

Report of the seventh session of the

COMMITTEE ON FISHERIES

Rome, 6 - 13 April 1972



FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
ROME, 1972

REPORT
of the
SEVENTH SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE ON FISHERIES
Rome, 6-13 April 1972

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Rome, May 1972

PREPARATION OF THIS REPORT

This is the final version of the Report as approved by the Seventh Session of the Committee on Fisheries.

Distribution:

All FAO Member Nations and Associate
Members
Participants in the Session
Other interested Nations and International
Organizations
FAO Department of Fisheries
FAO Regional Fishery Officers

Bibliographic Entry:

FAO. Committee on Fisheries.
Rome, 6-13 April 1972 (1972)
FAO Fish.Rep., (123):41 p.
Report of the seventh session

Conferences. Resource development.
International exchange. International
organizations. Legislation - law of the
sea. Pollution - marine.

15 May 1972

Mr. Michel Cépède
Independent Chairman
Council of FAO

Dear Sir,

I have the honour to transmit to you herewith the Report of the Seventh Session of the Committee on Fisheries which was held in Rome from 6 to 13 April 1972.

Yours faithfully,

E.G. Goonewardene
Chairman
Committee on Fisheries

CONTENTS

	<u>Paragraphs</u>
OPENING OF THE SESSION	1 - 3
ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE SESSION	4 - 5
ELECTION OF OFFICERS	6 - 8
INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION IN THE RATIONAL UTILIZATION OF FISHERY RESOURCES	9
(a) Some problems of management	10 - 20
(b) Developments in regional fishery bodies in regard to management	21 - 25
(c) Functions of the Committee on Fisheries	26 - 32
TECHNICAL CONFERENCE ON FISHERY MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT	33 - 42
COOPERATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM IN RELATION TO FISHERIES	
(i) UN Conference on the Human Environment	43
(ii) Inter-Secretariat Committee on Scientific Programmes Relating to Oceanography (ICSPRO)	44
(iii) Marine pollution	45 - 47
(iv) International cooperative investigations of the IOC	48
(v) Conference on the Law of the Sea	49 - 52
(vi) Relations with UNIDO	53
(vii) Relations with IMCO	54
REVIEW OF THE PROGRAMMES OF WORK OF THE ORGANIZATION	
(a) Medium-Term Plan 1972-77	55 - 67
(b) Policy and operational aspects of the field programme	68 - 78
<u>Guest speaker</u>	68
MATTERS CONSIDERED BY THE COUNCIL AND CONFERENCE OF FAO	79 - 82
REPORTS AND RECORDS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FISHERIES	83 - 84
DATE AND PLACE OF NEXT SESSION	85
OTHER MATTERS	86
MATTERS REQUIRING THE ATTENTION OF THE COUNCIL	87
	<u>Pages</u>
Appendix A List of Participants	15 - 26
Appendix B Address by the Deputy Director-General at the Opening Session	27 - 31
Appendix C Agenda	32
Appendix D List of Documents	33 - 34
Appendix E Terms of Reference for the ACMRR Working Party on Marine Mammals	35
Appendix F Address by L.J.C. Evans, Director, Agriculture Projects Department, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	36 - 41

OPENING OF THE SESSION

1. The Committee on Fisheries (COFI) held its Seventh Session from 6 to 13 April 1972 at FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy. The Session was attended by the representatives of 60 nations, members of the Committee, by observers from five other nations and by representatives from nine international organizations. A list of participants is given in Appendix A to this report.
2. Mr. K. Sunnanå (Norway), elected Chairman at the Fifth Session of the Committee, was in the Chair at the opening of the Session.
3. The Committee was welcomed, on behalf of the Director-General of FAO, in an opening address by Mr. Roy I. Jackson, Deputy Director-General of FAO. This address is reproduced in Appendix B to this report.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE SESSION

4. In adopting the Provisional Agenda the Committee agreed to the inclusion of a new item, Discussion of the Advisability of FAO Convening a Technical Conference on Fishery Management and Development, proposed by Canada. The Agenda, as adopted by the Committee, is given in Appendix C to this report. The documents which were before the Committee are listed in Appendix D to this report.
5. A Drafting Committee was appointed, consisting of the representatives of Argentina, France, Indonesia, Kenya and the United States of America.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

6. According to Rule I of its Rules of Procedure, the Committee was required to elect a Chairman, a first Vice-Chairman and four other Vice-Chairmen at the Session after the election of its members by the FAO Council. The members of the Committee were appointed at the Fifty-Eighth Session of the Council on 26 November 1971.
7. A Nominations Committee was appointed, consisting of the representatives of Australia, Brazil, India, Kenya, Libyan Arab Republic, Netherlands, Poland and the United States of America.
8. On the recommendation of the Nominations Committee, Mr. E.G. Goonewardene (Ceylon) was unanimously elected as Chairman of the Committee, Mr. F. Marcitllach Guazo (Spain) as First Vice-Chairman, and the representatives of Iran, Panama, Sierra Leone and the United States of America as other Vice-Chairmen.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION IN THE RATIONAL UTILIZATION OF FISHERY RESOURCES

9. The Assistant Director-General (Fisheries) addressing the Committee, pointed out that the need for making the best possible use of the riches of the seas and inland waters continued to grow in urgency. He emphasized that while solutions to specific problems had to be found by the regional and specialized bodies and by governments, while the scientific basis for these solutions had to be elaborated by scientists, and while the problems had to be considered in a wider context than that of fisheries, the Committee remained the only forum where the international problems of fisheries could be dealt with as a whole.

