Fisheries and Aquaculture. The MOU was signed by AIT and TECRO on July 30, 2002. It expires on July 30, 2007.

**Implementing Legislation**

None.

**Members**

The United States and Taiwan.

**Meetings**

The Parties (AIT and TECRO) agreed that their designated representatives will consult periodically, either in the United States or Taiwan.

**U.S. Representation**

The designated representatives for AIT are the National Marine Fisheries Service (U.S. Department of Commerce), the U.S. Coast Guard (Department of Homeland Security), and the Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs (U.S. Department of State).

**Description**

The United States began negotiating the MOU between AIT and TECRO in July 2000 to address problems associated with (1) Taiwan's inability, due to its political status as a non-state, to become party to a number of international fisheries treaties and regional organizations, and (2) Taiwan fishermen's involvement in large-scale high seas driftnet fishing activities in the North Pacific Ocean.

Pursuant to the MOU, Taiwan committed to abide by the rules for sustainable fisheries set forth by the 1995 Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 Relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks and the 1993 FAO Agreement on Promoting Compliance with International Conservation and Management Measures by Fishing Vessels on the High Seas. Taiwan also agreed to cooperate with the United States in the implementation of the 1995 FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries; and the International Plans of Action for the Management of Fishing Capacity, for the Conservation and Management of Sharks, for Reducing Incidental Catch of Seabirds in Longline Fisheries, and for Preventing, Deterring and Eliminating Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated fishing as adopted by the FAO. Finally, Taiwan committed to continue to cooperate with the United States in the implementation of United Nations General Assembly Resolution 46/215, which calls for a global ban on the use of large-scale high seas driftnets. Taiwan will take action against individuals, corporations and vessels subject to those laws and regulations that may engage in large-scale high seas driftnet fishing operations in the North

Pacific Ocean. In exchange for the above commitments from Taiwan, the United States agreed to assist Taiwan authorities to participate equitably in global, regional, and subregional fisheries organizations.

The two Parties, through their designated representatives, also agreed to (1) exchange information on fisheries and aquaculture research and relevant scientific reports and publications; (2) conduct joint studies and training programs on fisheries and aquaculture; (3) promote exchange visits of fisheries and aquaculture personnel; and (4) strengthen existing cooperation between fisheries enforcement representatives.

### **Recent Activities**

February 2006: Representatives of the U.S. Department of State, NOAA Fisheries Service, and the American Institute in Taiwan (AIT)-Washington Office met with Taiwan fisheries authorities on February 21-22, 2006, in Washington, D.C., and Silver Spring, Maryland. Dr. William Hogarth, Assistant Administrator for NOAA Fisheries, led the U.S. delegation and Mr. James Sha, Deputy Director-General of the Taiwan Fisheries Agency, led the Taiwan delegation. The main purpose of the meeting was to discuss the status of fisheries cooperation between the United States and Taiwan (pursuant to the MOU) in several regional fisheries management organizations.

International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT): Taiwan summarized efforts to date to meet its ICCAT obligations resulting from decisions made by the Parties at the 2005 ICCAT Annual Meeting. Such efforts include plans for scrapping vessels and adopting new rules limiting vessel construction (i.e., no new vessels can be built for domestic registration; if the vessels are to be foreign flagged, Taiwan needs proof that a vessel of equal tonnage would be scrapped). To improve monitoring and control, Taiwan has adopted new rules that require commercial entities to check with the Taiwan fisheries officials before taking on additional vessels. Furthermore, vessels not on Taiwan's authorized list are not allowed to enter ports in Taiwan.

To date, Taiwan has: (1) submitted its list of bigeye (15) and albacore vessels (30) to ICCAT and recalled all other vessels to home ports in Taiwan; (2) ensured all vessels are subject to daily monitoring by VMS, including vessels returning to home ports; (3) placed compliance observers on 15 bigeye tuna vessels; (4) gained approval from Taiwan's Cabinet for a vessel reduction plan (10 vessels will be given to Taiwan's Coast Guard and 15 will be used for artificial reefs); (5) completed a list of vessels between 10 and 24 m LOA; and (6) prepared for the March 31, 2006, deadline for port inspection procedures in Las Palmas and South Africa.

The U.S. side asked Taiwan to summarize the above efforts in a letter to ICCAT for the Commission's information and Taiwan agreed. The United States also suggested that Taiwan report often throughout the year, to keep ICCAT informed of its progress. Taiwan requested assistance in training its observers, and the United States offered to help in any way they could.

Other fishery issues of mutual concern were also discussed, including cooperation in the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC) and the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Convention, and planning for an upcoming Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) Fisheries Working Group capacity workshop hosted by Taiwan in May 2006.

August 2006: The two sides met again on August 9, 2006, in Taiwan. William Gibbons-Fly, Director of the Office of Marine Conservation, U.S. Department of State, led the U.S. delegation and Mr. Da-wen Hsieh, Chief, Taiwan Fisheries Agency, led the Taiwan delegation. The main purpose of the meeting was to discuss the status of efforts to control fishing capacity in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean tuna purse seine fishery in accordance with resolutions of the Multilateral High-Level Conference on the Conservation and Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific (Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Convention); the status of U.S. efforts to maintain the U.S. tuna purse seine fleet operating in the western and central Pacific Ocean under the Multilateral Treaty on Fisheries between the United States and the Pacific Island States, and cooperation between the United States and Taiwan under the MOU.

**Future Meetings:** AIT and TECRO will meet on March 27-28, 2007, in Washington, D.C., to discuss extending the MOU.

**Staff Contacts**

*NOAA Fisheries:*

Paul E. Niemeier  
International Fisheries Affairs Division (F/IA1)  
Office of International Affairs  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
1315 East-West Highway, Room 12752  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-2276  
Fax: (301) 713-2313  
E-mail: paul.niemeier@noaa.gov

*Department of State:*

Amanda Johnson-Miller  
Office of Marine Conservation (OES/OMC)  
Department of State  
2201 C Street, NW, Room 2758  
Washington, D.C. 20520-7818  
Telephone: (202) 647-2335  
Fax: (202) 736-7350  
E-mail: JohnsonMillerAX@state.gov

## EUROPE

### **Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Union Of Soviet Socialist Republics on Mutual Fisheries Relations (Basic Instrument For The U.S.-Russia Intergovernmental Consultative Committee -- ICC)**

#### **Basic Instrument**

Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on Mutual Fisheries Relations of May 31, 1988, as amended (TIAS 11442, the U.S.-Soviet Comprehensive Fisheries Agreement). Note: The obligations of the former Soviet Union under this agreement have devolved on the Russian Federation.

#### **Implementing Legislation**

Public Law 100-629 (An untitled Act that implemented the Comprehensive Fisheries Agreement. Enacted November 7, 1988).

#### **Member Nations**

The United States and the Russian Federation.

#### **Meetings**

The ICC meets alternately in the United States and Russia, on an annual basis, at the discretion of the heads of delegation.

#### **U.S. Representation**

Under the Rules of Procedure established for the ICC, the United States and Russia are to designate a Representative and an Alternate Representative. The current U.S. Representative is Ambassador David Balton, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and Fisheries Affairs. To date, the United States has not identified an Alternate Representative.

Pursuant to Section 5 of Public Law 100-629, a 12-member "North Pacific and Bering Sea Fisheries Advisory Body" was established to advise the U.S. Representative to the ICC. This body consists of the following individuals:

- (A) The Director of the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife of the State of Washington;
- (B) The Commissioner of the Department of Fish and Game of the State of Alaska;
- (C) Five members appointed by the Secretary of State from a list of ten nominees provided by the Governor of Alaska; and,
- (D) Five members appointed by the Secretary of State from a list of ten nominees provided by the Governor of Washington.

The current North Pacific and Bering Sea Advisory Body Representatives are:

Washington Department of Fisheries and Wildlife Representative

William Tweit, Distant Waters and Columbia River Policy Lead  
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, Washington  
*tweitwmt@dfw.wa.gov*

Alaska Department of Fish and Game Representative

Earl E. Krygier, Extended Jurisdiction Program Manager  
Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Anchorage, Alaska  
*earl\_krygier@fishgame.state.ak.us*

Alaska

Alvin Burch, Executive Director, Alaska Draggers Association, Kodiak, Alaska  
*alaska@ptialaska.net*

Richard Lauber, Fishing Industry Consultant  
Juneau, Alaska, *RickLauber@aol.com*

Henry Mitchell, Fishing Industry Consultant, Anchorage, Alaska  
*mitchellak@aol.com*

Hazel Nelson, President, Becharof Corporation  
Anchorage, Alaska, *becharof@gci.net*

Washington State

David Benson, Trident Seafoods Corporation, Seattle, Washington  
*daveb@TridentSeafoods.com*

Terry Leitzell, General Counsel  
Icicle Seafoods, Seattle, Washington  
*terryl@icicleseafoods.com*

Paul MacGregor  
Partner, Law Firm of Mundt, MacGregor, Happel, Falconer, Zulauf, and Hall  
Seattle, Washington, *pmacgregor@mundtmac.com*

Brent Paine, Executive Director, United Catcher Boats, Seattle Washington  
*BPaine@ucba.org*

Thorn Smith, Executive Director, North Pacific Longline Association, Seattle, Washington  
*thorndog@worldnet.att.net*

Description

The United States and the Russian Federation maintain the bilateral ICC fisheries forum pursuant to the U.S.-Soviet Comprehensive Fisheries Agreement, signed on May 31, 1988. The ICC is responsible for furthering the objectives of the Comprehensive Fisheries Agreement. These objectives include maintaining a mutually beneficial and

equitable fisheries relationship through (1) cooperative scientific research and exchanges; (2) reciprocal allocation of surplus fish resources in the respective national 200-mile zones, consistent with each nation's laws and regulations; (3) cooperation in the establishment of fishery joint ventures; (4) general consultations on fisheries matters of mutual concern; and, (5) cooperation to address illegal or unregulated fishing activities on the high seas of the North Pacific Ocean and Bering Sea. The agreement expires on December 31, 2009.

### **Current Status**

Pursuant to Article XIV of the 1988 Agreement on Mutual Fisheries Relations, representatives of Russia and the United States conducted the 17<sup>th</sup> Session of the ICC on Fisheries in Kaliningrad, Russia, on September 13-15, 2006. The Russian delegation was led by Mr. Sergey Podolyan, Deputy Director, Federal Fisheries Agency, and the U.S. delegation was led by Ambassador David Balton, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and Fisheries. A.V. Romanov, Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries of the Government of the Kaliningrad region, welcomed the ICC delegations to Kaliningrad and expressed the importance of the work of the ICC to Kaliningrad. The following fisheries issues were discussed at the meeting:

#### **Russia-U.S. Scientific Cooperation in the Study of Living Marine Resources**

**Pollock and Chum Salmon Bycatch:** The Russian side reported that the biomass of the Navarin Basin pollock is at a high level. An additional Russian survey was scheduled for November 2006 and a Russian research vessel was at sea conducting research at the time of the ICC meeting. Russia promised to report on the results of these surveys when they become available.

The United States reported that 2005 surveys and models predicted a decline in pollock stocks in the U.S. zone in the eastern Bering Sea for the immediate future. Additional U.S. research in 2006 confirmed this and found colder waters in the eastern Bering Sea shelf, more scattered fish schools, and catch rates much lower than in 2005. U.S. fishing vessels also encountered high chum salmon bycatch in 2006. This phenomenon was first noticed in 2003 and has continued in 2006. As a result, fishery managers adopted a real-time management system to move fishing vessels away from areas of high chum salmon concentrations. Russian researchers reported that chum salmon bycatch in Russian waters has been about 60 t per year since 2000. They predict that this bycatch will decline in future years. The Russians will consider increasing the number of scientific observers on their fishing vessels to better document salmon bycatch rates.

The U.S. delegation expressed disappointment that the U.S. R/V *MILLER FREEMAN* and the Russian R/V *MAGADAN* were not allowed to conduct surveys in the Russian zone in 2006. The U.S. side said it hoped that the Russian Government will be able to approve these surveys in the future, as they are important to the work of the ICC.

**Marine Mammals:** The U.S. side reported that Stellar sea lions are listed under the U.S. Endangered Species Act due to significant declines in their populations. U.S. research efforts have focused on their population status and determining how to rebuild populations. The United States is studying environmental changes, indirect fishery affects, direct human related impacts, predation, diseases, and contaminants to assess their impacts on the sea lions. The U.S. delegation requested information on sea lion populations in the Russian zone to help U.S. managers develop a more comprehensive recovery plan.

Russia reported that no significant decline in sea lion populations has been observed in Russian waters. Whereas U.S. scientists are researching the impacts of fishing activities on the food supply of marine mammals, Russia is researching the potential impact marine mammals are having on the fishery resources for the fishing industry. The Russian side gave a presentation on Russia's stock assessment of Pacific walrus, conducted jointly by the U.S. and Russia, using thermal scanning technology. Concentrations of walrus in the Anadyr herd has shifted to the south and the Chirikov herd occupied a larger territory from 2000 to 2005.

The U.S. side also raised the issue of Northern right whales and Northern fur seals. The U.S. delegation emphasized the importance of the right whale issue to the United States and welcomed the sharing of information on right whales

with Russia. With respect to fur seals, the U.S. has been studying populations in the areas around Bogoslof Island and the Pribilof Islands. These populations began declining between the years 1998 and 2004 and current populations are around 140,000 animals in the Pribilof islands. Around the Bogoslof Islands, populations were counted to be fewer than 100 pups prior to 1990, but pup production has increased to over 12,000 in 2005. The U.S. side expressed concern about the decline around the Pribilof Islands and welcomed information from Russia on fur seal research. The Russians reported that the Northern fur seal population around the Kuril Islands has actually increased. The largest population of fur seals is around the Commander Islands.

Seabirds: The United States described a U.S. satellite short tail albatross tagging program on the breeding grounds on Torishima Island off Japan. Preliminary data indicates the short tail albatross spends approximately 60% of its time off Alaska and 26% off Russia. The U.S. side also reported that sea bird bycatch rates are considerably reduced in longline fisheries by using integrated weighted long-lines to sink the line faster and thus prevent sea-birds from diving after the hooks. For trawl fisheries, paired streamer lines and other streamer lines are used to scare the birds away from the fishing gear. The U.S. delegation thanked Russia for the willingness of its fishing industry to test sea bird avoidance technologies.

Exchange of Information on Fisheries Under the Agreement on Preservation of Transboundary Fish Stocks in the Central Sea of Okhotsk (June 13, 1996): The Russian delegation emphasized the importance of the U.S. supporting Russia's position in the Sea of Okhotsk, which prevents the resumption of pollock fishing in the enclave and allows the stocks to rebuild. The United States will continue to support Russia on this matter.

#### Exchange of Information on Fisheries Enforcement Cooperation

The U.S. Coast Guard reported on U.S.-Russia mutual fisheries enforcement efforts since the 16<sup>th</sup> ICC. This included a summary of meetings between the U.S. Coast Guard's 17<sup>th</sup> District and the Russian Northeast Directorate of the Coast Guard Federal Security Service, joint U.S.-Russia enforcement exercises and activities, and exchange of statistical information on fisheries and law enforcement over the last eight years, as well as the results of high seas driftnet enforcement operations. Fishing activity along the U.S.-Russia maritime boundary line was reported to be lower than previous years, with only two suspected illegal incursions into the U.S. zone since the last ICC meeting.

The Russian Border Service representative reported that the Northeast Directorate of the Russian Border Service is monitoring the fisheries in the Northern part of the Bering Sea along with the regional offices of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, Customs, the Ministry of Environment, and the Ministry of Agriculture, as well as the Kamchatka Center of Monitoring and neighboring Coast Guard Directorates. In addition, the Northeast Directorate works closely with the U.S. Coast Guard's 17th District. In 2006, 25 Russian vessels and 5 Korean vessels are involved in the fishery which is monitored by Border Service patrol vessels and aircraft. Russian observers are also deployed on foreign fishing vessels. No violations have been detected in the last two years.

Review of the Results of the Eleventh Annual Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Conservation and Management of Pollock Stocks in the Central Bering Sea: The two sides briefly reviewed the results of the 11<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference held in Warsaw, Poland, on September 5-8, 2007.

Consideration of a Proposed Agreement Between the Government of the Russian Federation and the Government of the United States of America on the Conservation and Management of Living Resources in the Northern Bering Sea: The two sides continued to make progress on the texts of a comprehensive fisheries management agreement and an agreement on fisheries enforcement cooperation. Although the United States had hoped that the final text of these agreements could be finalized during the meeting, Russia believed that further work still needed to be done on the comprehensive agreement. The draft enforcement agreement will be prepared for signing concurrent with the signing of the comprehensive agreement.

Time and Place of the 18<sup>th</sup> Session of the ICC: The United States proposed that the 18<sup>th</sup> Annual ICC Meeting be held in the United States, sometime after the 12<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the

Conservation and Management of Pollock Resources in the Central Bering Sea.

**Staff Contacts**

*NOAA Fisheries:*

Paul Niemeier  
International Fisheries Affairs Division (F/IA1)  
Office of International Fisheries  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
1315 East-West Highway, Room 12752  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-2276 x 189  
Fax: (301) 713-2313  
E-mail: paul.niemeier@noaa.gov

*Department of State:*

Amanda Johnson-Miller  
Office of Marine Conservation (OES/OMC)  
U.S. Department of State  
2201 C Street, NW, Room 2758  
Washington, D.C. 20520-7818  
Telephone: (202) 647-2335  
Fax: (202) 736-7350  
E-mail: JohnsonMillerAX@state.gov

## United States-European Union High Level Fisheries Consultation

### **Basic Instrument**

There is no formal instrument.

### **Implementing Legislation**

None.

### **Members**

The United States and the European Union (EU).

### **Meetings**

The United States and the EU meet on an annual basis, alternating between the United States and the EU.

### **U.S. Representation**

The Consultation consists of one representative from each Government, as well as support staff and advisors. The current U.S. Representative is Ambassador David Balton, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and Fisheries, Department of State.

### **Description**

The United States and the EU first met in 1997 to promote cooperation in the field of fisheries and fisheries research. Since then, they have held annual consultations to review fishery issues of mutual concern.

### **Recent Activities**

National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and U.S. Department of State (DOS) representatives met with representatives of the European Commission's Directorate-General (D-G) for Fisheries and Marine Affairs on July 6-7, 2006, in Washington, D.C., for the 9<sup>th</sup> U.S.-EU High Level Fisheries Consultations. The meeting was split into two sessions--a general fisheries discussion at the Department of State on July 6 and a discussion on issues pertaining to the International Commission for the Conservation Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT) at National Marine Fisheries Service Headquarters in Silver Spring, Maryland, on July 7. Jörgen Holmquist, Director General, EU Directorate-General for Fisheries and Maritime Affairs, led the EU side and Ambassador David Balton, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Oceans and Fisheries, U.S. Department of State, and Dr. William Hogarth, NOAA Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, co-led the U.S. delegation.