(a) Some problems of management

The role of the Committee on Fisheries

10. The Committee stressed the importance of management and rational utilization of fishery resources, particularly in regard to its terms of reference "to conduct periodic general reviews of fishery problems of an international character with a view to concerted action".

The activities of the Committee could take three forms - discussion of problems of common interest to several regional fishery bodies; discussion of the general principles and techniques of management and a continuing overall review of the status of fish stocks throughout the world and of their management.

11. Some common problems were identified in the document prepared by the Secretariat (COFI/72/4), and in the discussions in the Committee. These included the question of the use of fish for reduction (discussed in more detail in paragraphs 19-20) and the timeliness with which management measures are introduced. This last was considered to be of special importance in view of the considerable number of cases in which no or insufficient measures had been introduced until both the stocks and the fisheries based on them had suffered damage. Such failures had occurred even when appropriate fishery bodies dealing with specific sea areas or specific species had been in existence.

12. In the review of the types of general problems that might be discussed by the Committee on Fisheries, it was stressed that political questions and controversial questions of general economic policy, as well as the actual decision on the implementation of specific management measures, were not the concern of the Committee on Fisheries but were within the responsibility of the appropriate independent regional fishery body. The Committee on Fisheries, and the Department of Fisheries, had, however, an important role in helping to provide the scientific and technical basis for the work of regional fishery bodies, especially those largely composed of developing countries, established within the framework of FAO, and in the study of general principles and techniques of management. In this study, and in any review that the Committee on Fisheries might make of the status of stocks and their management, the Committee would require support from the concerned units in the Department of Fisheries. In general this support should follow the lines outlined in the report of the Sixth Session of the Committee on Fisheries (FID/R103, paragraphs 47-56). The Committee also suggested that general studies of the techniques of management should receive particular attention from FAO.

Conservation of Whales

13. The present knowledge of the status of exploitation of whale stocks, and the activities of the International Whaling Commission (IWC) were reviewed in COFI/72/4. In welcoming this review, the Committee noted that its conclusion on the status of stocks was in agreement with that of other groups, such as the Scientific Committee of IWC, and the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN).

14. Considering the history of the past 25 years, it was clear that the IWC had not accomplished its main task of maintaining or restoring several major stocks of whales close to the level giving the maximum sustainable yield. However, its recent performance had been more effective. The Committee noted a statement by a group of most of the world's leading whale scientists: "Action has been taken by the IWC to rebuild stocks of the most depleted species (blue, bowhead, humpback, gray and right). Reduction of fin and sei whale stocks which had been occurring at a very rapid rate has been slowed or stopped. ... this is not good enough since no deliberate action is yet being taken to rebuild the very important Antarctic fin whale stocks."

15. In considering steps that could be taken to improve the present management of whale stocks, the Committee stressed the importance of implementing the International Observer Scheme and of setting catch quotas in the Antarctic in terms of species rather than the Blue Whale Unit. The Committee welcomed the statement made by one of the delegations from the whaling countries that both measures were expected to be implemented as of this year.

16. The Committee also noted that while uncertainty concerning the exact status of the stocks was a significant obstacle to agreement on management measures, very few scientists were devoting much time to the stock assessment of whales. It was also noted that the lack of biological and statistical information contributed remarkably to this uncertainty.

The Committee therefore believed, in order to resolve what appears to be a considerable degree of public concern in many countries on this subject, that it would be helpful for FAO to sponsor a scientific study by a group of competent scientists who, in formulating their report, would remain their findings with the scientists of the IWC. It was felt that this study might well be undertaken as a major activity of a Working Party of the Advisory Committee of Experts on Marine Resources Research (ACMRR), which, in view of the serious concern being expressed in respect of other marine mammals, should review the status of stocks of seals, porpoises and other marine mammals as well. A statement on behalf of the Officers of ACMRR is attached as Appendix E.

17. In order to be effective, the activities of the ACMRR Working Party would need to be facilitated by supporting work of FAO staff. It was recognized that the extent of this work would have to depend on the availability of funds, either within the Regular Programme or from other sources. The successful progress of such work would also depend on improving the collection, by countries, of the basic information on catches, and relevant biological data, and the Committee stressed the paramount importance of the collection of these data wherever marine mammals are caught and studied.

Tuna

18. The Committee considered the problems of the management of tuna, and the suggestion in COFI/72/4 for a worldwide tuna management body. It considered that although the management of tuna in different oceans had many elements in common, including possible interactions between events in different regions, there was no need, at least at present, for establishing a single body responsible for the management of tuna in all parts of the world. Rather, the emphasis at present should be given to improving and strengthening the coordination and cooperation that already existed between the various regional bodies concerned with management of tuna. This cooperation could be especially close in the collection, compilation and analysis of statistics and biological data, in stock assessment studies and relevant environmental investigations. Some delegates felt that, in the long run, this cooperation might result in a coalescing of at least the scientific activities of those bodies.

Use of fish for production of fish meal

19. The Committee welcomed the summary review of the question given in paragraphs 47-52 of COFI/72/4. It noted that when there was no practical alternative use for the fish stocks concerned, restriction of fishing for reduction was undesirable except where needed to restrict the catches to within the potential of the resource concerned. However, the desirability of developing uses of such fish for direct human consumption was stressed and the work already being done by FAO in this field was welcomed.

20. The use of fish for reduction may become a serious problem when such fisheries are catching fish from a stock which is also used for direct consumption, and when this stock is, or is likely to become, fully or over-exploited. In the event of such conflict, a priority should be given to fisheries for direct human consumption, particularly if the reduction fisheries catch an excessive proportion of small or immature individuals. The Committee noted, however, that in most cases economic factors would in the long run result in the conflict being resolved in favour of using fish for direct human consumption because of higher prices. It also noted that where a management regime involved the allocation of catch quotas to individual countries, the use made of these national quotas was a matter of national concern.

(b) Developments in regional fishery bodies in regard to management

21. The Committee was informed of the progress made in the field of fish stock assessment and management by five regional fishery bodies established within the framework of FAO which are concerned with marine fisheries.

22. The Committee expressed its satisfaction with the work of FAO bodies in this area and with the opportunity of reviewing a specific and essential aspect of the work of these regional fishery bodies. It commended the important work carried out by them in this field, in particular with respect to the collection, processing and analysis of statistical and biological data and in determining the stocks which were in need of regulation. It noted the support provided by FAO for this work. It also recognized that as the work of the regional bodies gained momentum there will also be greater demand for FAO assistance, especially bearing in mind the lack of specialized expertise in some countries and areas. This would require a strengthening of the support which FAO could supply, a matter which had to be borne in mind in formulating the programmes of the FAO Department of Fisheries, e.g. the Medium-Term Plan. Some delegations expressed reservations as to the competence of these bodies with respect to the implementation of fishery regulations and management, for which convention-based bodies would be better suited.

23. The Committee considered it important for all countries presently or potentially concerned with the fishery in an area to be involved in the actual work on assessment of the stocks and of the effects of fishing, and in the studies of the effects of possible regulation measures. It stressed, as at its previous Sessions, the need for regional bodies to facilitate the participation or collaboration of all countries involved in fishing and research in the area, this being essential if all data and information needed for stock assessment purposes were to be made available. One delegation referred to the situation in the area of the Regional Fisheries Advisory Commission for the Southwest Atlantic (CARPAS) where it was desirable that nations fishing in that area should be able to supply information, technical and financial assistance to facilitate the achievement of the objectives of this regional body.

24. In discussing the problems of regional bodies in general in securing financial and technical support, the Committee referred to the desirability that the developed countries contribute in both these respects to the work of the regional bodies in the areas in which these countries were active. The Committee was informed of the arrangements made, with support from UNDP, under the Indian Ocean Fishery Survey and Development Programme, in which substantial participation and contributions from developed countries was provided and facilitated and of the similar action being taken for the Eastern Central Atlantic. This might provide some guidelines for ways in which support from developed countries could be arranged in other areas.

25. The Committee noted with appreciation the invitation by the Government of Uganda to hold the First Session of the Committee on Inland Fisheries for Africa (CIFA) in that country.

(c) Functions of the Committee on Fisheries

26. The Committee on Fisheries considered a recommendation of the Sixteenth Session of the Conference of FAO that the Committee review its ability to discharge all the responsibilities it was likely to be called upon to discharge, including those that might arise from the forthcoming or proposed United Nations Conference on the Human Environment and on the Law of the Sea.

27. Some delegations expressed the opinion that with its present status and structure the Committee could not adequately fulfil its functions in an efficient manner, particularly as regards the conduct of periodic reviews of fishery problems of an international character with a view to their solution. They felt that the considerable development of world fisheries in recent years, the inter-relationship of fisheries in various areas, the desirability of strengthening existing arrangements for management and the increasing importance of technical assistance to developing countries not only to exploit but also to maintain fishery resources, pointed to the urgent need for an effective world fishery body irrespective of the outcome of the United Nations Conferences mentioned above.

In their view, this new body should be established within the framework of FAO, presumably under Article XIV of its Constitution, and it should have greater independence and authority than the Committee in its present form. Furthermore, it should be open not only to all interested Member Nations of FAO but also to such non-Member Nations as were members of the United Nations, so as to ensure that all important fishing countries had an opportunity to have full representation. These delegations considered that the world fishery body should in particular identify areas where overfishing occurs and where management measures should be taken, check on the effective implementation of conservation measures, ensure a close coordination between regional fishery commissions and promote technical assistance to developing countries in all sectors of fisheries. They stressed, however, that these functions should in no way affect the autonomy of regional fishery bodies. They also pointed out that the new body should not deal with such political and legal problems as come within the purview of the United Nations, or come within the sovereign competence of countries.

28. Some other delegations recalled that the Sixteenth Session of the Conference of FAO had decided in November 1971 that the Committee on Fisheries would be open to all interested Member Nations of FAO for a trial period of four years, at the end of which the structure and composition of the Committee and the method of appointment of its members would be reviewed by the Conference. They felt that yet another change in the structure of the Committee was not warranted at this time and that it was necessary to gain more practical experience with the present enlarged membership. In their view, non-Member Nations of FAO that were members of the United Nations could participate fully in the deliberations of the Committee as observers. They also pointed out that the Council could admit such countries to membership of subsidiary bodies of the Committee and that such countries could become members of FAO and then be full participants in the Committee on Fisheries. With respect to the functions of the Committee these delegations noted that with its present status the Committee had been able to discharge its responsibilities effectively and they expressed doubts as to whether a new body set up by international convention under Article XIV of the FAO Constitution could perform tasks that the Committee could not fulfil at present. Members of the Committee were also concerned that should the Committee on Fisheries become an Article XIV body, there might be an additional budgetary obligation that could result in the Committee on Fisheries and the Department of Fisheries competing for available funds. Furthermore, they pointed out that it would not be possible to know what additional functions, if any, would be assigned to the Committee by the United Nations Conferences on the Human Environment and on the Law of the Sea until these Conferences had taken place. They concluded that it would be premature at this stage to take any position regarding the establishment of a new world fishery body.