The agenda for the general fisheries discussion included issues of concern in the context of the United Nations Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks Review Conference; the Tuna Regional Fisheries Management Organizations Summit in Kobe, Japan, in 2007; fishing capacity; high seas bottom trawling; EU participation in the Central Bering Sea Pollock Convention; the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO); and large-scale high seas driftnet fishing by Italy in the Mediterranean Sea. ICCAT topics discussed on July 7 included the 2006 ICCAT Annual Meeting schedule and agenda; shark finning; billfish stock assessment; bluefin tuna catches and stock assessment; and member compliance and illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing.

**Next Meeting**

The EU will host the 10<sup>th</sup> session of the U.S.-EU High Level Fisheries Consultations in summer 2007.

**Staff Contacts***NOAA Fisheries:*

Dr. Dean Swanson, Chief  
International Fisheries Affairs Division (F/IA1)  
Office of International Affairs  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
1315 East-West Highway  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-2276  
Fax: (301) 713-2313

*Department of State:*

Deirdre Warner-Kramer  
Office of Marine Conservation (OES/OMC)  
U.S. Department of State  
2201 C Street, NW, Room 2758  
Washington, D.C. 20520-7818  
Telephone: (202) 647-2335  
Fax: (202) 736-7350  
E-mail: warner-kramerm@state.gov

## **PART III. SCIENTIFIC ORGANIZATIONS AND COUNCILS**

## PACIFIC OCEAN

### North Pacific Marine Science Organization (PICES)

#### **Basic Instrument**

Convention for a North Pacific Marine Science Organization (PICES)

#### **Implementing Legislation**

No implementing legislation. Self-executing treaty; under the general authority of the Secretary of State.

#### **Member Nations**

Canada, Japan, People's Republic of China, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, and the United States of America

#### **Organization Headquarters**

Dr. Alexander S. Bychkov  
Executive Secretary  
PICES Secretariat c/o Institute of Ocean Sciences  
P.O. Box 6000  
Sidney, B.C., Canada V8L 4B2  
Telephone: (250) 363-6364  
Fax: (250) 363-6827  
E-mail: bychkov@pices.int  
E-mail: pices@ios.bc.ca  
Web address: <http://pices.ios.bc.ca/>

Chair of Governing Council  
Dr. Tokio Wada  
Department of Resources Enhancement Promotion  
Fisheries Agency of Japan:

Vice Chair: Lev Bocharov (Russia)

#### **U.S. Representation**

##### A. Appointment Process

The United States is represented on the PICES Governing Council by two delegates appointed by the Secretary of State in consultation with interested agencies and institutions: one from a major Federal Government research agency and one from a research university or other academic institution. The United States is represented on the Scientific Committees and Working Groups created by the Governing Council by individuals appointed by the U.S. delegates with the authorization of the Secretary of State and in consultation with interested agencies and institutions.

B. U.S. Delegates:

Federal Government Representative:

Dr Samuel Pooley  
Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
2570 Dole St  
Honolulu, HI 96822  
PH: (808)983-5301  
FAX: (808)983-2901  
Internet: Samuel.Pooley@noaa.gov

Academic Representative:

Dr. George W. Boehlert (GC, FIS)  
Hatfield Marine Science Center  
Oregon State University  
2030 SE Marine Science Dr.  
Newport , OR  
U.S.A. 97365-5296  
Phone: (1-541) 867-0211  
Fax: (1-541) 867-0444  
E-mail: george.boehlert@oregonstate.edu

**Description**

A. Mission/Purpose:

The area which the activities of PICES concern is defined by the Convention as the temperate and sub-Arctic region of the North Pacific Ocean and its adjacent seas, especially northward from 30° North Latitude. Activities of the organization may, for scientific reasons, extend farther southward in the North Pacific Ocean.

The primary role of PICES is to promote and coordinate marine research undertaken by the Parties in the Convention Area; advance scientific knowledge about the ocean environment, global weather and climate change, living resources and their ecosystems, and the impacts of human activities; and promote the collection and rapid exchange of scientific information on these issues. PICES provides an international forum to promote greater understanding of the biological and oceanographic processes of the North Pacific Ocean and its role in global environment.

B. Organizational Structure:

PICES is comprised of (1) a Governing Council, (2) a Science Board, (3) such permanent or ad hoc scientific groups and committees as the Governing Council may from time to time establish, and (4) a Secretariat. The Governing Council has both scientific and administrative functions.

Governing Council: The scientific functions of the Governing Council are to identify research priorities and problems pertaining to the Convention Area and appropriate methods for their solution; to recommend coordinated research programs and related activities pertaining to the Convention Area which shall be undertaken through the national efforts of the participating Contracting Parties; to promote and facilitate the exchange of scientific data, information and personnel; to consider requests to develop scientific advice pertaining to the Convention Area; to organize scientific symposia and other scientific events; and to foster the discussion of problems of mutual scientific interest. The administrative functions of the Governing Council are to adopt and amend the Rules of Procedure and Financial Regulations; to consider and recommend amendments to the Convention; to adopt the annual report of the organization; to examine and adopt the annual budget and financial accounts of the organization; to determine the location of the Secretariat; to appoint the Executive Secretary; to maintain contact with other international organizations; and to manage the activities of the organization.

Science Board: The Science Board oversees the activities of the four scientific committees, the technical committee, and the scientific program. Its membership includes an overall chairman, as well as the chairmen from each of the four scientific committees:

- 1) MEQ - Marine Environmental Quality
- 2) BIO - Biological Oceanography
- 3) FIS - Fisheries Science
- 4) POC - Physical Oceanography and Climate

Additionally, there are two technical committees on Data Exchange:

I.TCODE – Technical Committee on Data Exchange

II.MONITOR – Technical Committee on Monitoring

Working Groups: Currently active PICES Working Groups are:

- \* WG-19 Ecosystem-based management science and its application to the North Pacific
- \* WG-20: Evaluations of Climate Change Projections
- \* WG-21: Non-indigenous Aquatic Species

### Science Program

Currently PICES has one Scientific Program:

- \* CCCC: Climate Change and Carrying Capacity Program

### Sections

A “Section” represents a sub-committee under a Scientific Committee that has a longer lifespan than a Working Group. Its purpose is to provide input to the parent Scientific Committee on specific issues for which expertise may be lacking on the parent committee. Sections should be reviewed periodically to ensure they continue to meet their objectives. Currently PICES has one Section:

- \* HAB: Harmful Algal Blooms Section

### Study Group

The purpose of a Study Group is to analyze the scientific, policy, and/or financial implications of a proposal made by Science Board or Governing Council, and provide recommendations for Science Board or Council on the proposal. This type of group would typically be formed for a period of one-year and would provide a report of their findings and recommendations to Science Board or Council prior to the Annual Meeting after it was formed.

Active Study Groups:

- \* SG-ESR: Study Group on "Ecosystem Status Reporting"
- \* SGFISP: Study Group on "Future Integrative Scientific Program(s)"
- \* SG-GOOS: Study Group to develop a strategy for GOOS
- \* SG-MAR: Study Group on "Marine Aquaculture and Ranching in the PICES region"
- \* SG-SC: Study Group on "Scientific Cooperation between PICES and non-member countries"

C. Recent Activities:

The North Pacific Marine Science Organization (PICES) held its 15<sup>th</sup> annual meeting in Yokohama, Japan from October 13-22, 2006. Approximately 400 participants from 17 countries attended the Science Conference. All six contracting parties were present at the Statutory Meetings. The U.S. delegation to PICES was led by Dr. Samuel Pooley (government representative, NOAA/NMFS) and Dr. George Boehlert (academic representative, Oregon State University). Dr. Vera Alexander, former U.S. academic representative to PICES, served as Chair of the Governing Council before stepping down at the conclusion to the Governing Council meeting at which point Dr. Tokio Wada of Japan assumed the chair. The U.S. also participated as a permanent member to the Finance & Administration Committee and as member of various scientific committees and working groups. Key issues of concern to the United States at PICES XIII included the continued scientific effectiveness of the organization and budgetary matters.

The overall theme of the Annual Meeting was "Boundary current ecosystems". The Keynote Lecture at the Science Board Symposium was given by Dr. Akihiko Yatsu (Hokkaido National Fisheries Research Institute), titled "Biological production, animal migration and ecosystem regime shifts in the Kuroshio and Oyashio Currents: Perspectives for sustainable use."

The Governing Council and the Science Board also held its 2007 inter-sessional in conjunction with the Future Integrative Science Plan meeting in April 2007 in Yokohama, Japan

#### BUDGETARY MATTERS

The contracting parties are assessed \$ \$108,500 for the year 2007.

#### APPOINTMENTS and ELECTIONS

Dr. Tokio Wada (Japan) was elected chair for 2007 at the annual meeting in October 2006 in Yokohama, Japan. Dr. Lev Bocharov of Russia was elected vice-chair. Dr. Laura Richards of Canada serves as chair of the Finance and Administration Committee and Pat Livingston (NOAA Fisheries/AFSC) serves as the U.S. member.

#### FUTURE PICES SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCES

The 16th Annual Meeting of PICES will be held October 26 - November 5, 2007, Victoria, BC, Canada on the theme of "The changing North Pacific: Previous patterns, future projections, and ecosystem impacts" The keynote lecture will be given by Dr. Kenneth L. Denman (Canadian Centre for Climate Modelling and Analysis, University of Victoria) titled "The North Pacific, human activity, and climate change".

#### **Staff Contacts**

##### *NOAA Fisheries (Headquarters):*

Office of Science and Technology (F/ST)  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
1315 East-West Hwy  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-2367  
Fax: (301) 713-1875

##### *NOAA Fisheries (Field):*

Dr Samuel Pooley  
Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
2570 Dole St  
Honolulu, HI 96822  
PH: (808)983-5301  
FAX: (808)983-2901  
Internet: Samuel.Pooley@noaa.gov

*Department of State:*

K. Alexandra Curtis, Ph.D.  
Office of Marine Conservation / Office of Oceans Affairs  
U.S. Department of State  
2201 C St NW, Room 2758  
Washington DC 20520  
Phone: 202-647-5808  
Fax: 202-736-7350  
Email: CurtisKA@state.gov

Elizabeth Tirpak  
Office of Ocean Affairs (OES/OA)  
U.S. Department of State  
2201 C Street, NW, Room 5801  
Washington, D.C. 20520-7818  
Telephone: (202) 647-0238  
Fax: (202) 647-1106  
E-mail: tirpakej@state.gov

*PICES may be contacted at the following points:*

North Pacific Marine Science Organization (PICES) Secretariat Address  
c/o Institute of Ocean Sciences  
P.O. Box 6000 (mailing address)  
9860 West Saanich Road (courier/institute address)  
Sidney, British Columbia  
Canada V8L 4B2  
Phone: +1-250-363-6366  
Fax: +1-250-363-6827  
Email: secretariat@PICES.int

## ARCTIC OCEAN

### Program for the Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF)

#### **Basic Instrument**

The Program for the Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna was established to address the special needs of Arctic species and their habitats in the rapidly developing Arctic region. It forms one of four programs the Arctic Council created by the Declaration on the Establishment of the Arctic Council, signed September 19, 1996 in Ottawa, Canada. The Arctic Council succeeded the Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy (AEPS), adopted through a Ministerial Declaration at Rovianemi, Finland in 1991.

#### **Implementing Legislation**

None

#### **Member Nations**

Canada, Denmark/Greenland, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Russia, Sweden, and the United States.

#### **Organization Headquarters**

The CAFF International Secretariat is located at Rannsoknarhusinu Nordslod, 603 Akureyri, Iceland.

Executive Secretary: Mária Victoriá Gunnarsdóttir

Telephone: 354 462 3350

Fax: 354 462 3390

E-mail: maria@caff.is

#### **Budget**

The cost of the Secretariat is borne largely by Iceland, the host country, supported by voluntary contributions from Member countries. The U.S. contribution is provided by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), Alaska Region.

#### **Website**

The CAFF website is [www.caff.is](http://www.caff.is).

#### **U.S. Representation**

##### A. Appointment Process

The U.S. Department of State has designated the FWS as the lead Federal agency for CAFF. The FWS Alaska Region provides the U.S. National Representative to CAFF and leads the U.S. delegation to the biannual meetings of CAFF. Kenton Wohl is the present U.S. National Representative.

## B. U.S. Delegates and Scientific Advisers

U.S. delegates and scientific advisors are provided to CAFF by the Department of State, FWS, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration/National Marine Fisheries Service, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, and non-governmental organizations.

## C. Interagency Arctic Policy Group (APG)

U.S. participation in CAFF is also informed and advised by the Interagency Arctic Policy Group convened on a monthly basis by the Department of State.

### **Description**

#### A. Mission/Purpose:

CAFF's main goals are to:

(1) conserve Arctic flora and fauna, their diversity and their habitats; (2) protect the Arctic ecosystem from threats; (3) improve conservation and management, laws, regulations and practices for the Arctic; and (4) integrate Arctic interests into global conservation.

Its guiding principles are:

(1) the involvement of indigenous and local people and the use of traditional ecological knowledge; (2) the use of a broad, ecosystem-based approach to conservation and management; (3) cooperation with other conservation initiatives and the other Arctic Council programs, particularly the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Program (AMAP) and the Program for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment (PAME); and (4) effective communication with respect to CAFF programs.

#### B. Organizational Structure:

CAFF operates through a system of Designated Agencies and National Representatives responsible to CAFF and their respective countries. The National Representatives and Permanent Participants meet several times a year to guide the administration of CAFF work and to prepare CAFF reports to meeting of Senior Arctic Affairs Officials (SAOs) and Arctic Ministers under the Arctic Council. CAFF meets biannually to assess programs and to develop CAFF Work Plans. It is directed by a chair and vice-chair, which rotate among the Arctic countries, and is supported by an International Secretariat.

Most of CAFF's work is carried out through a system of lead countries as a means of sharing the workload. Whenever possible, CAFF works in cooperation with other international organizations and associations to achieve common conservation goals in the Arctic.

As needed, CAFF also establishes Specialist and Expert Groups to address program areas.

#### C. Expert groups:

CAFF has established four expert groups/programs to carry out its Strategic Plan. The four expert groups/programs are the: Circumpolar Seabird Expert Group (CBIRD); CAFF Flora Expert Group (CFG); Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Program (CBMP); and Circumpolar Protected Areas Network Expert Group (CPAN).

**Circumpolar Seabird Expert Group (CBird)**

CBird facilitates seabird conservation, management and research activities between circumpolar countries, and works to improve communication between seabird scientists and managers. Conservation issues include exotic predators, habitat alteration, oil and contaminants pollution, seabird bycatch, subsistence harvesting, unregulated harvesting, and climate change. Further, CBird promotes conservation of seabirds outside the Arctic, coordinates research efforts with other seabird groups, and coordinates the circumpolar seabird monitoring network, in addition to developing seabird initiatives for CAFF.

Major accomplishments in the 2004-2006 period include:

Continued implementation of the “Circumpolar Eider Conservation Strategy and Action Plan”.

Completion of a “Common Eider Colony Poster” of the circumpolar region for all four eider species.

Continued implementation of the “International Murre Conservation Strategy” and related national implementation plans.

Completion and publication of the Ivory Gull Conservation Strategy.

Completion and submission to the journal *Global Change Biology* of a paper on Murres and climate change.

Soon, with the upgraded CAFF website, the datasets on circum-Arctic bird distributions will be accessible in integrated mapping format on the website.

Completion of an inventory of all data on Black-legged kittiwakes in the Arctic was completed

**CAFF Flora Expert Group (CFG)**

With botanical expertise drawn from CAFF member countries, the CAFF Flora Expert Group promotes, encourages, and coordinates internationally the conservation of biodiversity of arctic flora and vegetation, habitats, and research activities in these fields; and works to enhance the exchange of information relating to arctic flora and vegetation and factors affecting them. CFG is designated as the Arctic Plant Specialist Group of the IUCN Species Survival Commission.

Major accomplishments in the 2004-2006 period include:

Placement of draft checklist of Panarctic Lichens on the CAFF website. Bryophytes are soon to follow; mosses will be completed by March 2007.

Publication of the Aleut International Association’s project on “Traditional Use and Conservation of Plants from the Aleutian, Pribilof and Commander Islands”.

Publication of the proceedings of the Second International Workshop on Circumpolar Vegetation Classification and Mapping.

Development, publication and posting on the CAFF website of a list of 15 species identified at a vulnerable or higher threat level

Publication of CAFF Map No. 1 – Circumpolar Arctic Vegetation Map, and CAFF Map No. 2 - Vegetation of Arctic Alaska.

**Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Program (CBMP)**

The Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Program (CBMP) has evolved in response to the mandate CAFF, and numerous international conventions and agreements, which have stressed the link between conservation of biological diversity and sustainable development. The CBMP serves as a coordinating body for currently existing biodiversity monitoring efforts in the Arctic, for data gathering and data analyses, and for coordinating the communication of results.

Major accomplishments in the 2004 – 2006 period:

Held three workshops to identify the priority biodiversity indices and indicators for the CBMP.

Drafted Indicator Strategy for review.

Drafted Data Management document for review.

Drafted Remote Sensing Strategy for review.

Endorsement of a proposal for a 2010 Arctic Biodiversity Assessment by the Arctic Council Ministers.

Endorsement of the CBMP as an International Polar Year project.

Held implementation and community-based monitoring workshops.

**Circumpolar Protected Areas Network Expert Group (CPAN)**

The CPAN process is a cooperative effort to protect important areas of the unique Arctic environment, including all levels of biodiversity through a system of protected areas.

CPAN, though currently dormant due to a lack of country leads, needs to assess the effectiveness of the areas currently under protection in the Arctic. The questions it needs to address are: (1) what percentage of each biome is represented in the currently established network of protected areas; and (2) which areas are successfully protecting species and habitats that are most under threat. This work would tie directly into the 2010 Arctic Biodiversity Assessment. CPAN will resume its work when a country lead is in place.

D. CAFF's Work Plan for 2006-2008:

The CAFF program of work is guided by its "Strategic Plan for the Conservation of Arctic Biological Diversity" and undertakes priority tasks identified by the Arctic Council.

CAFF's Work Plan for the period 2006-2008 emphasizes cooperation and collaboration with other Arctic Council Working Groups, and organizations outside of the Arctic Council, and makes efforts to actively contribute to the global conservation agenda. This Work Plan responds to the findings and recommendations of the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA) report, the PAME Oil and Gas Assessment, the Arctic Council's Arctic Marine Strategic Plan and ECORA

It is presented in sections on: (1) Conserving Arctic Species; (2) Conserving Arctic Ecosystems and Habitats; (3) Assessing and Monitoring Arctic Biodiversity; (4) Global Issues; and (5) Engaging Society.

**E. Meetings:**

CAFF meets in plenary every two years. CAFF held its eleventh Plenary meeting in Yllas, Finland, June 5-9, 2006. Greenland is presently serving as the CAFF Chair and will host the Twelfth Plenary meeting in Greenland in early summer 2008.

The National Representatives to CAFF meet on an approximately every 6-month basis to address administrative and organizational matters. The meeting is referred to as a CAFF Management Board Meeting.

The Senior Arctic Officials meet approximately every six months.

The Fifth Arctic Council Ministerial Meeting was held October 2006 in Salekhard, Russia. The Sixth Ministerial Meeting will be held in Norway in 2009.

**Staff Contacts***NOAA Fisheries:*

Robin Tuttle  
Office of Science and Technology (F/ST3)  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
1315 East-West Highway, Room 12643  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-2282, ext. 199  
Fax: (301) 713-4057

*Department of State:*

Julie Gourley  
Office of Ocean Affairs (OES/OA)  
U.S. Department of State  
2201 C Street, NW, Room 5801  
Washington, D.C. 20520  
Telephone: (202) 647-3262  
Fax: (202) 647-9099

*Fish and Wildlife Service*

Janet Hohn  
Fish And Wildlife Service  
1011 East Tudor Road  
Anchorage, AK 99503  
Telephone: (907) 786-3544  
Fax: (907) 786-3640

## ATLANTIC OCEAN

### International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES)

#### **Basic Instrument**

The Council was established by an exchange of letters on July 22, 1902, in Copenhagen, Denmark, with eight country representatives in attendance (Denmark, Germany, Norway, Russia, Finland, the Netherlands, Sweden, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain & Ireland). The United States has been associated since 1912, and joined formally as a contracting party in 1972. From 1902 until 1964, the Council operated in a "gentlemen's agreement" fashion. On September 12, 1964, the Council membership concluded the Convention for the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea, 1964 (TIAS 7628), giving it true and full international status. The Convention fixed the seat of the Council at Copenhagen and, by the end of 1967, all Contracting Parties had ratified the Convention, which came into force on July 22, 1968.

#### **Member Nations**

Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Russia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom, and the United States of America.

#### **Council Headquarters**

International Council for the Exploration of the Sea  
H. C. Andersens - Boulevard 44-46 DK-1553 Copenhagen V Denmark Tel: +45 3338 6700 Fax: +45 3393 4215  
info@ices.dk

General Secretary: Mr. Gerd Hubold  
E-mail: gerd@ices.dk  
Web address: <http://www.ices.dk/>

#### **Budget**

The ICES annual budget is approximately \$5.9 million USD. The U.S. contribution to be paid by the Department of State for 2007 is 1,182,000 DKK which is approximately USD \$213,000.

#### **U.S. Representation**

##### **A. Process:**

NMFS, through NOAA and DOC, and the National Science Foundation provide the Department of State with recommendations for the U.S. representatives (delegates and advisors) to the annual meeting.

##### **B. U.S. Representation (Delegates):**

Dr. Steven Murawski  
Director, Scientific Programs, Chief Science Advisor  
NOAA Fisheries Service  
1315 East West Highway, Rm 14659  
Tel: 301-713-2239; Fax: 301-713-1940  
E-mail: [steve.murawski@noaa.gov](mailto:steve.murawski@noaa.gov)

Dr. Ed Houde  
Professor  
University of Maryland, Center for Environmental Science, Chesapeake Biological Laboratory  
Solomons, MD 20688-0038  
Tel: 410-326-7224 Fax: 410-326-7318  
E-mail: ehoude@cbl.umces.edu

### **C. Committees and Working Groups:**

U.S. representation in ICES has no formal (legislated) advisory structure. During 2006-2007, United States scientists served as members on each of the 8 scientific committees (Oceanography, Marine Habitat, Living Resources, Resource Management, Fisheries Technology, Mariculture, Baltic, Diadromous Fish), membership on each of the 3 advisory committees (Fisheries Management, Marine Environment, Ecosystems) and the Consultative Committee and a number of members on more than 60 working/study/planning groups.

### **Description**

#### **A. Mission/Purpose:**

The International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES), with 20 member nations, is the oldest intergovernmental organization in the world concerned with marine and fisheries sciences. (ICES was founded in 1902: the United States has been associated since 1912, and joined formally as a contracting party in 1972). ICES is a leading forum for the promotion, coordination, and dissemination of research on the physical, chemical, and biological systems in the North Atlantic and adjacent seas such as the Baltic Sea and North Sea, and advice on human impacts on its environment, in particular fisheries effects in the Northeast Atlantic. ICES has long recognized the mutual interdependence of the living marine resources and their physical and chemical environment. In support of these activities, ICES facilitates data and information exchange through publications and meetings, in addition to functioning as a marine data center for oceanographic, environmental, and fisheries data. ICES works with experts from its 19 member Countries and collaborates with more than 40 international organizations, some of which hold scientific Observer status.

Uniquely, ICES is also the provider of objective, independent and apolitical scientific advice on fisheries and environmental management, not only to the governments of its member countries but also to six intergovernmental regulatory commissions. The latter includes the North Atlantic Salmon Conservation Organization (NASCO) of which the U.S. is a leading member, particularly through NASCO's North American Commission.

ICES is a complex organization involving about 1600 scientists. It fulfills functions through an Annual Science Conference, about a dozen committees, close to 100 working and study groups, several symposia annually, and a wide range of quality science publications which are recognized as such by the world's scientific community. Two delegates represent each member country on the Council. Dr. Steven Murawski (NOAA Fisheries Director of Scientific Programs and Chief Science Advisor) serves in conjunction with Dr. Edward Houde (Professor, University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science, Chesapeake Biological Laboratory) as one of the two U.S. Delegates. Dr. Michael Sissenwine (former NOAA Fisheries Director of Scientific Programs) was President of ICES from 2003-2006.

The fundamental purposes of ICES outlined in the ICES Convention are: to promote and encourage research and investigation for the study of the sea particularly related to the living resources thereof; to draw up programs required for this purpose and to organize, in agreement with the Contracting Parties, such research and investigations as may appear necessary; and to publish or otherwise disseminate the results of research and investigations carried out under its auspices or to encourage the publication thereof.

The ICES mission is to advance the scientific capacity to give advice on human activities affecting, and affected by, marine ecosystems. The mission calls for: effective arrangements to provide scientific advice; informing interested parties and the public objectively and effectively about marine ecosystem issues; coordinating and enhancing physical, chemical, biological, and interdisciplinary research; partnerships with other organizations that share a common interest; developing and maintaining accessible marine data bases.

Further information on ICES and the many contemporary science and policy issues with which it is dealing can be found on the Web at [www.ices.dk](http://www.ices.dk).

### **B. Organizational Structure:**

The Council (the ultimate governing body) consists of the President who presides at all meetings of the Council and the Bureau, and two Delegates from each participating country. The Bureau (the executive body of the Council) meets intersessionally and consists of the President, a First Vice President and five Vice Presidents elected from the delegates, each for a 3-year term. On completion of his term of office a member of the Bureau is not eligible for re-election to the same office for the succeeding term.

ICES does most of its work through three Advisory Committees (Fishery Management, Marine Environment, Ecosystems) and eight Science Committees (Oceanography, Marine Habitat, Living Resources, Resource Management, Fisheries Technology, Mariculture, Baltic, Diadromous Fish). The chairmen of these Committees constitute the Consultative Committee, whose chairman is elected by the committee, but not necessarily from its members. Responsibility for oversight of the production of scientific advice rests with the Management Committee for the Advisory Process which assigns advisory tasks to the three advisory committees.

The chief executive officer of the Council is the General Secretary, who is responsible to the Bureau for the management of the Council's staff and office. He is appointed by the Council on the advice of the Bureau.

### **Recent Activities**

#### **The 2007 Annual Science Conference (ASC) and Delegates Meeting:**

The 2007 Annual Science Conference (ASC) of ICES will be held in Helsinki, Finland on September 17-21, 2007 and the Delegates Meeting will be held in Copenhagen, Denmark on October 23-25, 2007.

#### **Highlights of the 2006 ASC:**

The International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) held its Annual Science Conference (ASC) from September 19-23, 2006 in Maastricht, Netherlands. Approximately 650 participants attended the Science Conference from 34 countries. The U.S. delegation to ICES was led by Dr. Steven Murawski of NOAA Fisheries Service and Dr. Ed Houde of the University of Maryland. The President of ICES, Dr. Sissenwine, opened the meeting followed by an open lecture by Carlo Heip (The Netherlands) entitled: "Marine Biodiversity: the Exploration and Understanding of the Blue Planet". In addition there were three invited lectures: "Marine Data – A Big Issue" by Lesley Rickards, "Marine Ecosystem and Fish Stocks under Climate Variability and Change" by Svein Sundby, and "Marine Science in the 7th Framework Research Programme" by Pierre Mathy.

The 2006 ASC featured 17 themed sessions:

1. Large-scale changes in the migration of small pelagic fish and the factors modulating such changes
2. Climatic variability in the ICES area – 2000–2005 in relation to previous decades: physical and biological consequences
3. Census of Marine Life: Community and species biodiversity in marine benthic habitats from the coastal zone to the deep sea
4. Operational oceanography

5. What plankton are fish really eating? Species and diets, availability and dependency
6. Human health risks and marine environmental quality
7. Evolutionary effects of exploitation on living marine resources
8. Quantifying, summarizing, and integrating total uncertainty in fisheries resource surveys
9. Is there more to eels than SLIME?
10. Discarding: quantities, causes, and consequences
11. Marine mammals, seabirds, and fisheries: ecosystem effects and advice provision
12. Environmental and fisheries data management, access, and integration
13. Technologies for monitoring fishing activities and observing catch
14. Spatio-temporal characteristics of fish populations in relation to environmental forcing functions as a component of ecosystem-based assessment: effects on catchability
15. Integrated assessments in support of regional seas ecosystem advice – beyond quality status reporting
16. Use of data storage tags to reveal aspects of fish behaviour important for fisheries management
17. ICES advice in a changing time

The Statutory Meetings began prior to the Annual Science Conference and resumed for the four days following. The ICES Council, consisting of two delegates from each member State (Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Latvia, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Russia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States of America), discussed a variety of organizational matters that persisted from previous meetings.

**Science Committees:** Each of the Science Committees has two members from the US. The members are generally expected to attend Annual Science Conference Meetings, where the Committees meet.

**Advisory Committees:** There is one member per country, and these need to be approved by ICES. Members of advisory committees are nominated by countries, but once approved by ICES, they serve in their own professional capacity. .

**Working Groups and Study Groups:** These have flexible membership. Members are expected to attend some, but not all, intersessional meetings (usually one per year or every other year). Some of these groups work by correspondence.

### **Leadership**

U.S. scientists chair committees and several working/study groups.

### **Future Meetings**

In 2008 the ASC will be held in Halifax, Canada from September 22-26, 2008.

ICES plans to hold many group meetings at different locations in Europe and North America before the 2008 Annual Science Conference (scientific working, planning, and study groups and workshops) , and a number of groups will work by correspondence. A full calendar of events can be found at <http://www.ices.dk/reports/general/2007/ICESMeetingCalendar2007.pdf>

### **Staff Contacts**

Kirsten Larsen  
1315 East-West Highway  
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-2239  
E-mail=kirsten.larsen@noaa.gov

## GLOBAL

### Global Environment Facility (GEF)

#### **Basic Instrument**

Instrument for the Establishment of the Restructured Global Environment Facility. The Instrument was approved by participating countries in March 1994.

#### **Implementing Legislation**

No new implementing legislation needed. U.S. participation in the GEF is dependent on contributions from the Treasury Department to the GEF Trust Fund, through annual appropriations.

#### **Member Nations**

Currently, 176 countries, including both recipient countries and donors such as the United States, were participants in the GEF. See the GEF website ([thegef.org](http://thegef.org)) for a complete list.

#### **Secretariat Headquarters**

The GEF Secretariat  
1818 H Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20433  
Telephone: (202) 473-0508  
Fax: (202) 522-3240 or 522-3245  
Website: <http://www.thegef.org>

GEF Chief Executive Officer and Chairman: Leonard Good

#### **Budget**

GEF funds are contributed by donor countries. Since 1991, the GEF has provided \$4.5 billion in grants and generated \$14.5 billion in co-financing from other partners for projects in developing countries and countries with economies in transition. In 2002, 32 donor countries pledged \$3 billion to fund operations between 2002 and 2006.

#### **U.S. Representation**

The Department of the Treasury has the lead for the U.S. Government.

#### **Council Member**

PITTMAN, Bobby  
Deputy Assistant Secretary  
Multilateral Development Institutions and Policy  
Department of the Treasury  
1440 New York Avenue, Suite 2100  
Washington, D.C. 20220, United States  
TEL: (202) 622-0070  
FAX : (202) 622-1228  
E-mail: [mark.jaskowiak@do.treas.gov](mailto:mark.jaskowiak@do.treas.gov), [helen.walsh@do.treas.gov](mailto:helen.walsh@do.treas.gov) (Council Member: US)

JASKOWIAK, Mark M  
Director  
Office of Specialized Development Institution  
Department of the Treasury  
1440 New York Ave., Rm 3105,  
N.W. Washington, D.C. 20220  
USATEL: (202) 622-5052 FAX:  
E-mail: mark.jaskowiak@do.treas.gov

MCMURRAY, Claudia  
Deputy Assistant Secretary for the Environment  
Bureau of Oceans, International Environment and Scientific Affairs  
US Department of State  
2201 C Street, NW, Room 7831  
Washington, D.C.  
TEL: 202 647 2232 FAX: 202 647 0217  
Email: matuszakjm@state.gov, (*Alternate Member: US*)

### **Description**

#### III. Mission/Purpose

The GEF is the primary multilateral financial mechanism to protect the global environment through projects and programs in four focal areas: conserving biological diversity, mitigating climate change, reducing pollution of international waters, and phasing out the production and use of stratospheric ozone depleting substances (in countries not covered by the Montreal Protocol Fund). The GEF provides grants and concessional funding to recipient countries (developing countries and countries with economies in transition) to cover the incremental costs to achieve global environment benefits in the focal areas. The GEF operates the financial mechanisms for the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Convention on Biological Diversity. GEF projects must be country driven, incorporate consultation with local communities and, where appropriate, involve non-governmental organizations in project implementation.

#### IV. Organizational Structure

The GEF is governed by a 32 member GEF Council representing constituencies of over 176 donor and recipient country governments. The GEF Council meets at least twice a year to review and approve the work programs, policies, and administration in the GEF. The United States has one of the seats on the Council. A universal GEF Assembly meets approximately every three years. The first meeting of the Assembly occurred in 1998.

GEF projects and programs are managed through three implementing agencies: the World Bank, the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). The World Bank and UNDP manage the lion's share of the projects. The GEF Secretariat, which is functionally independent from the three implementing agencies, reports to and services the Council and Assembly of the GEF. A Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, convened by UNEP, provides advice on technical issues at the request of the Council and manages a roster of experts that provides technical reviews of individual projects.

## V. Programs:

The GEF was created as a multilateral mechanism to fund the incremental costs of achieving global environmental benefits in developing countries and countries with economies in transition. In particular, it was designed to fund agreements expected to be achieved at the 1992 U.N. Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. It began as a 3-year pilot-phase Facility in 1991. During the Pilot Phase, the United States did not contribute directly to the GEF core fund, but instead pledged and funded \$150 million in “parallel-financed” GEF projects funded and managed by the U.S. Agency for International Development.

The Facility was restructured and replenished with over US\$2 billion in 1994 (GEF-1), to cover the agreed incremental costs of activities that benefit the global environment in four focal areas: climate change, biological diversity; international waters; and stratospheric ozone. Both the Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Convention on Biological Diversity have designated the GEF as their funding mechanism on an interim basis. The second replenishment (GEF-2) was completed in early 1998.

Countries may be eligible for GEF funds in one of two ways: (1) if they are eligible for financial assistance through the financial mechanism of either the Framework Convention on Climate Change or the Convention on Biological Diversity; or (2) if they are eligible to borrow from the World Bank or receive technical assistance grants from UNDP through a Country Program. A country must be a party to the Climate Change Convention or the Convention of Biological Diversity to receive funds from the GEF in those focal areas. GEF projects must be country driven, incorporate consultation with local communities and, where appropriate, involve non-governmental organizations in project implementation.

To date, the GEF has approved proposals more than 700 projects in 125 countries, totaling over \$2.5 billion in GEF financing. Between 1991 and 1999, GEF allocated \$991 million in grants and mobilized an additional \$1.5 billion in co-financing (from recipient countries, bilateral agencies, other development institutions, the private sector, and non-governmental organizations) for biological diversity projects. During the same period GEF allocated \$884 million to 227 climate change projects and enabling activities, which was matched by more than \$4.7 billion in co-financing and nearly \$360 million to international water initiatives.

**Marine issues:** Marine projects of interest to NMFS may be funded under either the biodiversity focal area or the international waters focal area. Coastal, marine, and freshwater ecosystems represent one of four operational programs in the biodiversity focal area. The objective of the program is the conservation and sustainable use of biological resources in these ecosystems. The GEF has recently funded several World Bank projects in developing countries. The GEF is showing increasing flexibility and breaking new ground both in types of projects and as a coordination mechanism between U.N., bilateral, and multilateral development bank assistance mechanisms. NOAA has only begun to utilize the many opportunities for collaboration and leverage that the GEF provides.

### **Staff Contacts**

NOAA:

Susan Ware-Harris  
NOAA - Office of International Affairs  
14<sup>th</sup> and Constitution Ave, NW  
Washington, DC 20230  
Telephone: (202) 482-6196  
Fax: (202) 482-4307

## International Polar Year

The International Council for Science (ICSU) formally agreed to establish an International Polar Year (IPY) in 2007-2008 and formed an International Planning Group to direct the development of an IPY program. The World Meteorological Organization (WMO) agreed to co-sponsor the Polar Year with the ICSU and contributed to the Planning Group activities in 2003-2004. In September 2004 the Planning Group completed its brief and handed over leadership of the Polar Year planning to the ICSU-WMO Joint Committee.

The IPY 2007-2008 will be an intense, internationally coordinated campaign of research that will initiate a new era in polar science. It will include research in both polar regions and recognize the strong links these regions have with the rest of the globe. It will involve a wide range of research disciplines, including the social sciences, but the emphasis will be interdisciplinary in its approach and truly international in participation. It aims to educate and involve the public, and to help train the next generation of engineers, scientists, and leaders.

In the United States, the National Academies' Polar Research Board established the U.S. National Committee (USNC) for the IPY to outline a framework for, and continue to coordinate, U.S. participation in the IPY. The Committee, chaired by Mary Albert, authored a report entitled *A Vision for the International Polar Year 2007-2008* that identified five scientific challenges: (1) assess large-scale environmental and social change in the polar regions; (2) conduct scientific exploration of the polar regions; (3) create multidisciplinary observing networks in the polar regions; (4) increase understanding of human-environment dynamics; and (5) create new connections between science and the public.

The USNC recommended that the: (1) U.S. science community and agencies use the IPY to initiate a sustained effort aimed at assessing large-scale environmental change and variability in the polar regions; (2) U.S. science community and agencies pioneer new polar studies of coupled human-natural systems that are critical to U.S. societal, economic, and strategic interests; (3) U.S. IPY effort explore new scientific frontiers from the molecular to the planetary scale; (4) the IPY be used as an opportunity to design and implement multidisciplinary polar observing networks that will provide a long-term perspective; (5) United States invest in critical infrastructure (both physical and human) and technology to guarantee that the IPY leaves enduring benefits for the nation and for the residents of northern regions; (6) U.S. IPY effort excite and engage the public, with the goals of increasing understanding of the importance of polar regions in the global system and, at the same time, advancing general science literacy in the nation; and (7) U.S. science community and agencies should participate as leaders in the IPY.