29. All delegations that took part in the discussions stressed the importance of the close relationship that existed between the Committee on Fisheries and the Department of Fisheries, and also between the Committee and the governing bodies of the Organization. They agreed that whatever the status of the Committee should be in the future it was essential that this close and effective relationship be preserved.

30. After a thorough debate on the question of its functions and composition, the Committee decided to refer this matter to its Sub-Committee on the Development of Cooperation with International Organizations concerned with Fisheries. To this effect, it amended paragraph 2 of Resolution No. COFI/1/1, under which the Sub-Committee has been established, by adding a new sub-paragraph (d) reading as follows:

"(d) to review the present status of the Committee on Fisheries and, if necessary, to recommend measures to improve the Committee's ability to discharge all its present and anticipated responsibilities and, in particular, to examine, among other alternatives, the desirability or otherwise of reconstituting the Committee on Fisheries under Article XIV of the FAO Constitution"

31. The Committee also amended paragraph 3 of that Resolution by providing that membership in the Sub-Committee would consist of the following Member Nations and non-Member Nations of FAO, the latter subject to approval by the Council:

Argentina	Indonesia	Peru
Australia	Japan	Poland
Canada	Kenya	Senegal
Cuba	Morocco	Spain
France	Nigeria	U.S.A.
India	Norway	U.S.S.R.

32. The Committee took note of a statement by the observer for U.S.S.R. that his country had in principle no objection to participating in the work of the Sub-Committee and that such participation would not affect the question of its participation in the Committee itself.

TECHNICAL CONFERENCE ON FISHERY MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

33. The Committee had before it a proposal by Canada that FAO convene a general Technical Conference on Fishery Management and Development in the first half of 1973. The purpose of the technical conference would be to consider scientific and technical principles and methodology for management as well as scientific information related to development. In the view of the Canadian Government, which was offering to host the conference and to bear the costs involved, including some assistance for the attendance of fishery experts from developing countries, the technical conference was urgently needed regardless of the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea and regardless of the sort of regimes that may emerge from the latter Conference. The Canadian Government realized, however, that the technical conference must not be allowed to delay the Conference on the Law of the Sea.

34. One delegation recalled that the Committee on Fisheries had pronounced itself against the convening of a technical conference at its Fourth Session in 1969 though that proposal concerned a conference of a somewhat different nature.

35. Some delegations indicated that the desirability of convening a technical conference had been considered by the United Nations Sea-Bed Committee at the session it held in New York from 28 February to 30 March 1972, and that a majority of the delegations that had spoken on this subject had expressed negative views. They felt that present knowledge on fisheries and the work of the Committee on Fisheries itself made it unnecessary to convene a technical conference similar to the International Technical Conference on the Conservation of Living Resources of the Sea that had met under the auspices of the United Nations in 1955 at FAO Headquarters in preparation for the 1958 United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. In their view, the documents that had already been submitted or would be presented by FAO to the Sea-Bed Committee at its request provided sufficient technical and scientific information on the basis of which political and economic decisions could be made.

36. Other delegations stated that they had not yet received instructions from their governments and that the official position of their countries would be communicated to FAO as soon as possible.

37. A sizeable majority of the delegations that intervened in the debate expressed support for the Canadian proposal. They felt that a general Technical Conference on Fishery Management and Development would be timely, if not overdue, and would contribute significantly to the understanding and solution of fishery problems without duplicating the work of the Committee on Fisheries and of the Department of Fisheries. Some of these delegations considered that the technical conference would in no way prejudice the results of the new Conference on the Law of the Sea and should not, in fact, be seen in the context of the preparations of that Conference. Other delegations that had spoken in favour of the

Canadian proposal were of the view that the findings of the technical conference could assist the Sea-Bed Committee in its work. They all agreed, however, that the conference proposed by Canada should essentially bring together fishery experts who would not be expected to take decisions on behalf of the governments that have designated them. They also agreed that the conference should consider the technical aspects of fishery management and development, to the exclusion of political and jurisdictional matters.

38. After a prolonged discussion, the Committee agreed to recommend to the Council that it authorize the Director-General, subject to the necessary funds being available in accordance with the generous offer made by the Government of Canada, to convene early in 1973 a Technical Conference on Fishery Management and Development. It made the following recommendations regarding the terms of reference and reporting procedures of the Technical Conference and the category of meeting to which it should belong:

(a) Terms of reference

39. The Conference should consider scientific and technical principles and methodology for both fishery management and fishery development. Examples of topics to be discussed would include the nature and adequacy of population theory, data requirements for management models, methods of assessing latent fishery resources and techniques of aquaculture. The Conference should supplement consideration of these matters by studying, on a regional basis, the state of the resources, the state of their exploitation, the management mechanisms and requirements and perspectives for fishery development.

40. Political aspects and problems of jurisdiction or rights over fisheries, and similar matters, should be outside the purview of the Conference. Economic matters would be considered only insofar as they related to the problem of making fisheries profitable and not as they related to overall social or to political problems.

(b) Reporting procedures

41. The Conference should report to the Director-General of FAO.

(c) Category of meeting

42. The Conference should be a technical conference convened under Article VI-5 of the Constitution of the Organization. It should fall within Category 2 of meetings, as defined by the Conference at its Fourteenth Session and by the Council at its Fifty-First Session, namely: a meeting to deal with technical and/or economic matters attended by experts designated by Member Governments and by observers from Member Nations, non-Member Nations and intergovernmental and international non-governmental organizations having established relations with FAO, in accordance with the General Rules and Principles set out in the Basic Texts; the participants would not be expected to take decisions on behalf of the governments that have designated them; suitable arrangements could be worked out, in consultation with governments, for participation by representatives of national institutions, including parastatal and private institutions; consultants could be used by FAO to assist the secretariat in various ways, including the introduction of agenda items.

COOPERATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM IN RELATION TO FISHERIES

(i) UN Conference on the Human Environment

43. The Committee noted with satisfaction that FAO was collaborating closely with the Secretariat for the UN Conference on the Human Environment and it expressed its appreciation for the contribution of FAO to preparations for the Conference. It stressed that FAO should continue to play a leading role in technical matters relating to the conservation of fishery resources and the related activities in the protection of the marine environment at the international level, and that the Department of Fisheries should receive adequate financial support for the proper execution of this role from whatever funds are available.

(ii) Inter-Secretariat Committee on Scientific Programmes Relating to Oceanography (ICSPRO)

44. The Committee was informed of the action taken by the Seventh Session of the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) with a view to studying, in cooperation with the ICSPRO agencies, ways and means of increasing the size and efficiency of its Secretariat (Resolution 7.34). Several delegations expressed the hope that FAO would participate actively in the implementation of Resolution 7.34. To this effect, and in order that problems related to fishery research receive adequate attention, they agreed that there should be the closest possible links between ICSPRO and IOC and that it would be advantageous to provide for a more regular scheduling of ICSPRO meetings. Some delegations considered that the contribution of FAO to the activities and to the Secretariat of IOC should be strengthened in the future.

(iii) Marine pollution

45. The Committee stressed that marine pollution problems required a multi-disciplinary approach and that they could not be tackled without a large international effort. In this respect, it welcomed the present inter-agency cooperation as a valuable contribution to the solution of particularly complex problems. At the same time, it recalled that FAO should provide leadership in protecting living aquatic resources from pollution and in promoting the necessary field activities and services required by member nations. It recognized the particular importance of establishing national and regional laboratories and of training scientific workers and research managers from developing countries. In this respect, it pointed out that international support provided by UNDP and bilateral assistance programmes, especially the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA), constituted significant developments.

46. The Committee expressed the hope that it would be possible to expedite the implementation of the programme for a Global Investigation of Pollution in the Marine Environment (GIPME) as a major part of the Long-Term and Expanded Programme of Oceanic Exploration and Research (LEPOR). FAO should continue to cooperate closely with IOC in this regard and to intensify its collaboration in the formulation of monitoring programmes. The Committee noted that under GIPME special attention would be given to enclosed areas such as the North, Baltic and Mediterranean Seas and the Gulf of Mexico, where levels of pollution could eventually reach serious proportions. In this connection, it expressed its appreciation for the action recently taken by the General Fisheries Council for the Mediterranean (GFCM) at its Eleventh Session (March 1972) as a follow-up of the "Review on the State of Marine Pollution in the Mediterranean Sea". The Committee also heard with interest statements made by the representative of the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO) and by the observers from the Permanent Commission for the South Pacific (CPPS) and from the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES), who gave a detailed account of the activities of their organizations in the field of marine pollution.

47. The Committee was informed that Sub-Committee III of the Sea-Bed Committee acting as preparatory committee for the UN Conference on the Law of the Sea had included in its programme of work for its future sessions a discussion of the Report of the FAO Technical Conference on Marine Pollution and its Effects on Living Resources and Fishing, and of the Report of the Seventh Session of the Committee on Fisheries to the extent to which it relates to the preservation of the living resources of the high seas. The Committee requested FAO to extend its full cooperation to the Sea-Bed Committee in this matter.

(iv) International cooperative investigations of the IOC

48. The Committee noted the progress achieved in carrying out the Cooperative Study of the Kuroshio and Adjacent Regions (GSK) and the Cooperative Investigations of the Caribbean and Adjacent Regions (CICAR), of the Mediterranean (CIM) and in the Northern part of the Eastern Central Atlantic (CINECA). It expressed its appreciation for the contribution of the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea to CINECA and urged FAO to give its continued support to those investigations.

(v) Conference on the Law of the Sea

49. The Committee was informed that at its July-August 1971 session the Sea-Bed Committee, acting as a preparatory committee for the UN Conference on the Law of the Sea, had requested FAO to prepare four additional documents, viz. an expanded version of the illustrative atlas on the living resources of the seas; a report on regulatory fishery bodies; a series of fishery country profiles; and a paper on conservation problems, with special reference to new technology. These documents had been submitted in draft form to the Sea-Bed Committee at the session it held in New York from 28 February to 30 March 1972 and were now before the Committee on Fisheries for review and comment. The Committee congratulated the Department of Fisheries on the objectivity and the high quality of these documents. In its view, this further contribution of FAO to the work of the Sea-Bed Committee was in conformity with UN General Assembly Resolution 2750C (XXV), which provided that the Sea-Bed Committee could call upon FAO and its Committee on Fisheries to seek their cooperation from the technical and scientific points of view. The Committee agreed that FAO was indeed in a unique position to assist with the technical solution of fishery problems.