### **Staff Contact:**

*NOAA Fisheries:*

Robin Tuttle  
Office of Science and Technology (ST3)  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
1315 East-West Highway, Room 12643  
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910  
Telephone: 301-713-2282 (x-199)

## **Joint FAO/WHO International Codex Alimentarius Food Standards Program**

### **Basic Instrument**

The Codex Food Standards Program was established in 1962 when FAO and WHO recognized the need for international standards to protect the health of consumers and facilitate trade among member nations. The Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC) is charged with developing food standards for adoption and use by member countries. These international food standards are contained in 14 volumes that have been adopted by the CAC. The purpose of these standards is to protect the health of consumers and facilitate fair practices in food trade. These texts are in the form of Specific Food Standards, Codes of Practice and Recommendations. The CAC includes provisions for food hygiene, food additives, pesticide residues, contaminants, labeling and presentation and methods of analysis and sampling.

### **Member Nations**

Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Barbuda, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Democratic Republic of Congo, Republic of Costa Rica, Cote D'IVOIRE, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Islamic Republic of Iran, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia Federated States, Moldova, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Sultanate of, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, Tanzania, Thailand, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Vietnam, Yemen, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

### **Non-member Country**

Bahamas

### **Commission Headquarters**

Secretariat of the Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Program  
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations  
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla  
00100 Rome, Italy  
Telephone: (39-6) 52251  
Fax: (39-6) 52253152/5225493  
Telex: 610181FAO1  
E-Mail: Codex @ FAO.ORG  
WEB Site: [www.fao.org/waicent/faoinfo/economic/esn/CODEX](http://www.fao.org/waicent/faoinfo/economic/esn/CODEX)

### **Budget**

The total budget for the Codex Program is \$5.7KK. Seventy-five percent is contributed from FAO and 25% is contributed from WHO.

### **Organizational Structure**

The Program is operated by an International Commission through an Executive Committee and has various subsidiary bodies. Subsidiary bodies or Committees are both vertical and horizontal--or cross-cutting in nature. For example, specific food commodity committees such as the Codex Committee on Fish and Fishery Products (CCFFP) would be an example of a vertical committee. The Codex Committee on Food Hygiene (CCFH), which must address the hygienic considerations in all of the outputs of the Codex Alimentarius Program is an example of a horizontal or cross-cutting Committee. Additionally, there are regional Committees that are also cross-cutting in nature which address special needs of specific geographical regions. In addition to member nations, Codex relies on scientific support from three prestigious committees sponsored by other specific United Nations programs. These are the Joint Expert Committee on Food Additives, the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues, and the International Consultative Group on Food Irradiation. A fourth expert committee is currently being formed to pass expert judgement on microbiological risk assessments which are offered to the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene. Each member country maintains a country contact point.

### **U.S. Representation**

There are currently 22 different commodity and subject matter committees within Codex. The U.S. delegate is nominated by the U.S. Codex Office and affirmed by the Interagency Codex Policy Steering Committee, chaired by the USDA Undersecretary for Food Safety. The Steering Committee consists of: the U.S. Manager for Codex; and administrative appointed senior level policy personnel being the Deputy Commissioner for Policy, Food and Drug Administration; the Assistant Administrator, Office of Prevention, Pesticides, and Toxic Substances, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; the Assistant Secretary, Marketing and Regulatory Programs, Department of Agriculture; the Undersecretary of Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services, Department of Agriculture; the Special Assistant to the Secretary, Department of Agriculture; the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service; Special Trade Ambassador for Agriculture, Office of the U.S. Trade Representative; the Director of the Office of Agricultural and Textile Trade, Department of State; the Undersecretary, Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services, Department of Agriculture; the Undersecretary of Research, Education, and Economics, Department of Agriculture; and the Vice Chairman, Codex Alimentarius Commission. There is also an interagency technical committee for U.S.A. Codex consisting of career senior level SES executives. The Director of NMFS/Office of Sustainable Fisheries serves on this interagency technical committee. U.S.A. delegates to the Committee meetings are led by the U.S.A. Delegate and are comprised of other governmental and NGO advisors which include academia, industry, state government officials, trade associations, consumer organizations, etc.

### **Programs**

The output products of the Codex Alimentarius Food Standards Program generally relate to four specific areas, for example, (1) the development of General Principles to be followed in the international trade of food commodities, (2) specific Codex Commodity Standards for individual food commodities, or processing requirements, (3) the establishment of Codex Guidelines for specific actions or procedures, and (4) recommended Codes of Hygienic Practice which are similar to our GMP concepts that are to be followed when producing and/or manufacturing specific food commodities. A country's adherence to these Codex outputs provides the country a "safe harbor" in the settlement of GATT disputes by WTO. The Codex Program provides a forum for the world's leading experts to discuss, debate, and reach a scientific consensus on the food safety issues that affect international trade. Further, governmental participation allows access to the world's most current and complete body of scientific food safety information. Without a doubt, Codex has upgraded global food manufacturing practices which have dramatically resulted in improved global consumer protection. Such improvements lessen expensive regulatory efforts for

importing countries during a time of shrinking resources. The United States has benefited substantially from its participation in Codex. Action of the Codex Alimentarius Program can greatly influence world regulatory food control activities since Codex work products represent a consensus of opinion on regulatory issues by the more than 140 member countries that in turn represent more than 97 percent of world's population.

### **Staff Contacts**

#### *NOAA Fisheries:*

E. Spencer Garrett  
Director, National Seafood Inspection Laboratory  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
705 Convent Street  
Pascagoula, MS 39567  
Telephone: (228) 769-8964  
Fax: (228) 762-7144  
E-mail: [spencer.garrett@noaa.gov](mailto:spencer.garrett@noaa.gov)

#### *Department of Agriculture*

Patrick Clerkin  
Associate U.S. Manager for Codex  
U.S. Department of Agriculture  
4861 South Building  
14<sup>th</sup> Street and Independence, SW  
Washington, D.C. 20250  
Telephone: (202) 205-7760  
Fax: (202) 720-3157  
E-mail: [patrick.clerkin@usda.gov](mailto:patrick.clerkin@usda.gov)

**PART IV. OTHER INTERNATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS OF INTEREST**

### **Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) Fisheries Working Group**

**Background:** APEC was established in 1989 to promote open trade and economic cooperation among economies around the Pacific Rim. The APEC Fisheries Working Group (FWG) was formed in 1991. The FWG meets annually, and deliberates on a broad range of living marine resource issues and specific project proposals. Decisions are taken by consensus. The FWG includes 21 APEC Economies and projects are funded by the broader APEC organization, with individual members supplementing where possible/appropriate.

In recent years, the FWG has concentrated project work on capacity-building in the areas of fisheries management/science; seafood safety; aquaculture; and various environmental issues. Although some FWG project work has been undertaken on trade-related issues (such as setting minimum standards for trade in live reef food fish), discussions on challenging issues --such as trade liberalization, have been blocked by a small number of FWG members. Recent projects sponsored or co-sponsored by the United States have included work on: continuing improvements in shark management and science; membership development and implementation of FAO National Plans of Action (NPOAs); training programs for seafood inspectors by U.S. inspectors; and development of a network in the Americas for improving aquaculture methodology.

**The future of the FWG:** The 2005 Bali Plan of Action (BPA), endorsed by APEC Ministers during the 2<sup>nd</sup> APEC Oceans Ministerial Meeting (AOMM2) provides a comprehensive task listing of the work to be undertaken by the FWG over the next several years. At its 2006 meeting, the FWG agreed on a project designed to identify gaps between existing FWG activities and those actions called for under the BPA. This gap analysis will aid in identifying immediate priorities for FWG project work. Key U.S. priorities for future work include: reduction of overcapacity; IUU fishing; trade liberalization; and aquaculture.

**Overcapacity:** The 2006 FWG meeting was preceded by a seminar (FWG project developed and co-sponsored by the United States and Taiwan) designed to share APEC Economy experiences (both good and bad) in fishing capacity control and reduction. The goal of the exchange was to provide a template of "best practices" for use by APEC Economies and others. This seminar proved to be highly successful in terms of opening up a frank discussion on the challenges faced by participating economies. Although the seminar was not attended by as many Taiwanese fishing industry members as had been hoped, the lessons brought out in these discussions may be of use in future project work by the FWG. The United States (and others) strongly support further project work by the FWG in this area --including the possible development of a "best practices" list. Further work could also include capacity-building for Economies attempting to implement the FAO IPOA on Capacity. Interested Economies will likely discuss what form/function such project work might take in advance of the 2007 FWG meeting.

**IUU fishing:** This issue is a major priority for the international community, and the BPA urges FWG action in support of this effort. There is general agreement that excess fishing capacity contributes to the IUU problem, so in that sense, the FWG has already begun to examine this issue. At the 2006 FWG meeting, the role of strong MCS programs (strengthening of the MCS Network), the work of the High Seas Task Force, better information on high seas fishing vessels (a global listing system), and the possible development of a model RFMO were also recognized as potential ways forward on this issue.

**Trade liberalization:** As noted above, discussions on fisheries trade issues (although a high priority for both APEC and many of the FWG Economies) have been stymied by a small group of Economies. The United States supports future FWG project work designed to encourage/enhance trade liberalization in this region where the bulk of the world's seafood production takes place.

**Subsidies:** During the 2006 FWG meeting, the FWG discussed issues relating to subsidies --if and how the suspension of the DOHA Round negotiations create a potential niche for FWG, the classification of subsidies (good or bad), impact on trade of subsidies, use of subsidies in developing states fisheries. It is possible that project work building on past projects could be a way forward in this area. Australia will provide an expert to present at the 2007 FWG meeting on the work of the WTO on subsidies. The FWG also discussed the trade agenda -- standards and

technical barriers (e.g., SPS, HACCP), trade facilitation (e.g., Small-Medium Enterprises, mutual recognition). There was general agreement that the gap analysis on the BPA would assist in determining future FWG trade/investment priorities.

*Other:* Finally, the FWG has already been engaged in perhaps the most promising area in terms of poverty alleviation and small enterprise building in the fisheries sector with project work in the area of aquaculture. This continues to be a high priority for lesser-developed FWG Economies and will likely continue to receive U.S. (and others') support. At its 2006 meeting, the FWG agreed to continue work on its ecotech project relating to the establishment of an Aquaculture Network for the Americas (ANA), which has great potential benefits for both producer and consumer Economies in terms of increased product quality.

Project work under consideration for 2007:

1. Gap analysis project: 'Current Implementation of Bali Plan of Action to Meet APEC Priorities' (proposed by Canada, co-sponsored by Australia, USA and Mexico);
2. Project on IUU fishing in the APEC Region (proposed by Canada);
3. Project to increase economic cooperation on trade among Economies (proposed by Mexico);
4. Project on social aspects of coastal fisheries (proposed by Malaysia, supported by Vietnam, Canada, and Thailand);
5. Project for a seminar on implementation of eco-system based approach (Chile); and
6. Project for SME-related issue (Thailand).

Upcoming Meeting: The next APEC FWG meeting will be held April 23-27, 2007, in Gold Coast, Australia. This meeting will be held jointly with the APEC Marine Resource Conservation Working Group. For more information on the activities of the FWG and MRC, see the APEC web site: <http://www.apecsec.org.sg/>

Staff Contacts

*NOAA Fisheries:*

Patrick E. Moran  
Office of Sustainable Fisheries (F/SF4)  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
1315 East-West Highway  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-2276  
Fax: (301) 713-2313  
E-mail: [pat.moran@noaa.gov](mailto:pat.moran@noaa.gov)

*Department of State:*

Alexandra Curtis  
Office of Marine Conservation (OES/OMC)  
Department of State  
2201 C Street, NW, Room 5806  
Washington, D.C. 20520-7818  
Telephone: (202) 647-5808  
Fax: (202) 736-7350  
E-mail: [CurtisKA@state.gov](mailto:CurtisKA@state.gov)

### **Asia-Pacific Fishery Commission (APFIC)**

APFIC was organized in 1948 as the Indo-Pacific Fisheries Council (later, Commission), an FAO regional fishery body. It was redesignated as the Asia-Pacific Fishery Commission in 1993. The functions of the Commission are to promote full and proper utilization of the living aquatic resources of the Asia-Pacific area through the development and management of fishing and aquaculture operations and the development of related processing and marketing activities in conformity with the objectives of its members. It has no regulatory powers.

APFIC operates through an Executive Committee and two subsidiary committees. The Executive Committee consists of a Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson, preceding Chairperson, and two members elected by the Commission. Subsidiary committees consist of the Aquaculture and Inland Fisheries Committee and the Committee on Marine Fisheries. There is no standing scientific committee, but the Commission can establish temporary, special, or standing committees and working parties to study and make recommendations on specific technical problems.

The Commission meets at least once every two years unless otherwise called by a majority of the Members. Each member has one vote and decisions are made by simple majority.

The Commission held its 29<sup>th</sup> Session on August 21-23, 2006, in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. An official report of this and earlier sessions can be found at <http://www.apfic.org>.

The APFIC Members are Australia, Bangladesh, Cambodia, China, France, India, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Pakistan, Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand, United Kingdom, the United States, and Viet Nam.

#### Secretariat:

FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific  
39 Phra Atit Road, Bangkok 10200, Thailand  
Telephone: +66 2 281 7844  
Fax: +66 2 280 0445  
Web address: <http://www.apfic.org>.

### **Association of Official Analytical Chemists (AOAC) International**

AOAC was founded in 1884 as the Association of Official Agricultural Chemists, under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), to adopt uniform methods of analysis for fertilizers. In the 21st Century AOAC INTERNATIONAL is committed to be a proactive, worldwide provider and facilitator in the development, use, and harmonization of validated analytical methods and laboratory quality assurance programs and services. Also, to serve as the primary resource for timely knowledge exchange, networking, and high-quality laboratory information for its members. To meet these goals, AOAC is focusing very closely on streamlining its methods review process and providing new methods in areas of increasing international interest, such as genetically modified organisms (GMOs) and nutraceuticals. The explosion of international accreditation as a requirement for participation in the global marketplace has given AOAC INTERNATIONAL an opportunity to seize a leadership role in developing criteria for laboratory accreditation.

### **Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC)**

The signing of the North American Free Trade Act (NAFTA) in 1993 created the world's largest trading bloc. At the same time, the NAFTA partners (Canada, Mexico, and the United States) sought to build environmental safeguards into the trade liberalization pact and signed the North American Agreement on the Environmental Cooperation, creating the North American Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC). In June of 2004, the CEC restructured its programs around three pillars 1.) Information sharing for decision makers, 2.) Capacity Building and 3.) Trade and Environment. Projects focus on the protection of the North American environment, and therefore trilateral environmental problems, issues and cooperation are given priority in funding. The CEC biodiversity work program is increasingly addressing the marine environment. Currently, the CEC supports projects on the pink footed shearwater, the leatherback turtle and the humpback whale, as well as work in improving coordination on marine protected areas along the Pacific coast.

The 13th Regular Session of the Council of the CEC and the Biodiversity Conservation Working Group met June 2006, in Washington, D.C.

#### Headquarters

Commission for Environmental Cooperation  
393, rue St-Jacques Ouest  
Bureau 200  
Montréal (Québec)  
H2Y 1N9 Canada  
Telephone: (514) 350-4300  
Fax: (514) 350-4314  
E-mail: [info@cceintl.org](mailto:info@cceintl.org)  
Web address: <http://www.cec.org/home/index.cfm?varlan=english>

#### NOAA Fisheries Contact

Elizabethann English  
Office of International Affairs  
Foreign Affairs Specialist  
1315 East-West Highway, Room 12626  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301)713-2276  
Fax: (301) 713-2313  
Web address: <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/ia/>

### **Canada/Mexico/US Trilateral Committee for Wildlife and Ecosystem Conservation and Management**

In 1996, the wildlife conservation agencies of the United States, Mexico, and Canada signed a Memorandum of Understanding establishing the Canada/Mexico/US Trilateral Committee for Wildlife and Ecosystem Conservation and Management. This agreement formally brought together for the first time the three nations of North America, consolidating a continental effort for wildlife and ecosystem conservation and management. The Trilateral Committee facilitates and enhances cooperation and coordination among the wildlife agencies of the three nations in

projects and programs for the conservation and management of wildlife, plants, biological diversity, and ecosystems of mutual interest. The Trilateral also facilitates the development of partnerships with other associated and interested entities. Delegations from each country come together annually for discussions on a wide range of topics, from joint, on-the-ground projects to issues of law enforcement to the development of information databases. Discussions take place under the auspices of working tables that report to an executive body comprising the directors of the three wildlife agencies. Because the issues important to the three nations change, working tables are established and discontinued as needed. Currently, there are six active working tables: Species of Common Concern, Law Enforcement, Ecosystem Conservation, Migratory Birds, Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna (CITES), and the Executive Committee.

In May 2007, Canada will host the annual trilateral meeting in Montreal. The 2007 meeting is of special interest to NOAA as this meeting will have a marine focus.

**Staff Contact**

Elizabethann English  
Office of International Affairs  
Foreign Affairs Specialist  
1315 East-West Highway, Room 12626  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301)713-2276  
Fax: (301) 713-2313  
Web address: <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/ia/>

**Commission for Sustainable Development (CSD)**

The CSD was established as a functional commission of the UN Economic and Social Council by Council decision 1993/207. Its functions are set out in General Assembly resolution 47/191 of December 22, 1992. The Commission is composed of 53 members elected for terms of office of 3 years.

One of the main purposes of the Commission is to review progress at the international, regional, and national levels in the implementation of recommendations and commitments contained in the final documents of the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), namely Agenda 21; the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development; and the Non-legally Binding Authoritative Statement of Principles for a Global Consensus on the Management, Conservation and Sustainable Development of All Types of Forests (also known as the Forest Principles).

The CSD holds meetings annually in New York and reviews documents and resolutions that address, *inter alia*, various global fishery issues in light of the charges in the 1992 Rio declarations. It provides a convenient barometer for gauging opinions in the United Nations on global fishery and living marine resource issues. While the 14<sup>th</sup> Session of the CSD, held in May 2006, did not focus on fisheries or marine issues, an international panel discussion on Climate Change discussed how it will affect not only the environment but also social and economic systems, thus threatening agricultural production and food security, fisheries, and coastal zone management. The 15<sup>th</sup> session of the CSD will be held between 30 April and 11 May 2007, at UN Headquarters in New York.

Web address: <http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/csd.htm>

### **Convention on the Conservation and Management of Fishery Resources in the Southeast Atlantic Ocean (SEAFO)**

A Convention to establish a new regional fisheries conservation and management organization for the Southeast Atlantic Ocean, the Southeast Atlantic Fisheries Organization (SEAFO), has been negotiated. When it comes into force, SEAFO will manage fishery resources on the high seas of the Southeast Atlantic Ocean, but not those under national jurisdiction, nor highly migratory species. The text of the convention was adopted in November 2000 and signed on April 20, 2001, in Windhoek, Namibia.