50. The Committee noted with satisfaction that the Sea-Bed Committee had in fact requested FAO to prepare further documents, which were described in COFI/72/7, Sup. 2, including: fishery profiles for countries not already covered in the first series; a more detailed paper on conservation problems; a supplementary paper on ways and means whereby present fishery management techniques and machinery could be improved and strengthened; and documents on the following subjects: sedentary, migratory and intermingling species; stocks located in areas off the coasts of two or more neighbouring countries; criteria relating to the apportionment of total catch quotas, and the extent of present cooperation between countries in the field of research on the living resources of the seas.

51. While welcoming this further contribution to the work of the Sea-Bed Committee, the Committee on Fisheries sounded a note of caution. It pointed out that some of the new documents that had been requested might imply the examination of questions that were not exclusively technical and scientific. It felt that FAO should maintain the reputation for objectivity it enjoyed. The Committee agreed therefore that the documents should be submitted to the Sea-Bed Committee as drafts and that the Committee on Fisheries should have an opportunity to review them. The Committee also agreed that in preparing these documents the Department of Fisheries should, when appropriate, request the cooperation of the international organizations concerned.

52. The Committee expressed its appreciation for the synopsis of the views on fisheries expressed by delegations at the Sea-Bed Committee in the course of the March 1971 and July-August 1971 sessions (COFI/71/9(b), Sup. 2 and COFI/72/7, Sup. 1). It noted that some delegations in connection with the work of the Preparatory Committee of the Law of the Sea Conference made several comments of an international legal nature. It requested the Secretariat to prepare a similar synopsis with respect to the February-March 1972 session and urged that the synopsis be given a wide distribution as soon as possible.

(vi) Relations with UNIDO

53. The Committee was informed of the present state of relationship and arrangements between FAO and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO). It expressed the hope that a joint statement would be agreed upon by the two organizations in the near future and that working relations would be fully and effectively developed in the interest of an orderly development in the fishery industry sector.

(vii) Relations with IMCO

54. The Committee noted with appreciation the results of the work of the Sub-Committee on Safety of Fishing Vessels of IMCO, and the continuing nature of the Department of Fisheries' participation at secretariat level in the work of this body.

REVIEW OF THE PROGRAMMES OF WORK OF THE ORGANIZATION

(a) Medium-Term Plan 1972-77

55. The Committee noted its responsibilities in accordance with Resolution 6/71 on the Medium-Term Plan, adopted by the Conference at its Sixteenth Session, and reviewed the programme of work of the Department of Fisheries proposed for the medium-term, as submitted in document COFI/72/8.

56. It expressed its general satisfaction with the proposals submitted, both as regards a suitable distribution of activities in an integrated programme for the fisheries sector and as regards the manner of presentation which provided the Committee with a useful basis in order to pronounce its views on three distinct aspects: recommendations on the priorities which should be accorded to sub-programmes in 1974-75, a re-examination of trend indicators for sub-programmes in the medium-term until 1977, and guidance for the preparation of a revised Medium-Term Plan extending to 1979. It noted that with the progressive implementation of the programme budgeting system within the Organization, it could expect to receive, in future years, additional information on programmes and accomplishments therein to enable it to examine the proposals in even greater depth.

57. The Committee noted a problem related to the integration of the activities of the Department of Fisheries financed from the Regular Budget and those financed from extra-budgetary resources; namely that the former resources were currently subject to serious constraints, while the latter were rising quite rapidly. The Regular Budget resources were being utilized, to an increasing extent in direct support of field projects that were normally financed from other resources, chiefly the UNDP and bilateral funds, and the programming of which was mainly in the hands of individual governments and outside the control of the governing bodies of FAO. The Committee felt that the impact of these developments on the more general activities financed from the Regular Budget and on the structure of the Organization should be under constant review and the suggestion was made that it was desirable that the matter should be specifically considered at its next Session.

58. The Committee felt that it could not comment, to any significant extent, on alternative modes of implementation of the medium-term plan. In fact there is no great flexibility at present in this field as a great part of Regular Budget resources is tied to fixed professional posts. The Committee felt, however, that the Director-General's modified personnel policy with greater use of short-term appointments would ameliorate the situation. It also considered that the determination of priorities of elements within and between sub-programmes should be largely a responsibility of the Director-General to be exercised in the context of the overall guidance it was equipped to provide.

59. The Committee concentrated on considering relative priorities as between sub-programmes as a whole. It was clear that each sub-programme proposal was considered important by some member or members of the Committee. The Committee felt, however, that the budgetary stringency and prospects of limited funds made it incumbent upon it to distinguish an order of priorities among sub-programmes. While there could be no unanimous declaration of one order of priorities, some measure of agreement was evident. The Committee agreed that the management and development of fisheries, with the underlying aim of assisting developing countries, should be the paramount objectives of FAO in the field of fisheries.