Web address: [http://www.fao.org/fi/body/rfb/SEAFO/seafo\\_home.htm](http://www.fao.org/fi/body/rfb/SEAFO/seafo_home.htm)

### **Coral Disease and Health Consortium (CDHC)**

The National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the Department of Interior (DOI) developed the framework for the CDHC for the United States Coral Reef Task Force through an interagency effort in March 2000. The Coral Reef Task Force was established by Executive Order in June 1998 (Executive Order 13089 on the Protection of Coral Reefs) to help preserve and protect the biodiversity, health, heritage, and social and economic value of U.S. coral reef ecosystems. The purpose of the CDHC is to organize and coordinate the scientific resources of the United States and its territories to document the condition of coral reef ecosystems, determine causes of declines in coral reef health, and provide technical information and assistance to managers and scientists regarding coral reef health. These objectives will be achieved by integrating three functional disciplines, specifically Clinical Pathology, Health Assessment, and Risk Assessment and Management. Development of the CDHC framework already has fostered national and international partnerships in coral disease research, education, and outreach activities. For example, NOAA has developed waterproof coral disease identification cards for improved disease monitoring. NOAA has also partnered with the World Conservation Monitoring Center to create the first global coral disease database. In addition, a new video production will highlight examples of coral bleaching and disease, research on the effects of stress on corals, and standardization of histological methodologies. The CDHC aims to significantly enhance current assessments of coral ecosystem health, improve the effectiveness of management decisions by providing early warning of disease and disease outbreaks, identify putative causative factors and possible prevention and mitigation strategies, and offer managers viable risk management options. The NMFS Office of Protected Resources is focused on coral disease epizootiology (distribution, abundance and impacts of diseases and bleaching), effects of diseases and bleaching on Candidate Species for the ESA, and management of coral diseases.

Website address: [www.coralreef.gov](http://www.coralreef.gov)

### **Fishery Committee for the Eastern Central Atlantic (CECAF)**

CECAF is the FAO regional fishery body for the Eastern Central Atlantic. The main objectives of the Committee are:

- (a) to facilitate the coordination of research and to encourage education and training
- (b) to assist its members in an advisory management capacity in establishing rational policies to promote the rational management of resources.

The functions of the Committee, which has no regulatory powers, are principally to translate and adopt scientifically based conservation recommendations into management measures for adoption, including harmonized rules such as minimum mesh sizes. Recommendations are not binding on Commission members. It operates through a Main Committee and a Scientific Subcommittee. The Scientific Subcommittee exists to provide scientific advice to the Committee.

The CEEAF Members are Benin, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Congo (Republic of), Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Equatorial Guinea, European Community, France, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Italy, Japan, Korea, Liberia, Mauritania, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Poland, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Togo, and the United States.

Secretariat:

FAO Regional Office for Africa  
P.O. Box 1628  
Accra, Ghana  
Telephone: +233 21 675 000/675051-060/701 0930  
Fax: +233 21 668 427/701 0943  
Web address: <http://www.fao.org/fi/>

**Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)  
Committee on Fisheries (COFI)**

**FAO**

The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) was founded in October 1945 with a mandate to raise levels of nutrition and standards of living, to improve agricultural productivity, and to better the condition of rural populations.

Today, FAO is the largest autonomous agency within the United Nations system with 175 Member Nations plus the EC (Member Organization) and more than 1,500 professional staff.

The Organization offers direct development assistance, collects, analyses, and disseminates information, provides policy and planning advice to governments and acts as an international forum for debate on food and agriculture issues. FAO is active in land and water development, plant and animal production, forestry, fisheries, economic and social policy, investment, nutrition, food standards and commodities and trade. It also plays a major role in dealing with food and agricultural emergencies. A specific priority of the Organization is encouraging sustainable agriculture and rural development, a long-term strategy for the conservation and management of natural resources. It aims to meet the needs of both present and future generations through programs that do not degrade the environment and are technically appropriate, economically viable, and socially acceptable.

FAO is governed by the Conference of Member Nations, which meets every two years to review the work carried out by the organization and approve a Program of Work and Budget for the next biennium. The Conference elects a Council of 49 Member Nations to act as an interim governing body. Members serve 3-year, rotating terms. The Conference also elects a Director-General to head the agency. The current Director-General, Jacques Diouf, began a third and final 6-year term in January 2005.

The Organization's work falls into two categories. The Regular Program covers internal operations, including the maintenance of staff who provide support for field work, advise governments on policy and planning and service a wide range of development needs. It is financed by Member Nations, who contribute according to levels set by the Conference. The Field Program implements FAO's development strategies and provides assistance to governments and rural communities. Projects are usually undertaken in cooperation with national governments and other agencies. More than 60 percent of Field Program finances come from national trust funds and nearly a quarter is provided by the United Nations Development Program. FAO contributes through its Technical Cooperation Program (TCP).

\$40,017,000 was budgeted in 2006-2007 for FAO's Program of Work for the Fisheries and Aquaculture Department supplemented by \$33,958,000 in direct support of the Program of Work from Trust Funds and an additional \$33,083,000 from other voluntary contributions.

### **Committee on Fisheries (COFI)**

COFI, a subsidiary body of the FAO Council, was established by the FAO Conference at its Thirteenth Session in 1965. The Committee presently constitutes the only global inter-governmental forum where major international fisheries and aquaculture problems and issues are examined and recommendations addressed to governments, regional fishery bodies, NGOs, fishworkers, FAO and international community, periodically on a world-wide basis. COFI has also been used as a forum in which global agreements and non-binding instruments were negotiated.

COFI membership is open to any FAO Member and non-Member eligible to be an observer of the Organization. Representatives of the UN, UN bodies and specialized agencies, regional fishery bodies, international and international non-governmental organizations participate in the debate, but without the right to vote.

The two main functions of COFI are to review the programs of work of FAO in the field of fisheries and aquaculture and their implementation, and to conduct periodic general reviews of fishery and aquaculture problems of an international character and appraise such problems and their possible solutions with a view to concerted action by nations, by FAO, inter-governmental bodies and the civil society. The Committee also reviews specific matters relating to fisheries and aquaculture referred to it by the Council or the Director-General of FAO, or placed by the Committee on its agenda at the request of Members, or the United Nations General Assembly. In its work, the Committee supplements rather than supplants other organizations working in the field of fisheries and aquaculture.

COFI is empowered to establish subcommittees on specific issues. These subsidiary bodies meet in the intersessional period of the parent Committee. COFI has a Sub-Committee on Fish Trade and a newly established Sub-Committee on Aquaculture, and is advised by the FAO Advisory Committee on Fishery Research. The next meeting of the Sub-Committee on Trade is scheduled for February 2008. The second meeting of the Sub-Committee on Aquaculture is scheduled for 2008.

The Twenty-sixth meeting of COFI was held in Rome in February 2005 and was immediately followed by a Fisheries Ministerial which issued declarations on the December 2004 tsunami that struck in the Indian Ocean and illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing. The report of the Twenty-sixth Session and the Ministerial Declarations can be downloaded from the FAO website. The 27<sup>th</sup> Session of COFI will meet March 5-9, 2007, in Rome.

Approved the draft Strategy for Improving Information on the Status and Trends of Capture Fisheries and recommended that the FAO Secretariat report back regularly to COFI on its implementation;

**Website:** [www.fao.org](http://www.fao.org)

**Staff Contact:**

Dean Swanson  
Chief, International Fisheries Affairs Division (F/IA1)  
Office of International Affairs  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
1315 East-West Highway  
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910  
Telephone: 301-713-2276

**FAO Contact:**

Mr. Ndiaga Gueye  
Chief, FIPL and Secretary of COFI  
Telephone: 39 06 57052847  
Fax: 39 06 57056500  
E-mail: [ndiaga.gueye@fao.org](mailto:ndiaga.gueye@fao.org)  
Web address: <http://www.fao.org/>

**Free Trade Agreements –FTAs**

The US is currently negotiating multiple *Free Trade Agreements (FTAs)*, and initiated negotiations with several additional nations in the past year. NOAA has the opportunity to participate in negotiations of these agreements, including the environment chapter, the environmental impact assessment, the environmental cooperation agreement and associated work plan.

- *Environmental Chapters* of FTAs are negotiated by USTR, and formulated through an interagency process in the US, with public input. The text is similar across FTAs, with differences most apparent between developed and developing countries. The language tends to be non-mandatory, with the exception of a commitment to not fail to effectively enforce one's environmental laws.
- *Environmental Assessments* of FTAs are also prepared by USTR. These evaluate the anticipated impact on the environment of all countries participating in the FTA.
- The State Department negotiates *Environmental Cooperation Agreements* and the associated *Work Plans* for each FTA. These may be binding or non-binding documents that address cooperative and capacity building work related to trade and the environment, and require varying levels of commitment from the participating countries.

Specific activities undertaken by NOAA in the 2006-2007 timeframe will focus on work with the CAFTA-DR countries, with support from DOS and USAID. Projects will address: improved use of turtle excluder devices, reduction of turtle by-catch in longline fisheries, fisheries enforcement, and impacts of trade on invasive species. Work is also planned for Morocco to address use of driftnets and to develop a national programme of action. Cooperation with Chile is ongoing, work is described under the US-Chile bilateral. NOAA continues to consider how our mission can be supported through engaging in environmental cooperation under other existing free trade agreements and those being negotiated currently.

**Staff Contacts:**

*NOAA:*

Pamela Toschik  
Office of International Affairs  
14<sup>th</sup>&Constitution Ave NW, Rm 6224  
Washington, DC 20230  
Tel (202) 482-4347

*NMFS:*

Elizabethann English  
Office of International Affairs  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
1315 East-West Hwy  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-9090  
Fax: (301) 713-2313

*Department of State:*

David E. Brown  
Director, Office of Environmental Policy  
Department of State (OES/ENV)  
Washington, DC 20520  
Tel (202) 647-9831

**Global Ocean Ecosystem Dynamics (GLOBEC)**

GLOBEC (Global Ocean Ecosystem Dynamics) was initiated by SCOR and the IOC of UNESCO in 1991 in response to the recommendations of a joint workshop which identified a need to understand how global change will affect the abundance, diversity and productivity of marine populations comprising a major component of oceanic ecosystems. GLOBEC is primarily focused on zooplankton, the assemblage of herbivorous grazers on the phytoplankton, and the primary carnivores that prey on them. Both groups are the most important prey for larval and juvenile fish.

The aim of GLOBEC is to advance understanding of the structure and functioning of the global ocean ecosystem, its major subsystems, and its response to physical forcing so that a capability can be developed to forecast the responses of the marine ecosystem to global change. GLOBEC has four primary objectives: (1) to better understand how multiscale physical environmental processes force large-scale changes in marine ecosystems; (2) to determine the relationships between structure and dynamics in a variety of oceanic systems which typify significant components of the global ocean ecosystem, with emphasis on trophodynamic pathways, their variability and the role of nutrition quality in the food web; (3) to determine the impacts of global change on stock dynamics using coupled physical, biological and chemical models linked to appropriate observation systems and to develop the capability to predict future impacts; and (4) to determine how changing marine ecosystems will affect the global earth system by identifying and quantifying feedback mechanisms.

GLOBEC consists of four cross cutting research foci, four regional programs, and national program activities.

Web address: <http://www.pml.ac.uk/globec/>

### **Global Ocean Observing System (GOOS)**

GOOS is an internationally coordinated system for systematic operational data collection (measurements), data analysis, exchange of data and data products, and technology development and transfer. The objective of GOOS is to ensure the establishment of a permanent system of global and systematic observations adequate for forecasting climate variability and change; for assessing the health or the state of the marine environment and its resources, including the coastal zone; and for supporting an improved decision-making and management process, which takes into account potential natural and man-made changes in the environment and their effects on human health and marine resources. GOOS is coordinated by the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) headquartered in Paris, France. Four GOOS design panels (Coastal, Living Marine Resources, Health of the Oceans, and Climate) are in the process of identifying the observations and resources required to meet GOOS objectives.

Web address: <http://ioc.unesco.org/goos/goos.htm>

### **Gulf of Maine Council (GOMC)**

The GOMC was established in the late 1980's and consists of the states and provinces bordering the Gulf of Maine. The Council's primary goals are to restore shellfish habitat, promote restoration of fishery resources, address ecosystem and public health effects of toxics in the marine food chain, protect and restore regionally significant coastal habitats, and

reduce marine debris and prevent whale entanglements. Federal partners from both the United States and Canada are traditional, long-standing non-voting members on the GOMC. The NOAA Fisheries representative is the Northeast Regional Administrator.

#### Council Coordinator:

Michele L. Tremblay  
Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment  
c/o NH DES  
PO Box 95  
Concord, NH 03302-0095  
(for overnight mail - 60 Forest Lane, Boscawen, NH 03303)  
Telephone: 603-796-2615  
Fax: 603-796-2600  
E-mail: [info@gulfofmaine.org](mailto:info@gulfofmaine.org)  
Web address: <http://www.gulfofmaine.org/>

### **Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC)**

The Agreement for the Establishment of the IOTC was approved at the 27<sup>th</sup> Session of the FAO Conference and adopted by the Council at its 105<sup>th</sup> Session in November 1993. The Agreement entered into force with receipt of the 10<sup>th</sup> instrument of acceptance on March 27, 1996. The aim of the IOTC is to promote cooperation among its members with a view to ensuring, through appropriate management, the conservation and optimum utilization of fish

stocks covered by the Agreement and to encourage sustainable development of fisheries based on such stocks. The IOTC has authority over tuna and tuna-like species, with a main focus on albacore, bigeye and yellowfin tunas.

The members are Australia, China, Comoros, Eritrea, European Community, France, Guinea, India, Islamic Republic of Iran, Japan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Sultanate of Oman, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritius, Pakistan, Philippines, Seychelles, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand, United Kingdom and Vanuatu. Indonesia and South Africa are cooperating non-contracting Parties.

The main functions of the IOTC are, among other things: (a) to review the conditions and trends of the stocks and to gather, analyze, and disseminate scientific information, catch and effort statistics, and other relevant data; (b) to encourage, recommend, and coordinate research and development activities in respect of the stocks and fisheries covered by the Agreement; and (c) to keep under review the economic and social aspects of the fisheries based on the stocks covered by the Agreement. In order to achieve these ends, the Commission may, by a two-thirds majority, adopt, on the basis of scientific evidence, conservation and management measures to ensure the conservation and optimum utilization of the stocks covered by the Agreement. IOTC has passed measures that are comparable to the other tuna RFMOs including: positive and negative vessel lists, VMS, trade restrictive measures, statistical document requirements for bigeye tuna, a shark finning ban and measures regarding sea turtles and sea birds. The Commission also has conservation and management measures in place for bigeye tuna and swordfish.

The Commission is the main decision-making body and is composed of all Members. There is also a Scientific Committee which advises the Commission (and any sub-commissions which may be established) on research and data collection, status of stocks, and management issues. Seven Working Parties-- Tropical Tunas, Neritic Tunas, Billfishes, Temperate Tunas, Tagging, Methods and Bycatch--report to the Scientific Committee. The Data Collection and Statistics Working Party was transformed into a sub-Committee of the Scientific Committee in 2004.

Secretariat:

IOTC Secretariat  
P.O. Box 1011 Victoria  
Mahe, Seychelles  
Telephone: +248 22 54 94  
Fax: +248 22 43 64  
Web address: <http://www.seychelles.net/iotc>

### **Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)**

The IPCC was established by the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) in 1988 to provide an authoritative statement of scientific opinion on climate change. Several hundred scientific experts serve on three Working Groups and a Task Force. Their work has been broadly peer-reviewed and subjected to full governmental reviews. Working Group I deals with the science of climate change. Working Group II deals with impacts and response strategies. Working Group III deals with broad socioeconomic issues, such as the costs and benefits of global mitigation efforts in energy, forestry and agriculture. The Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories oversees the National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme. The IPCC does not carry out new research, nor does it monitor climate-related data. It bases its assessment mainly on published and peer-reviewed scientific technical literature.

All of the significant fisheries materials are included in the Working Group II reports. The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) Office of Science and Technology had significant roles in Working Group II, including the designation as Co-Convening Lead Author for the Polar Regions report, which was completed and published as a

special areas report of the IPCC. The current IPCC effort is being developed as a regional assessment. NMFS was a reviewer of the regional sections to ensure that fishery interests were adequately addressed for each region.

Secretariat:

IPCC Secretariat  
C/O World Meteorological Organization  
7bis Avenue de la Paix  
C.P. 2300  
CH- 1211 Geneva 2, Switzerland  
Telephone: +41-22-730-8208  
Fax: +41-22-730-8025  
Web address: <http://www.ipcc.ch/>

### **Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC)**

The Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) of UNESCO was founded in 1960. The work of the IOC has focused on promoting marine scientific investigations and related ocean services, with a view to learning more about the nature and resources of the oceans. The IOC focuses on four major themes: (1) develop, promote and facilitate international oceanographic research programs to improve understanding of critical global and regional ocean processes and their relationship to the sustainable development and stewardship of ocean resources; (2) ensure effective planning, establishment and coordination of an operational global ocean observing system to provide the information needed for oceanic and atmospheric forecasting, for oceans and coastal zone management by coastal nations, and for global environmental change research; (3) provide international leadership for education and training program and technical assistance essential for systematic observations of the global ocean and its coastal zone and related research; and (4) ensure that ocean data and information obtained through research, observation and monitoring are efficiently handled and made widely available. Priority focal areas include the Global Ocean Observing System (GOOS), Ocean Science, and tsunamis.

Through secondments and direct contributions, the United States supports the IOC's Ocean Science Section, which includes support for the Global Ecosystem Dynamics (GLOBEC) program, Large Marine Ecosystems (LMEs), Harmful Algal Blooms (HAB), and the Global Coral Reef Monitoring Network (GCRMN). The U.S. also provides support to the IOC Secretariat for the development of GOOS.

Secretariat:

Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 Paris  
FRANCE  
Telephone: (33) 1 45 68 39 84  
Fax: (33) 1 45 68 58 12/10  
Email: [ioc.secretariat@unesco.org](mailto:ioc.secretariat@unesco.org)  
Web address: <http://ioc.unesco.org/iocweb/>

### **IOC Sub-Commission for the Caribbean and Adjacent Regions (IOCARIBE)**

IOCARIBE is a Sub-Commission of the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) of UNESCO. It is the first of its kind and was established on the basis of very promising experiences gained from previous cooperative programs in the Caribbean and Adjacent Regions. The aim of IOCARIBE is the same as that of the IOC--to promote marine scientific investigations and technology and related ocean services with a view to learning more about the nature and resources of the oceans through the concerted action of IOCARIBE Members States.

IOCARIBE Members are Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominica, Dominican Republic, France (French Guiana, Grenada, Guadeloupe, Martinique, St. Barthelemy, and St. Martin), Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, the Netherlands (Aruba), Netherlands Antilles (Bonaire, Curacao, Saba, Sint Eustatius, and Sint Maarten), Nicaragua, Panama, Russia, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Surinam, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom (Anguilla, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Montserrat, Turks & Caicos), United States (Puerto Rico and U.S. Virgin Islands), and Venezuela.

Web address: [http://ioc.unesco.org/iocaribe/What\\_is%20IOCARIBE.htm](http://ioc.unesco.org/iocaribe/What_is%20IOCARIBE.htm)

#### **Contacts**

##### *NOAA Fisheries:*

NMFS Southeast Fisheries Science Center  
75 Virginia Beach Dr.  
Miami, FL 33149-1003  
Telephone: (3050 361-4270

##### *IOCARIBE Regional Secretariat:*

IOCARIBE  
A.A. 1108  
Cartagena de Indias  
Colombia  
Telephone: (575) 664 6399  
Fax: (575) 660 0407  
E-mail: [iocaribe@col3.telecom.com.co](mailto:iocaribe@col3.telecom.com.co)  
E-mail: [iocaribe@cartagena.cetcol.net.co](mailto:iocaribe@cartagena.cetcol.net.co)

### **International Queen Conch Conference**

Since 1996, countries in the Wider Caribbean have been meeting to discuss issues of queen conch (*Strombus gigas*) science and management. This informal international effort is being coordinated by the Caribbean Fishery Management Council, which forms a practical bridge between the United States and countries in Latin America and the Caribbean. At its most recent meeting, discussion was largely driven by the large amount of illegal, unreported, undocumented fishing in the region. Strategies adopted by the group to address this problem and provide coordinated management for the resource included:

- convening of a stock assessment workshop in 2002, which established an adequate protocol for data collection and analysis;
- strengthening the ways in which the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) can ensure that trade in this listed species is sustainable;
- presentation of information on the management of queen conch to Ministers at the CARICOM Council for Trade and Economic Development;
- considering the proposal of the government of the Dominican Republic for the establishment of an Inter-American Convention for the Management and Conservation of *Strombus gigas*; and

- seeking assistance to establish better enforcement systems and tools, such as Vessel Monitoring Systems (VMS).

Website address: <http://www.strombusgigas.com>

**Staff Contact**

Nancy K. Daves  
Office of Protected Resources (F/PR)  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
1315 East-West Highway  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-2319  
Fax: (301) 713-0376

**Large Marine Ecosystems (LMEs)**

NOAA, in partnership and with support from the Global Environment Facility (GEF), UN agencies (United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization, United Nations Environmental Program, United Nations Development Program, United Nations Industrial Development Organization, United Nations Educational and Scientific Organization and the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission), the World Bank, and the IUCN-The World Conservation Union, is assisting numerous countries bordering several LMEs to develop programs for the sustainable, ecosystem-based management of their marine areas. These comprehensive programs will provide the information necessary for these countries to make decisions regarding the status and management of their marine resources. In some cases (e.g. the Guinea Current LME and Benguela Current LME), the countries bordering the LME have made inter-ministerial commitments to assess and manage their marine areas from an LME perspective.

In addition to the United States, LME participating countries include China, Korea, Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar, Maldives, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Cambodia, Philippines, Vietnam, Korea, Madagascar, Mozambique, South Africa, Angola, Namibia, Cape Verde, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Mauritania, Morocco, Senegal, Angola, Benin, Cameroon, Congo, Dem. Repub. of the Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Ghana, Cote d'Ivoire, Liberia, Nigeria, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Togo, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Jamaica, Mexico, Panama, St. Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago, Venezuela, Chile, Peru, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Russia, Sweden, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Russia, and Sweden.

Web address: <http://www.edc.uri.edu/lme/>

**Staff Contact**

*NOAA Fisheries:*

Dr. Kenneth Sherman  
Northeast Fisheries Science Center - Narragansett Laboratory  
28 Tarzwell Drive  
Narragansett, RI 02882-1199  
Telephone: (401) 782-3211  
Fax: (401) 782-3201

**Memorandum of Understanding on the Conservation and Management of Marine Turtles  
and Their Habitats Of the Indian Ocean and South-East Asia  
(concluded under the auspices of the Convention on Migratory Species)**

The Memorandum of Understanding on the Conservation and Management of Marine Turtles and their Habitats of the Indian Ocean and South-East Asia (IOSEA) was completed on June 23, 2001, in Manila, Philippines. IOSEA is the second of its kind to be concluded under the auspices of the Convention on Migratory Species. It is a non-binding agreement and provides a framework through which States of the region--as well as other concerned States--can work together to conserve and replenish depleted marine turtle populations for which they share responsibility. It acknowledges a wide range of threats to marine turtles, including habitat destruction, direct harvesting and trade, fisheries bycatch, pollution and other man-induced sources of mortality. The IOSEA recognizes the need to address these problems in the context of the socio-economic development of the States concerned, and to take account of other relevant instruments and organizations.

The IOSEA has a potential membership of at least 40 countries, covering the entire Indian Ocean and Southeast Asia. Activities may also be coordinated through subregional mechanisms in South-East Asia, as well as in the northern, western, and southwestern Indian Ocean. Twenty-six States have signed the IOSEA: Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Comoros, Eritrea, Indonesia, Iran, Jordan, Kenya, Madagascar, Mauritius, Myanmar, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, Thailand, United Arab Emirates, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States, and Vietnam. The fourth meeting of the Signatory States was held in Oman in March 2006. The Conservation and Management Plan, containing 24 programs and 105 specific activities, aims to reverse the decline of marine turtle populations throughout the region. The measures to be taken focus on reducing threats, conserving critical habitat, exchanging scientific data, increasing public awareness and participation, promoting regional cooperation, and seeking resources for implementation.

The Secretariat, located in Bangkok, Thailand, is under the auspices of the Convention on Migratory Species. The Advisory Committee consists of seven members with expertise from various disciplines, appointed by the Signatory States. Financial support has come from Australia, France, United Kingdom, United States, Convention on Migratory Species Trust Fund, and United Nations Environment Programme.

Web address: <http://www.ioseaturtles.org/>

**NOAA Fisheries Contact**

Therese Conant  
Office of Protected Resources (F/PR)  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
1315 East-West Highway  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-2322  
Fax: (301) 427-2522

### **National Standards Foundation (NSF) International**

The NSF, the largest non-profit health organization in the world, develops a variety of food safety and other types of standards for equipment. NMFS National Seafood Inspection Laboratory personnel currently serve on the organization's Council of Public Health Consultants.

Web address: <http://www.nsf.org>

### **NOAA Fisheries / Norwegian Institute of Marine Research Scientific Cooperation**

#### Cooperative Agreements

NOAA Fisheries and the Norwegian Institute of Marine Research conduct cooperative science pursuant to two agreements concluded in 2001.

Cooperation in Fisheries Science and the Biology and Management of Living Marine Resources, Alaska Fisheries Science Center (AFSC) and Institute of Marine Research (IMR), April 2001.

- 1.1. Joint sponsorship of workshops or symposia on the biology and management of living marine resources in the two regions.
- 1.2. Exchange of expertise and information.
- 1.3. Extended visits of scientists.
- 1.4. Cooperative research on common scientific issues and methodological problems.
- 1.5. Coordination and planning.

Cooperation in Large Marine Ecosystem (LME) Research, Assessment, and Management, Northeast Fisheries Science Center (NEFSC) and IMR, December 2001.

- 2.1. Joint sponsorship of workshops or symposia on the assessment and management of living marine resources of the LMEs of the North Atlantic.
- 2.2. Exchange of expertise and information.
- 2.3. Extended visits of scientists.
- 2.4. Cooperative research on common scientific issues and methodological problems.
- 2.5. Coordination and planning.

#### Recent and Ongoing Cooperative Activities

In March, 2006, scientists from IMR, NEFSC and AFSC held a research planning workshop in Woods Hole. Topics included: comparative ecosystem dynamics, effects of organic contaminants, and cooperative (industry-agency) research and provision of management were developed. Follow up activities include:

- A US/Norway workshop on catch monitoring technologies at the AFSC in Settle, May, 2006
- Participation by an AFSC scientist in an IMR research cruise to evaluate new catch monitoring technologies, October 2006
- A US/Norway catch sampling and estimation workshop held in Bergen, Norway in January, 2007

#### Part IV. Other International Arrangements of Interest

---

- A workshop on comparison of marine ecosystems of Norway and the US (MENU) to be held in Bergen, Norway in March 2007
- A theme session on Comparative Marine Ecosystem Structure and Function: Descriptors and Characteristics which will take place at the 2007 ICES Annual Science Conference and will be convened by scientists from AFSC, NEFSC, IMR, and the Canadian Department of Fisheries and Oceans. A similar theme session will be proposed for the 2008 World Fisheries Congress to be held in Japan.
- An international panel of international panel of Arctic oil effects researchers will be convened in Tromsø, Norway in the spring of 2007 with participation from AFSC, NEFSC and IMR.
- Emerging plans for an ICES Symposium on the Collection and Interpretation of Fishery Dependent Data which would be co-sponsored by IMR, NOAA and the Marine Institute of Ireland and would take place in Ireland in 2010.

Other recent and ongoing activities include:

- In October 2004, the NOAA-supported Gulf of Maine Mapping Initiative (GOMMI) selected Terje Thorsnes of the Norwegian Ecological Survey to be on the GOMMI Scientific Advisory Committee to assist in seabed mapping activities in the NE.
- An ICES study group on the collecting of acoustic data from fishing vessels concluded its work in 2007. The study group was chaired by an AFSC scientist and included several scientists from IMR and NMFS. The findings of this study group will be published in an ICES Cooperative Research Report in 2007.
- Scientists from AFSC and IMR convened a theme session on technologies for monitoring fishing activities and observing catch at the 2006 ICES Annual Science Conference in Maastricht, Netherlands.
- AFSC hosted an IMR scientist for one month in 2006; this individual collaborated with AFSC scientists on the analysis of research vessel intercalibration data.
- An IMR scientist spent 10 months in Seattle in 2005 and 2006 as a Norwegian Research Council postdoctoral fellow. He collaborated with scientists at the University of Washington and AFSC on studies of fish behavior and fish avoidance of research vessels
- A workshop on multibeam sonar is planned to take place in Woods Hole in 2007. Scientists from NMFS, IMR, and IRD (France) will participate.
- Book (in preparation): M. Fogarty, B. Megrey, T. Jakobsen, E. Moksness. Fish Reproductive Biology and its Implications for Assessment and Management.
- Book (in preparation): B. Megrey and E. Moksness. Computers in Fishery Research.
- MAR-ECO: Census of Marine Life project to characterize the Mid-Atlantic Ridge Ecosystem; NEFSC to provide *FSV Bigelow* for MAR-ECO cruise in June – July, 2007 (dependent on funding); NEFSC, IMR, NMFS Office of Science and Technology, NOAA Ocean Exploration Program.

### **Overcoming the Barrier to Increased Collaboration**

The major barrier to increased collaboration is the lack of funding. The Norwegian Institute of Marine Research (in association with the Norwegian Research Council) has provided funds for NMFS scientists to participate in two workshops in Norway in 2007 and supported the extended visits of two Norwegian scientists to Seattle in 2006 as described above. NOAA has been unable to provide funds to support these types of activities. A modest amount of funding, on the order of \$100 - 150K/yr, would support travel for scientific exchanges and a post-doctoral fellow.

### **Next meeting**

The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for September 2007, during the ICES Annual Science Conference in Helsinki, Finland.

### **Contacts**

Nancy Thompson  
Director  
Northeast Fisheries Science Center  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
166 Water Street  
Woods Hole, MA 02543-1026  
Telephone: (508) 495-2233  
Fax: (508) 495-2232

Douglas DeMaster  
Director  
Alaska Fisheries Science center  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
7600 Sand Point Way, N.E.  
Building 4  
Seattle, WA 98115-6349  
Telephone; (206) 525-4000  
Fax: (206) 526-4004

### **Republic of Korea Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries (MOMAF)-NOAA Integrated Coastal and Ocean Resources Science and Technical Arrangement**

This Memorandum of Arrangement is between the Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries of the Republic of Korea and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration of the United States of America. It was first signed in November 2000 for a 5-year period and was renewed in 2005 to continue to 2010. The overall purpose of the Arrangement is to pursue scientific and technical cooperation in integrated coastal and ocean resources management in the mutual interest of both countries. The Arrangement provides a framework for the exchange of scientific data and information, personnel and technical knowledge, and envisions cooperative activities, as may be mutually determined, that will enhance the integrated coastal and ocean resources management capabilities of the United States and the Republic of Korea. In addition, each country may, with the consent of the other country, invite other governmental, academic or private entities of the United States and the Republic of Korea to participate in activities undertaken pursuant to this Arrangement.

In August 2005, at the five-year anniversary of the Arrangement, the Parties agreed to conduct a review of the projects from 2000-2006. The review documented benefits, and identified improvements and adjustments for future directions of the overall cooperation. Both sides agreed that the first five years had been successful in building mutual understanding of technical, policy, and programmatic capabilities; and further agreed to increase collaboration in the forthcoming period. The desire to move from information exchange and short term training to sustained multi-year cooperation in technical and resource management areas were mutually recognized.

The MOMAF-NOAA MOA is unique when compared to other NOAA bilateral arrangements in the sense that the contribution of funds to run the projects can be in cash or in-kind resources. MOMAF tended to have provided the funds in cash to NOAA for administration of the activities that are agreed to annually. NOAA generally provided in-kind resources, training, and scientific services to carry out the projects.

Joint Project Agreement, 2006-2007 Each year's projects are described in a Joint Project Agreement (JPA) by a working group of MOMAF and NOAA representatives. This year's JPA covers 14 existing projects and added one new one. The existing projects are on: Fisheries Resources Management, Aquaculture Development, GEOHAB, Ecological Risk Assessment, Ocean Data Exchange and Technical Cooperation, Integrated Coastal Management, Marine Contaminated Sediment Assessment and Remediation, Marine Protected Areas, Sea Grant, Korean Nationals' Training and Education, Marine Pollution, ARGO, LIDAR, and Ocean Observation and Monitoring. The new project is on GEOSS.

The NOAA lead for the first project, Fisheries Resources Management, is the Alaska Fisheries Science Center of NOAA Fisheries in Seattle. The MOMAF counterpart lead is the National Fisheries Research and Development Institute (NFRDI) in Pusan. Six topics are covered under this project: joint research on climate changes and fisheries resources, joint research on ecosystem based assessment and management, training for fisheries resources management procedures, salmon research, bycatch and discard reduction research, and bilateral science workshop.

The second project, Aquaculture Development, also involves NOAA Fisheries; although the NOAA-side project lead is OAR's National Sea Grant Program. The project covers the following topics: cooperative research and scientist exchange for sustainable shrimp production, comparison of the economic performance of offshore aquaculture production between Korea and the USA, automated system for offshore aquaculture, and cod culture.

#### **NOAA Fisheries Contact**

Dr. Loh-Lee Low  
International Coordinator  
Alaska Fisheries Science Center  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
7600 Sand Point Way, N.E., Building 4  
Seattle, WA 98115-6349  
Telephone: (206) 526-4190  
Fax: (206) 526-6723  
E-mail: Loh-Lee.Low@noaa.gov

#### **International Scientific Committee for Tuna and Tuna-Like Species in the North Pacific Ocean (ISC)**

The ISC was established in 1995 through an intergovernmental agreement between the governments of Japan and the United States. Since then, it has undergone a number of changes including a name change in 2005 from "Interim Scientific Committee" to the current "International Scientific Committee" and to membership qualifications. Membership currently is open to coastal states and fishing entities that border the region or that have vessels fishing for tuna and tuna-like species in the region, and to relevant intergovernmental fishery or marine science organizations. Current members of the ISC are Canada, China, Chinese-Taipei, Japan, Korea, Mexico the United States the Food and Agriculture Organization, Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC), the North Pacific Science Organization (PICES) and Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC).

The purpose of the ISC is to enhance scientific research and cooperation for conservation and rational utilization of the species of tuna and tuna-like fisheries which inhabit the North Pacific Ocean and to establish the scientific groundwork for the conservation and rational utilization of these species in the region through a multilateral regime. The Committee is organized into six Working Groups – Statistics, Bycatch, Pacific Bluefin Tuna, Albacore, Swordfish, and Marlins -- that report to a Plenary body. Results of the ISC are made available to participating members and Highly Migratory Species Regional Fishery Management Organizations of the Pacific Ocean. Through

a Memorandum of Understanding, the ISC provides scientific support for the work of the Northern Committee of the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC).

The 6<sup>th</sup> Plenary meeting of the ISC was held in La Jolla, California, U.S.A., March 23-27, 2006 and hosted by the NOAA Fisheries Southwest Fisheries Science Center. Scientists from Canada, Chinese-Taipei, Japan, Korea, Mexico, the United States, IATTC, and the SPC participated. Non-members participating were from the Philippine Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources and the Scientific Committee of the WCPFC.

Key results of the 6<sup>th</sup> meeting. The ISC Plenary reviewed the results of work performed by the Working Groups since the 5<sup>th</sup> meeting. Considerable progress was made in stock assessment research and towards understanding the status of the North Pacific stocks. Additional work is required before definitive conclusions can be provided on stock status of several of the principal species; nonetheless, taking into account recent trends in catch of the fisheries, life history characteristics of the species, and experience from developments of analogous fishery, the ISC concluded that the stocks of North Pacific albacore (*Thunnis alalunga*), Pacific bluefin tuna (*T. orientalis*), and striped marlin (*Tetrapterus audax*) in the North Pacific Ocean are heavily exploited and preliminary information on fishing mortality rates for recent years appears excessive for sustaining high yields from the stocks. The ISC advised that fishing mortality not be increased above recent levels for these stocks as a precautionary measure until the stock assessments underway are completed. The ISC Plenary also adjusted its work plan and recommended accelerated stock assessment research for albacore, Pacific bluefin tuna and swordfish, in order to provide more timely and definitive scientific advice on stock status of these stocks of special concern.

**NOAA Fisheries Contact:**

Dr. William Fox, Jr.  
Southwest Fisheries Science Center  
8604 La Jolla Shores Drive  
La Jolla CA 92037-1508  
Phone: 858-546-7067  
Fax: 858-546-5655

**Office International des Epizooties (OIE)**

The OIE is the WHO's Programme for animal health and is the second of three international health organizations that promulgate standards, which when conformed with, can provide a legal safe harbor in cases of WTO trade disputes. The OIE was established in 1924, and by March of 2001 consisted of 157 member countries. The mission of the OIE is to inform governments of the occurrence and course of animal diseases globally, and the methods which can be implemented to control such diseases. The organization also coordinates international studies for surveillance and control of animal diseases and harmonizes regulations for trade in animals and animal products among member countries.

The Fish Diseases Commission is one of four OIE Specialist Commissions. The role of Specialist Commissions is to study specific problems relating to the epidemiology and control of certain diseases or groups of diseases. The Fish Diseases Commission was created in 1960. One of the reasons for establishing the Fish Diseases Commission was the increasing awareness of the importance of international trade in fish and other aquatic animals, which in recent years has grown considerably.

Web address: <http://www.oie.int/>

Headquarters:

Office International des Epizooties  
12, rue de Prony, 75017 Paris, France  
Telephone: 33 – (0)1 44 15 18 88  
Fax: 33 – (0)1 42 67 09 87  
Email: oie@oie.int

### **Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)**

OECD is a Paris-based international organization that provides a forum for consultations on a wide range of economic issues among developed countries. The OECD Committee for Fisheries meets twice annually (in the spring and fall) and occasionally holds ad hoc technical meetings.

The Committee has agreed on certain basic guidelines in developing its program of work:

- the Committee's role should mainly be to constitute a policy forum for an open and frank exchange of views and experiences on various fisheries matters;
- the Committee should carry out in-depth studies and objective analysis which should lead to potential solutions to problems common to Member countries;
- the Committee should address fishery economic and policy questions at the international level, while avoiding duplicating work done in other international organizations; and
- the Committee should in its work take an interdisciplinary approach, thus exploiting the OECD's comparative advantage.