60. The management of fisheries involved a high priority being accorded to three sub-programmes in particular: 2.4.1.5 - Management of Fishery Resources; 2.6.2.5 - Fisheries Statistics, Analysis and Planning; and 2.3.1.1 - Aquatic Surveys and Evaluation. Considerable importance was attached to sub-programme 2.6.2.5 because it was essential for effective support to regional fishery bodies. The Committee recalled its attention to this matter under item 4 of its agenda. High priority was attached to the development of statistics and data collection and their analysis for stock assessment. The value of statistics provided in Bulletins and Yearbooks of Statistics was fully acknowledged but the Committee urged that effort and resources be directed for the eventual computerization of such

statistics and data and, at the same time, their close association with resource surveys and exploratory fishing data handled in the Fishery Data Centre, covered under sub-programme 2.3.1.1. The Committee noted that this Data Centre suffered from limited resources, with the consequent danger of loss of much valuable information collected through surveys. In urging closer association between the Data Centre and the statistical services in the Department of Fisheries, the Committee felt that the two activities must jointly serve the needs of both fishery management and fishery development. Special attention was drawn by the Committee to the needs of developing countries for assistance in the collection and analysis of reliable data for their own requirements, as well as for regional management purposes. The Committee assigned high priority to sub-programme 2.3.1.1 as the assessment of stocks provided the basis for fishery management and development. It noted the high level of extra-budgetary resources under this sub-programme and felt that, in view of this, a higher priority should be accorded under the regular budget than presently indicated in the trends for the next two biennia. It felt, however, that activities concerned with remote sensing should be given less importance.

61. The development of fisheries involved a high priority being accorded particularly to four sub-programmes, in addition to the ones outlined above: 2.1.3.7 - Fisheries Education; 2.3.2.3 - Fish Production; 2.2.2.6 - Aquatic Resource Development; and 2.4.1.4 - Improvement of Aquatic Environment and Control of Aquatic Pollution.

62. The Committee emphasized that the training of personnel in developing countries, embracing a wide range—industry personnel, scientists, techniques, administrators and extension workers—was a prerequisite for the expansion of their fisheries. All other activities were contingent on the availability of suitably trained and qualified personnel. The importance of developing managerial skills was stressed, as was the need for an adequate number of extension workers.

63. Activities under sub-programme 2.3.2.3 were ascribed a high priority, particularly for assistance to artisanal fisheries and for integrated fishing industry development, including assistance to governments on the location and design of harbour and shore facilities and work on the handling of fish on board vessels and during the landing of the catch, to ensure an optimum preservation of its quality.

64. The Committee attached a high priority to sub-programme 2.2.2.6, emphasizing the importance of fish culture especially, at this time, of herbivorous species in inland waters, particularly in developing countries, and of the potential benefits of aquaculture, which were recognized by both developing and developed countries. Aquaculture could assist both in augmenting fish supplies for domestic consumption, especially in areas where transportation was a major obstacle, and in providing high-value species for export.

65. The Committee recognized that aquaculture activities and fisheries in coastal waters were particularly vulnerable to pollution of the seas and inland waters when it emphasized the importance of sub-programme 2.4.1.4. It noted that some other organizations, notably IMCO and IOC, had within their respective competences, leading roles to play in the control study and monitoring of marine pollutants. It emphasized, however, that FAO had a clear responsibility as regards the effects of pollution on fishery resources and their utilization, and an interest in the measures to control and mitigate them and all other pertinent environmental aspects. This responsibility should also include the training of personnel from developing countries in this field. It noted with concern that the Department of Fisheries was not able to assign a single full-time professional officer for such work and hoped that the Director-General would soon be in a position to remedy this situation.

66. Work on distribution, processing and marketing involved the consideration of four sub-programmes as a group: 2.4.3.3 - Distribution of Fish and Fish Products; 2.5.1.6 - Studies of Fishery Markets; 2.5.2.4 - Fishery Products Marketing; and 2.5.3.4 - Fishery Industries.

Owing to the closely related nature of work under these sub-programmes, the Committee suggested that the Director-General consider the desirability of regrouping some of them, particularly sub-programmes 2.5.1.6 and 2.5.2.4 which certain delegates felt might diminish in importance in the medium-term. Some delegations, however, attached importance to the work under these four sub-programmes.

67. The Committee noted with appreciation the statement of the U.S.S.R. to continue to cooperate with FAO in the field of fisheries.

(b) Policy and operational aspects of the field programme

68. Guest speaker: The Committee heard with appreciation an address delivered, at the invitation of the Director-General, by the Guest Speaker, Mr. L.J.C. Evans, Director, Agricultural Projects Department, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. This address is reproduced as Appendix F to this report. Following the address, Mr. Evans replied to questions from members of the Committee.

69. The Committee noted with satisfaction the continued expansion of FAO field activities in fisheries. It recommended that under the UNDP Country Programming procedure, a government must accord a high priority to fishery projects, in comparison to projects in other sectors, if a satisfactory rate of growth for the development of fisheries was to be maintained. The expanding Government Cooperative Programme should be able to supplement to some extent the projects assisted by the UNDP. In this regard several delegates emphasized the need for close collaboration between multilateral and bilateral assistance programmes.

70. The Committee also noted that a substantial amount of time of staff employed under the Regular Budget was used for the support of the field activities. It requested that, in the future, information on individual sub-programmes be presented so as to show the interrelationship between the activities financed from Extra-Budgetary sources and the Regular Budget. This would facilitate determination of the priorities for the Regular Budget. The importance of cross-fertilization and mutual support between the so-called Regular Programme and the field activities was emphasized and the Committee cautioned against any effort that might separate these activities.

71. The Committee noted the recommendation of the Conference, at its Sixteenth Session, that more use should be made of sub-contracting field projects to competent firms or institutions, in order not to over-burden Regular Programme staff.