The Committee for Fisheries is currently debating its mandate and hopes to have an updated version approved by Members by 2008.

The Committee's program of work for 2006-2008 continues its ongoing data collection activities summarized in the Review of Fisheries while focusing on two other areas: 1) reforming fisheries policies in light of commitments to restore fish stocks to achieve maximum sustainable yields by 2015 and 2) meeting the challenges and capturing the benefits of globalization in the fisheries sector while mitigating its costs. As budgets tighten the OECD has increasingly relied on case studies supplied by Members and on workshops which draw on extra-budgetary funds. The United States has submitted case studies on decommissioning schemes, permit buyouts, as well as structural reforms in labor markets.

Web address: [http://www.oecd.org/department/0,2688,en\\_2649\\_33901\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/department/0,2688,en_2649_33901_1_1_1_1_1,00.html)

### **Staff Contacts**

#### *NOAA Fisheries:*

Greg Schneider  
Office of International Affairs  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
1315 East West Highway  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-9090  
Fax: (301) 713-2313  
E-mail: greg.schneider@noaa.gov

#### *OECD Headquarters:*

Carl-Christian Schmidt, Head of Fisheries Division  
OECD  
2, rue André Pascal  
F-75775 Paris Cedex 16  
France  
Telephone: (33-1) 45 24 95 60  
Fax: (33-1) 44 30 61 21  
carl-christian.schmidt@oecd.org

### **Protocol for Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPA) in the Wider Caribbean Region to the Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region (Cartagena Convention)**

SPA was adopted in Kingston, Jamaica, by the member governments of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Caribbean Environment Programme on January 18, 1990. It entered into force on June 18, 2000, after ratification by its ninth Contracting Party. It is one of three Protocols to the Cartagena Convention--the other two deal with cooperation to combat oil spills, adopted in 1983, and land-based marine pollution, adopted in 1999. The SPA Protocol preceded other international environmental agreements in utilizing an ecosystem approach to conservation. It acts as a vehicle to assist with regional implementation of the broader and more demanding global Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD).

The Cartagena Convention is the only legally binding environmental treaty for the wider Caribbean area. The Convention and its Protocols constitute a legal commitment by the participating governments to protect, develop and manage their common waters individually or jointly. UNEP provides the secretariat in Kingston for the Convention and its Protocols.

The stated objectives of the SPA program are:

- To significantly increase the number of and improve the management of national protected areas and species in the region, including the development of biosphere reserves, where appropriate;
- To develop a strong regional capability for the coordination of information exchange, training and technical assistance in support of national biodiversity conservation efforts;
- To develop specific regional, as well as national management plans developed for endangered, threatened or vulnerable species such as sea turtles, the West Indian manatee, black coral and migratory birds;
- To coordinate the development and implementation of the Regional Program for Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife in the Wider Caribbean, in keeping with the mandate of the SPA Protocol;
- To coordinate activities with the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, as well as other biodiversity-related treaties, such as the CITES, Ramsar, Bonn, and Western Hemisphere Conventions.

The Parties to the SPA Protocol are Barbados, Colombia, Cuba, Dominican Republic, France, Netherlands, Panama, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Trinidad and Tobago, and Venezuela. On September 5, 2002,

#### Part IV. Other International Arrangements of Interest

---

the United States Senate, with the reservations, an understanding, and a declaration, gave its advice and consent to the ratification of the Protocol .

Website address: <http://www.cep.unep.org/programmes/spaw/spaw.html>

#### **Staff Contacts**

##### *NOAA Fisheries:*

Nancy K. Daves  
Office of International Affairs (F/IA)  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
1315 East-West Highway  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-9090  
Fax: (301) 713-0376

##### *SPAW:*

UNEP -- Caribbean Environment Programme  
Regional Coordinating Unit  
14-20 Port Royal Street  
Kingston, Jamaica, WI  
Telephone: 876 922-9267  
Fax: 876 922-9292  
Email: [uneprcuja@cwjamaica.com](mailto:uneprcuja@cwjamaica.com)

## **Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)**

SPREP is a regional organization established by the governments and administrations of the Pacific region to look after its environment. It has grown from a small program attached to the South Pacific Commission (SPC) in the 1980s into the Pacific region's major intergovernmental organization charged with protecting and managing the environment and natural resources. It is based in Apia, Samoa, with over 70 staff.

The Pacific island governments and administrations saw the need for SPREP to serve as the conduit for concerted environmental action at the regional level. The establishment of SPREP also sends a clear signal to the global community of the deep commitment of the Pacific island governments and administrations towards sustainable development, especially in light of the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development in the form of the Plan of Implementation, the Millennium Development Goals and Declaration, the Barbados Plan of Action and Agenda 21.

### **Mandate**

SPREP's mandate is to promote cooperation in the Pacific islands region and to provide assistance in order to protect and improve the environment and to ensure sustainable development for present and future generations.

### **Vision**

SPREP's vision is that people of the Pacific islands are better able to plan, protect, manage and use their environment for sustainable development.

### **Focus**

SPREP's unique focus is to sustain the integrity of the ecosystems of the Pacific islands region to support life and livelihoods today and tomorrow.

### **Members**

SPREP has 21 Pacific island member countries and four countries with direct interests in the region.

### **Programmes**

SPREP operates two programmes: Island Ecosystems and Pacific Futures

Website address: <http://www.sprep.org/sprep/about.htm>

### **Staff Contacts**

#### *NOAA Fisheries:*

Dr. Charles Karnella  
Administrator  
Pacific Islands Regional Office  
1601 Kapiolani Blvd., Suite 1110  
Honolulu, HI 96814  
Telephone: (808) 944-2200  
Fax: (808) 973-2941

#### *SPREP:*

Secretariat of the Pacific Regional International Fisheries  
Environment Programme (SPREP)  
PO Box 240, Apia, Samoa  
Telephone: +685 21929  
Fax: +685 20231

## **Treaty on Fisheries Between the Governments of Certain Pacific Island States and the Government of the United States of America (South Pacific Tuna Treaty -- SPTT)**

### **Implementing Legislation**

South Pacific Tuna Act of 1988 as amended ( U.S.C. 973 et seq.).

### **Parties**

The United States, Australia, Cook Islands, Federates States of Micronesia , Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, New Zealand, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, and Samoa.

### **Description**

The SPTT entered into force in 1988. After an initial 5-year agreement, the SPTT was extended in 1993 and again in March 2002, when the Parties agreed to amend and extend the Treaty and to extend the related Economic Assistance Agreement between the United States and the Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) beyond the June 2003 expiration date, for a term of 10 years. The 2002 extension provides licenses for up to 40 U.S. purse seiners, with an option for 5 additional licenses reserved for joint venture arrangements, to fish for tuna in the EEZ's of the Pacific Island Parties. It also contains a number of amendments to the Treaty and its annexes, such as updating the methods available for reporting; a revised procedure for amending the annexes; a revised observer program fee formula; provisions on the use of a vessel monitoring system (VMS); and general provisions on fishing capacity, revenue sharing, and linkages between the Treaty and the Western and Central Pacific Tuna Convention (WCPTC), among others. The SPTT agreement expires on June 14, 2013.

The Treaty is said to be working efficiently and to the benefit of all involved. It has been viewed as a model of international and fishery cooperation. Issues that arise typically are addressed in formal annual consultations between U.S. Government and Pacific Island States representatives, or during informal discussions which also have taken place on an annual basis. The Department of State has specific authority to act for the United States.

### **Budget**

Of the total cost for access under the SPTT, the U.S. tuna industry, as coordinated by the American Tunaboat Owners Association , provides up to \$3 million each year to the Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) located in Honiara, Solomon Islands. The FFA Director and staff act as the SPTT Administrators for the Pacific Island Countries party to the agreement. The FFA deducts a small amount (approx. \$500,000) for treaty administration, after which 15 percent of the revenue is divided equally among FFA members, with the remaining balance (85 percent) distributed on a *pro rata* basis depending on the weight of tuna landed in each respective EEZ. The Director of the FFA is currently Taniela Sua (telephone: 677-21124; fax: 677-23995).

Also associated with the SPTT is an Economic Assistance Agreement between the U.S. Government (U.S. Agency for International Development) and the FFA. The U.S. Government pays \$18 million annually, subject to the availability of appropriated funds for this purpose, into an economic development fund administered by the FFA. The FFA ensures that the fund is used to support economic development programs in the region. Payments to the Pacific Island Countries under the Economic Assistance Agreement are now the only significant source of U.S. economic support for the stability and security of the region outside the assistance provided to the Freely Associated States. Under the terms of the SPTT, both the U.S. tuna industry and the U.S. Government annual payments must be made before any fishing licenses will be issued (renewed annually on June 15th). In addition to paying access fees, the U.S. tuna industry also pays the FFA costs associated with observer coverage (including training), vessel monitoring system deployment and associated recurring costs, and a regional registration fee. Under the new agreement, the overall costs of the industry supported observer fund will be based on 15 vessels making an average

#### Part IV. Other International Arrangements of Interest

---

of five trips and an average observer placement cost of an estimated \$4,500 per trip. Also included are newly agreed costs for program management (\$30,000) and training (\$17,000) resulting in an estimated total cost to the U.S. industry of approximately \$.90,000 annually.

#### **U.S. Administration**

U.S. operational, administrative, and enforcement commitments under the SPTT are carried out by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). These responsibilities are implemented by the NMFS Pacific Islands Regional Office located in Honolulu, Hawaii.

#### **Future Meetings**

The Pacific Island Countries confirmed that the next formal consultation would be held in Vanuatu in mid-March 2007 and that an informal meeting of representatives of the FFA, some PICs, the U.S. purse seine vessel owners and relevant US Government officials, will occur in the last quarter of 2007 in San Diego, California.

#### **Staff Contacts**

##### *NOAA Fisheries:*

Bill Robinson, Administrator  
Pacific Islands Region  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
2570 Dole Street, Room 106  
Honolulu, HI 96822-2396  
Telephone: (808) 973-2937  
Fax: (808) 973-2941  
E-mail: Bill.Robinson@noaa.gov

### **United Nations (UN) Atlas of the Oceans Agreement**

The UN Oceans Atlas is Internet-based, containing information relevant to sustainable development of the oceans and to the advancement of ocean science. It is designed for use by policy makers needing to become familiar with ocean issues and by scientists and resource managers needing access to underlying data bases and approaches to sustainability. The Atlas includes: (1) background on the oceans--from how they were formed, to their physiology, biology, and climatology; (2) uses of the oceans--from food to shipping, mining, energy, etc.; and (3) ocean issues, such as sustainability, food security, global change, and pollution. The project was initially funded by the UN Foundation. Six UN agencies having mandates for oceans and coasts (e.g., UNEP, WMO, IOC) have committed fiscal resources to the project. FAO conducts the project on behalf of the UN because of their expertise in building atlases in support of global decision making and research. Dr. John Everett (formerly of NMFS) is coordinating NOAA involvement. Under a separate agreement, NOAA line offices have supported Dr. Everett's role as the Atlas Project Manager for the UN. He is coordinating the development and maintenance of materials by a dozen UN agencies and several collaborating nations and contractors, through to production of the Atlas product. OAR/OGP, OAR/SG, NESDIS, SDIA and NMFS have shared the direct costs of Dr. Everett's involvement as Project Manager. Website address: [www.oceansatlas.org](http://www.oceansatlas.org)

### **NOAA Fisheries Contact**

Research Analysis and Coordination Division  
Office of Science and Technology  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
1315 East-West Highway  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-2363  
Fax: (301) 713-1875

### **United Nations General Assembly (UNGA)**

The United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) was not traditionally a forum for the discussion of fisheries issues, but this changed in the 1990s when it took up the problem of large-scale, pelagic driftnet fishing on the high seas. UNGA Resolution 44/225, adopted in 1990, called for a moratorium on the use of this fishing gear on the high seas by June 30, 1992. This Resolution was supplanted by UNGA Resolution 46/215, which delayed the effective date of the moratorium until December 31, 1992. Since that time, the United Nations General Assembly has annually provided guidance for the sustainable management of global living marine resources, including implementation of the 1995 UN Fish Stock Agreement. UNGA fisheries resolutions address unauthorized fishing in zones of national jurisdiction and on the high seas; fisheries bycatch and discards; promoting the entry into force of the Food and Agriculture Organization Agreement to Promote Compliance with International Conservation and Management Measures by Fishing Vessels on the High Seas; and promoting the entry into force of the Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 Relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks. Additionally, the UN General Assembly negotiates a resolution that focuses on broader oceans issues, which can affect fisheries management, such as initiatives to address marine debris, marine protected areas and coastal zone management. The United States is represented at each of these negotiations by the Department of State and supported by NOAA and NOAA Fisheries technical expertise.

Web address: <http://www.un.org/Depts/los/>

### **NOAA Fisheries Contact**

Patrick E. Moran  
Office of International Affairs  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
1315 East-West Highway  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-2276  
Fax: (301) 713-2313  
e-mail: [pat.moran@noaa.gov](mailto:pat.moran@noaa.gov)

### **U.S.-Canada International Joint Commission (IJC)**

The IJC is an independent binational organization established by the U.S.-Canada Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909. Canada and the United States created the IJC because they recognized that each country is affected by the other's actions in lake and river systems along their border. The IJC's purpose is to help prevent and resolve disputes relating to the use and quality of boundary waters and to advise Canada and the United States on related questions.

The IJC has six members--three are appointed by the President of the United States, with the advice and approval of the Senate, and three are appointed by the Governor in Council of Canada, on the advice of the Prime Minister. The Commissioners must follow the Treaty as they try to prevent or resolve disputes.

#### United States Section

Dennis L. Schornack, Chair  
Irene B. Brooks, Commissioner  
Allen I. Olson, Commissioner

The Commission has set up more than 20 boards, made up of experts from the United States and Canada, to help it carry out its responsibilities.

#### Contact

U.S. Section, International Joint Commission  
1250 23rd Street, NW  
Suite 100  
Washington, D.C. 20440  
Telephone.: (202) 736-9000  
Fax : (202) 735-9015  
Contact: Frank Bevacqua

Web address: [http://www.ijc.org/en/home/main\\_accueil.htm](http://www.ijc.org/en/home/main_accueil.htm)

### **U.S.-China Marine and Fisheries Science and Technology Protocol**

The United States and China signed the U.S.-China Science and Technology Agreement in Washington, D.C., on January 31, 1979. Twenty five years later, this umbrella agreement contains over 30 individual protocols for science and technology cooperation between the two countries.

The Protocol on Cooperation in Marine and Fishery Science and Technology was signed on May 8, 1979. At the latest meeting in Silver Spring, Maryland, on March 5-6, 2002, the Protocol was extended through May 8, 2004. NOAA is the lead U.S. Agency for this protocol; the State Oceanic Administration (SOA) is the lead agency for China.

Marine and Fisheries S&T Protocol: The Objectives for the Marine and Fisheries S&T Protocol are:

1. To promote diplomatic relations with China;
2. To exchange spatial and historical data and information unique to the two countries;
3. To make marine and fishery research more cost effective;
4. To achieve more global coverage for marine and scientific studies, including PRC-controlled waters;
5. To enhance marine and fishery S&T activities; and
6. To assist China in becoming a contributing oceanographic research power.

The Protocol contains five major areas of cooperation where bilateral panels have been set up to meet periodically:

- (1) Data and Information Exchange,
- (2) Marine Environmental Services,
- (3) Understanding the Role of the Oceans in Climate Change,
- (4) Living Marine Resources, and
- (5) Marine and Coastal Management.

Living Marine Resources (LMR): The 6th U.S.-China Joint Coordination for Living Marine Resources Cooperation was held in New Orleans, Louisiana, January 17-21, 2005. The co-chairs (Dr. James McVey, Aquaculture Program Director of the National Sea Grant College Program, and Mr. Kexin Li, Vice-President of the Chinese Academy of Fishery Sciences) reaffirmed that the U.S.-China LMR Program has established an effective vehicle for cultivating win-win partnerships and collaborative relations between the two countries. The co-chairs shared the common understanding that the U.S. and China will continue collaborative efforts to optimize ecosystem based management for living marine resources by promoting scientific research and education between the two countries. The topical areas where collaboration is expected to take place over the next two years are: (1) endocrinology of shrimp reproduction, maturation and spawning; (2) research on Chinese sturgeon in the Yangtze Estuary and Coastal East China Sea; (3) study on virology of aquatic organism; (4) seaweed cultivation, biology and biotechnology. (5) study on HAB toxins, and (6) aquaculture education exchange between China and the U.S.. The next panel meeting will be held in China in 2007.

The U.S.-China Joint Coordination Panel for Living Marine Resource Cooperation has maintained an active level of technical exchange between the United States and China in aquaculture and fisheries. China and the U. S. have worked together on fishery data exchange, marine macro-algae genetics and culture, scallop culture and disease, shrimp culture and disease, marine fish culture and management, and genetic technologies for several species groups as well as earlier work on jellyfish harvest and processing. Both countries have benefited from this mutual exchange and long-term cooperation. For example, the Living Marine Resource Panel has worked together to develop new strains of pathogen free shrimp to improve industry performance, to exchange macro-algae strains for improved culture performance, to develop ecosystem models in Xincun Bay in Hainan, China, to develop aquaculture school curricula between schools in both countries, and to exchange fisheries data and information through web-page development and agency cooperation.

U.S. Co-Chair: (unfilled), NOAA

Chinese Co-Chair: Mr. LI Jieren, Vice President, Chinese Academy of Fisheries Sciences (CAFS)

Other Marine and Fishery S&T Projects: Other projects conducted under the Marine and Fishery S&T umbrella include:

Data and Information Exchange: The U.S.-China Data and Information Panel has served as an important mechanism to foster cooperation in data and information exchange between the two countries. Based on the principle of free and open exchange of marine and fishery scientific information, much oceanographic and meteorological data for research and other uses have been exchanged. This has resulted in the World Ocean Database (WOD). The U.S. delegation proposed to begin development of a data atlas for the South China Sea/Sea of Japan/western Pacific using oceanographic profile data. The Chinese delegation agreed to continue exchanging data and personnel to focus on areas such as GTSP (Global Temperature-Salinity Profile Program), ARGO, XML (Extensible Markup Language), satellite data processing, coastal monitoring, and Harmful Algal Blooms, most of which were discussed at the 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Panel. Both delegations agreed that the resulting data will be shared freely and openly to achieve greater societal benefits.

In addition, the world still lacks a global network of coastal tide gauges capable of providing timely access to complementary data to achieve maximal benefit from tide gauges. Both delegations agreed to collaborate on timely access to “fast-delivery” tide gauge data from Chinese GLOSS (Global Sea Level Observing System) tide gauges as part of the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) GLOSS, under the auspices of the China-U.S. Protocol on Marine and Fishery Science and Technology.

U.S. Co-Chair (Acting): Terry Tielking, NOAA/NODC

Chinese Co-Chair: LIN Shaohua, SOA/NMDIS

Understanding the Role of the Oceans in Climate Change: Since 1994, U.S.-China cooperation in coupled ocean/atmospheric climate research became dormant primarily due to shift in China's research priorities and the lack of funding at both sides. However, at the 16th JWG Meeting, both sides shared a common understanding that China and the U.S. need to further strengthen their partnership over the next decade to provide enhanced coverage of in-situ ocean observations in the Pacific, the Arctic Ocean, and the Indian Ocean to support the implementation of the ocean components of the Global Earth Observation System of Systems (GEOSS) declared by the Earth Observation Summit. Both delegations recognized a common, global goal of seeking increased support to sustain these technological advancements in ocean science. In this context, both sides agreed to rejuvenate the Role of the Ocean in Climate Change Panel. Currently, NOAA and SOA are communicating regarding the follow ups through correspondence.

In this context, both sides agreed to rejuvenate the Role of the Ocean in Climate Change Panel with the initial meeting to be hosted by the U.S.. It was agreed that the next panel meeting would be co-chaired by Dr. Chester Koblinsky, Director of the Climate Program and Mr. LI Xiaoming, Director-General of the Department of Environmental Protection of SOA. The size of the panel would be no greater than ten (10) scientists and government administrative officials from each side. The specific venue and a date of this panel meeting will be confirmed through correspondence of the Panel co-chair persons.

Marine and Coastal Management: The U.S.-China Joint Coordination Panel for Integrated Coastal and Ocean Management held its Third Meeting in Xian, Shaanxi Province, China, November 3-4, 2003, and held its Fourth Meeting in Silver Spring, Maryland, USA, in February 2006. Focal areas of this program were: marine biodiversity conservation, environmental monitoring and emergency response, sea area use, integrated coastal management, and enforcement. In 2004-05, NOAA and SOA participated in several delegation exchanges in areas including sea area use, harmful algal bloom diagnostics and forecasting, ocean policy discussions, and ocean public education and outreach. In addition, in late 2005, the U.S. Trade Development Administration (TDA) approved a proposal submitted by SOA for a feasibility study for designing an "Integrated Coastal Management Emergency Response System in the Bohai Sea". In 2005, NOAA and SOA began collaborations to improve access and distribution of publicly available coastal and ocean satellite imagery for the research community in an extension of NOAA's current Coastwatch and Oceanwatch programs.

Polar Sciences: The 2nd US-China Joint Coordination Panel for Polar Sciences held its Second Meeting in China, 2006. Focal areas of this program were: (1) Joint research as a part of the International Study of Arctic Change (ISAC); (2) Development of Sino-US project plan for the implementation of Arctic research; (3) Joint study on the linkages between the Arctic ocean circulation and mid-latitude climate change; (4) Bilateral activities during the International Polar Year in 2007-2008; (5) Application of satellite remote sensing in polar research; and (6) Data exchange and sharing.

#### **NOAA Fisheries Contact**

Michael Abbey  
Office of Science and Technology  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
1315 East-West Highway  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-2367  
Fax: (301) 713-1875

### **U.S.-France Cooperative Program**

Under the U.S.-France Cooperative Program in Oceanography, the Director of the Northeast Fisheries Science Center serves as the U.S. Program Leader for the Living Resources Panel. French and U.S. scientists have collaborated on various projects including: (1) Technological Interactions in Multi-Species Fisheries; (2) Age Composition of Fisheries Catch; (3) Genetic Manipulation: Shellfish and Marine Invertebrates; (4) COADS (Comprehensive Ocean-Atmosphere Data Set) Data Bank for Fisheries; (5) CEOS (Climate and Eastern Ocean Systems); (6) Spatio-temporal Scales in the Dynamics of Exploited Populations; and (7) Automated Image Processing Techniques for Classification and Assessment of Living Resources.

#### **NOAA Fisheries Contact**

Northeast Fisheries Science Center  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
166 Water Street  
Woods Hole, MA 02543-1026  
Telephone: (508) 495-2233  
Fax: (508) 495-2232

### **U.S.-Republic of Ireland Cooperation**

*The Joint Statement to Pursue Collaboration in the Programmes of Marine Research and Technology Development, Sustainable Development, Coastal Zone Management, and Marine Coastal Protected Areas Between the Marine Institute of Ireland and the U.S. Department of Commerce National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration* was signed by Commerce Secretary Ron Brown and the Irish Minister for Marine and Natural Resources Sean Barrett in December 1995. A \$5 million/5-year collaboration between NOAA and the Marine Institute of Ireland was initiated in October 1999.

The Joint Statement has committed NOAA to collaborate with Irish marine scientists and managers in the development of theoretical and applied marine scientific research and technology. The collaborative NOAA-MI program continues to foster the exchange of ideas, supports "best practice" in scientific methodology, and improves understanding of the marine ecosystem.

Representatives of both organizations met in Dublin (December 1998) and Washington (1999) to identify a range of co-operative activities which would be of mutual benefit and provide a vehicle for collaboration, including technology transfer, staff exchange, and training.

#### **Overall Objective**

The Flagship Project of the Joint Statement was defined as "The Application of Ocean Data Management, Remote Sensing and Modeling of Ocean Conditions to Improve Our Understanding of the Factors that Influence Fisheries Recruitment, Harmful Algal Events and Salmon Migration." Four applications groups consisting of Irish and U.S. experts were defined under the flagship project and have been meeting since 2000:

- Fisheries Application Group
- Harmful Algal Events Application Group
- Salmon Management Application Group.
- Ocean Data Management Group

#### Part IV. Other International Arrangements of Interest

---

A series of annual meetings in June 2000 (Athlone, Ireland), January 2001 (Betteystown, Ireland) and May 2002 (Woods Hole, USA) have been held to define specific work programs, aims and objectives for each of the application groups:

The Fisheries Application Group has been working toward determining spawning grounds through egg and larval surveys using MOCHNESS sampling gear in conjunction with remote sensing and drifter buoy technology.

The Harmful Algal Events Application Group is undertaking work on behalf of the shellfish industry, including investigations of early warning systems, automated information distribution systems, biotoxin chemistry, phytoplankton biology and remote sensing.

The Salmon Management Application Group is collaboratively undertaking the following lines of interest: to provide a scientific basis for salmon abundance forecasting, focusing on survival and migratory patterns at sea; the exchange of information on the governance and integration of the aquaculture industry with other inshore interests; and estimation of angling catches. These are just an example of the Group's projects.

The Ocean Data Management Group entered into the activity of collecting retrospective physical, biological, and chemical oceanographic data in support of the research aims of the other applications groups. An inventory of this data is available. Additionally, the group is supporting the development of physical oceanographic modeling to predict currents around the Irish coast, the Northwest Atlantic shelf, and shelf edge to provide input to the applications groups.

Recently, the two countries have developed new collaborative efforts to study deep sea corals. NOAA works very closely with the Chair of the Irish Coral Task Force and representatives of Canada, Australia, and several European nations (Belgium, France, Germany, Great Britain, Ireland, Italy, Norway, and Sweden) on topics such as mapping the density and distribution of deep-sea corals, as well as understanding their ecological importance. Comprised of scientists from 11 nations, including the United States, the International Steering Committee is charged with developing and implementing a biannual international deep-sea corals science conference. The 2005 conference, hosted by NOAA, will be held in the United States. NOAA, Canada, and the European community are expected to hold a planning workshop in Spring 2004 to begin discussions on undertaking a multi-nation trans-Atlantic expedition in Summer 2005.

Website address: <http://www.marine.ie/partnerships/international/>

#### **NOAA Fisheries Contact**

Office of Science and Technology  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
1315 East-West Highway  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-2367  
Fax: (301) 713-1875

### **U.S.-Morocco Cooperation**

The United States established fisheries ties with the Government of Morocco in 1975, when a U.S. Regional Fisheries Attaché position was established in Casablanca. These ties were formalized by a series of agreements signed in Washington, D.C., in May 1983. The agreements call for cooperative exchanges between Moroccan and U.S. fishery scientists as a part of an agreement linking the NMFS Southeast Fisheries Science Center and the Institut Scientifique des Peche Maritimes in Casablanca. In early December 1996, a delegation from NMFS visited Morocco to encourage marine scientific exchanges and help establish a science-based fisheries management program similar to that of the United States. Both the United States and Morocco are interested in a plan that will: (1) rebuild and maintain sustainable fisheries, (2) promote the recovery of protected or endangered species, and (3) protect and maintain the health of coastal marine habitats.

Since that time, cooperation with Morocco has varied. Most recently, the NMFS Office of International Affairs has been pursuing several joint projects with the Ministère de l'Agriculture du Développement Rural et de la Pêche. Very little progress has been made in the Mediterranean region in addressing the issue of fisheries bycatch, particularly of sea turtles. Sea turtles can become entangled in drift gillnets, hooked in longline fishing gear or other fishing gears and drown. Compounding the loss of these sea turtles is that no data are collected on the level of interaction or where it is taking place, increasing the difficulty in monitoring these populations and improving management. Morocco is in the process of phasing out its driftnet fishery for swordfish and transitioning to the use of longlines. While longlines are less destructive than driftnets there are still bycatch issues associated with them, including effects on turtles. The main focus of the NMFS projects has been the phase-out of Morocco's driftnet fishery, specifically to help their transition to longline gear. Given the known interactions between sea turtles and other bycatch species with longline gear, the United States has been working to encourage Morocco to require the use of circle hooks in their longline fisheries. In 2007, two workshops are in the process of being planned to teach Moroccan fishermen safe handling and release techniques for sea turtles and use of circle hooks. In addition, the NMFS Southwest Science Center has been conducting sea turtle research work with driftnet fishermen in Morocco. Notably, asking fishermen to document and report their interactions with sea turtles as well as doing nesting beach research.

The United States is in the process of developing an MOA between NOAA and the Government of Morocco for technical assistance in a variety of areas including fisheries (NMFS), coastal zone management (NOS), and use of satellite monitoring systems to analyze desertification (NESDIS) and other issues.

#### **NOAA Fisheries Contact**

Kelly Denit  
Office of International Affairs  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
1315 East-West Highway  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-2276  
Fax: (301) 713-2313

### **U.S.-South Africa Cooperative Program**

The Conservation, Environment, and Water Committee of the U.S.-South Africa Binational Commission was established, in part, to assist South Africa maintain its high quality of oceanographic and fisheries science through increased cooperation with international marine scientists and organizations, and to seek increased participation of under-represented communities in marine sciences.

### **U.S.-Vietnam Fisheries Cooperation Program**

The bilateral fisheries relationship with Vietnam began in earnest during 1998 and was initiated with the exchange of several fishery scientists from both sides. In October 1998, NOAA Fisheries Assistant Administrator Rolland Schmitten led a U.S. fisheries delegation composed of both government and private sector representatives to Vietnam. The visit resulted in agreement to continue cooperative exchanges designed to provide benefits to both sides. During 1999 and 2000, a wide variety of scientific exchanges took place, the most notable being the participation of a NOAA Fisheries scientist on a Vietnamese fisheries research cruise during October 2000.

During 2000 and 2001, there was a lull in exchange activity, although Vietnam did express a passing interest in formalization a relationship based on exchange of scientific personnel. At the 2001 APEC Oceans Ministerial in Korea, Vietnam once again expressed interest in continuing the bilateral exchanges of scientific personnel and to further our dialogue on trade issues of mutual interest. Although no mention was made of the development of a formal relationship, Vietnam requested that the United States send a delegation to Hanoi for these discussions. In March 2003, Dr. Rebecca Lent, NMFS Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, led a delegation of NMFS and Department of State representatives to Hanoi. The agenda for this meeting covered possible future work with Vietnam in areas relating to fisheries science, conservation and management policy, enforcement, and trade. This meeting resulted in a commitment by the United States and Vietnam to examine areas where future cooperation might take place. Although no formal agreement or monetary commitment was made, the stage was set for enhanced cooperation between the two governments.

During November 2003, a delegation from the Vietnamese Ministries of Fisheries, Science and Technology, and Finance spent approximately one week in the United States meeting with representatives of U.S. federal agencies and research institutions and on issues of fisheries management, aquaculture and science and technology. The itinerary for this trip included two days in the Washington, D.C. area, where they met with NOAA officials at the Department of Commerce and with NOAA Fisheries and other agency representatives in Silver Spring, MD. They also visited the University of Maryland's Center of Marine Biotechnology (COMB) and the National Aquarium in Baltimore. The U.S. visit was concluded with two days in the Seattle/Puget sound area for visits to the NOAA Fisheries Northwest Fisheries Science Center Manchester Field Station aquaculture facility, the Washington State Salmon Hatchery, and the Alaska Fisheries Science Center (located in Seattle).

Although communications continue at the staff level, no formal U.S.-Vietnam bilateral meetings took place during 2006. It is possible that such a meeting will take place in Fall 2007.

#### **Staff Contact**

*NOAA Fisheries:*

Patrick E. Moran  
Office of Sustainable Fisheries  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
1315 East-West Highway  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-2276  
Fax: (301) 713-2313  
e-mail: pat.moran@noaa.gov

## **Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission (WECAFC)**

### **Basic Instrument**

Article VI-1 of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) Constitution. Resolution 4/61 of the FAO Council at its Sixty-first Session in November 1973. Statutes amended by FAO Council in December 1978.

### **Implementing Legislation**

None.

### **Member Nations**

Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominica, France, European Community, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Japan, Korea (Rep. of), Mexico, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Panama, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Spain, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom, United States, and Venezuela.

### **Commission Headquarters**

FAO Sub-Regional Office for the Caribbean  
6<sup>th</sup> Floor, Tom Adams Financial Centre  
P.O. Box 631C  
Bridgetown, Barbados

Secretary: Mr. Bisessar Chakalall  
Telephone: 246 426 7110  
Fax: 246 426 7111  
Web address: [http://www.fao.org/fi/body/rfb/WECAFC/wecafc\\_home.htm](http://www.fao.org/fi/body/rfb/WECAFC/wecafc_home.htm)

### **U.S. Representation**

The Assistant Regional Administrator for Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service Southeast Region, generally heads the U.S. delegation to WECAF.

### **Description**

#### A. Mission/Purpose:

WECAF's purpose is to facilitate the coordination of research; to encourage education and training; to assist Member Governments in establishing rational policies; and to promote the rational management of resources of interest to two or more countries. The Commission has an advisory management function but no regulatory powers.

#### B. Organizational Structure:

The Commission, composed of all Members, is the central policy forum. The Commission has four Subsidiary Committees: (1) Working Party on Assessment of Marine Fishery Resources; (2) Working Party on Fishery Economics and Planning; (3) Committee for the Development and Management of Fisheries in the Lesser Antilles; and (4) the Ad hoc working groups.

### **Recent Developments**

At its most recent meeting of the Commission succeeded in updating statutes for a strengthened WECAFC in October 2005. These will be forwarded to the FAO Council for their concurrence. The US has been working to promote the effective conservation and management of living marine resources in the region through the work of WECAFC's Ad Hoc Working Groups. We participated in a workshop of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Queen Conch and, with funds from the State Department; we supported a workshop of the Ad Ho Working Group on Spiny Lobster. We have been instrumental in promoting better collaboration between FAO-WECAFC and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) and succeeded in the adoption of a consensus text between the two bodies for a Memorandum of Understanding.

### **Staff Contacts**

#### *NOAA Fisheries:*

Nancy K. Daves  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
Office of International Affairs  
1315 East-West Highway  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-9090  
Fax: (301) 713-2313  
E-mail: nancy.daves@noaa.gov

National Marine Fisheries Service  
Southeast Regional Office  
9721 Executive Center Drive N.  
St. Petersburg, Florida 33702  
Telephone: (727) 570-5305  
Fax: (727) 570-5583  
\\WECAF Contact:

FAO Subregional Office for the Caribbean  
P.O. Box 631C  
Barbados  
Telephone: +246 426 7110  
Fax: +246 426 7111

### **World Health Organization (WHO) of the United Nations**

The WHO of the United Nations is the premier international organization whose mission is to ensure the attainment by all people the highest level of health. For WHO purposes, health is defined as "a state of complete physical, mental, and societal well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity." WHO was founded in 1948 and has four main functions to: (1) provide international guidance in the field of health; (2) establish global standards for health; (3) assist national governments in improving their health plans; and (4) engage in developing and transferring health technologies, standards, and information. WHO conducts numerous food safety activities, and along with FAO, is a joint sponsor of Codex.

Web address: <http://www.who.int/home-page/>

**NOAA Fisheries Contact**

E. Spencer Garrett  
National Seafood Inspection Laboratory  
P.O. Drawer 1207  
Pascagoula, Mississippi 39568-1207  
Telephone: (228) 769-8964  
Fax: (228) 762-7144

**World Trade Organization (WTO)**

The WTO (formerly the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) was established in 1947, and is the international organization that negotiates and enforces trade rules and periodically convenes multilateral trade negotiations. The last completed multilateral trade negotiations, the Uruguay Round, began in 1986 and concluded in 1994. NOAA Fisheries has two broad fishery-related interests in WTO: (1) defending our conservation laws in WTO dispute settlement; and (2) negotiating fisheries tariffs, non-tariff barriers, and subsidies in the trade rounds.

The Fourth WTO Ministerial Conference was held in Doha, Qatar, from November 9-14, 2001. The Ministers agreed to launch negotiations on the relationship between existing WTO rules and trade obligations set out in multilateral environmental agreements. The negotiations will address how WTO rules are to apply to WTO members that are parties to environmental agreements. Ministers also agreed to clarify and improve WTO rules that apply to fisheries subsidies. The issue of fisheries subsidies has been studied in the WTO Trade and Environment Committee for several years. Some studies demonstrate these subsidies can be environmentally damaging if they lead to too many fishermen chasing too few fish. The U.S. position has been that WTO Members should eliminate subsidies that lead to overcapacity, overfishing and that distort trade. Negotiations on subsidies to the fisheries sector are taking place in the Negotiating Group on Rules and have proven to be very contentious.

Ministers instructed the Trade and Environment Committee to pay particular attention to eliminating or reducing trade restrictions and distortions to benefit trade, the environment and development as part of its on-going work. Finally, Ministers charged the Trade and Environment Committee to look at the impact of eco-labeling on trade and examine whether existing WTO rules stand in the way of eco-labeling policies. Parallel discussions are to take place in the Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) Committee.

Ministers reaffirmed their commitment to a successful conclusion of the Doha Development Agenda as relates to fisheries subsidies in Hong Kong in December 2005. Negotiations at the WTO since that time have progressed remarkably with the latest submissions in 2006-2007 focusing on legal text for an agreement.

Web address: <http://www.wto.org/>

**NOAA Fisheries Contact**

Greg Schneider  
Office of International Affairs  
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
1315 East West Highway  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Telephone: (301) 713-9090  
Fax: (301) 713-2313  
E-mail: [greg.schneider@noaa.gov](mailto:greg.schneider@noaa.gov)

## **PART V. APPENDIX**

### **Governing International Fishery Agreements (GIFAs) Between the United States and Foreign Entities**

Pursuant to the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act), Title II, Section 201, foreign fishing within the U.S. 200-mile Exclusive Economic Zone may only be conducted under a GIFA.

Although many GIFAs have been concluded since the enactment of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, the following list includes only active agreements that are currently in force or in the process of being extended.

Status as of July 1, 2007.

<b>Country</b>	<b>Expiration Date</b>	<b>Status</b>
Russia	December 31, 2009	Extended