72. The Committee endorsed the Department's policy of handling field projects on an integrated basis and hoped that this would continue.

73. Several delegates emphasized the need for a regional and inter-regional approach in fisheries. The International Indian Ocean Fishery Survey and Development Programme and the similar projects being developed for the FAO Fishery Committee for the Eastern Central Atlantic (CECAF) area were cited as desirable precedents. It expressed its concern, however, that the extremely limited UNDP resources available for regional and inter-regional projects might restrict projects of this type in the future. The Committee stressed the importance to the developing nations of the need for special consideration to be given to the support of regional and inter-regional projects for fisheries development, because of the peculiar international character of many fishery resources which occur off the shores of two or more developing nations.

74. The importance of artisanal fisheries particularly in developing countries was stressed. The use of associate experts in this type of project was suggested. The importance of building training elements into projects was stressed. Based on experience gained by a bilateral programme, it was also suggested that "on-the-job" training, which is directly applicable to local conditions, was valuable and in addition provided a useful basis for the selection of candidates for training abroad.

75. The Committee agreed that aquaculture should be given increasing attention to supplement the catch from the sea.

76. Several operational problems of the Field Programme were pointed out. It was noted that the introduction of the new Project Document, in place of the Plan of Operation, will define project objectives and activities more precisely and should eliminate many of the difficulties. It was suggested that future projects should lay more emphasis on providing needed equipment rather than experts who are handicapped by language and other problems. In this connection it was suggested that in formulating a project, utilization of available local expertise and equipment should be considered.

77. The Committee suggested that in the next issue of the Field Project Catalogue, the inclusion of a brief note of evaluation of each project would be useful.

78. The Committee noted that, in accordance with Resolution 9/71 adopted by the Conference at its Sixteenth Session, the agenda for the next session should include an item regarding needs and priorities on research for development purposes. It furthermore stressed the importance of investment follow-up to projects and agreed to examine the success to date, in this aspect, at a future session.

MATTERS CONSIDERED BY THE COUNCIL AND CONFERENCE OF FAO

79. The Committee was informed of the action taken by the FAO Council at its Fifty-Sixth, Fifty-Seventh and Fifty-Eighth Sessions and by the Conference of FAO at its Sixteenth Session with respect to such matters of concern or interest to the Committee as were not already covered under other items of the agenda.

80. The Committee noted with appreciation that the Committee for Inland Fisheries of Africa (CIFA) had been formally established and that the Director-General had promulgated its Statutes on 6 July 1971. The Committee on Fisheries stressed that the Committee for Inland Fisheries of Africa should be an action-oriented body and that its activities should be so geared as to meet the aspirations of African countries for a speedy development of their inland fisheries. It requested the Secretariat to circulate the provisional agenda for the first session sufficiently in advance, in order to enable member countries to put forward suggestions as required. The Committee was informed that the session would be held in Fort-Lamy, Chad, late in 1972 at the invitation of the Government of Chad. Some delegations observed that they would have welcomed it if more consultations had taken place before a decision was made regarding the venue.

81. The Committee noted that it had been invited by the Council to examine its own methods of work, with a view to considering specific guidelines to expedite and improve these methods, and the methods of work of the Council, with a view to making suggestions for the improvement of these methods, especially as regards those aspects which would facilitate the work of the Committee. An account was given to the Committee of the preliminary views that had already been expressed in this regard by the Committee on Commodity Problems at its Forty-Sixth Session in October 1971. The Committee on Fisheries agreed that most of these views were relevant to its own methods of work.

82. The Committee on Fisheries felt that the appointment of a Drafting Committee at the beginning of each session would contribute to the quality of the report. As regards the scope and coverage of the sessions, it considered that it would be useful, at the end of each session, to hold a preliminary discussion on the list of major items that should be placed on the agenda of the next session. It agreed that the oral presentation of items by the Secretariat should be as concise as possible so as to give the Committee the maximum amount of time for substantive discussions. It noted with concern that the late distribution of working papers was hampering participation and stressed that these papers should be circulated to member nations sixty days in advance of the session. As the Committee did not have the time, nor sufficient background information, to examine the item fully, it suggested that the Chairman should consult with delegations before he presented the Committee's report to the Council in November 1972.

REPORTS AND RECORDS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FISHERIES

83. The Committee agreed that summary records of open meetings were not necessary as the report it adopted at the end of each session covered the main points made in the deliberations as well as the conclusions reached by the Committee. In this connection, it felt that the establishment of a Drafting Committee helped to ensure an adequate and objective coverage of the deliberations. It also felt that savings from the discontinuance of summary records could be more usefully devoted to programme activities.

84. The Committee therefore agreed unanimously to delete the words given in brackets in Rule VI-2 of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee on Fisheries: "Reports of sessions (and records of open meetings of a session) shall be circulated to all Member Nations and Associate Members of the Organization and to non-Member Nations invited to attend the session, as well as to interested international organizations entitled to be represented at the session." The Committee also agreed unanimously to delete Rule VI-4 of the above-mentioned Rules of Procedure.

DATE AND PLACE OF NEXT SESSION

85. The Committee agreed that its Eighth Session should be held at FAO Headquarters, Rome, in principle from 10 to 17 April 1973. The precise timing was left to the Director-General to decide, in consultation with the Chairman of the Committee on Fisheries, bearing in mind the timing of other sessions.

OTHER MATTERS

86. The Committee was informed that the International Commission for the Southeast Atlantic Fisheries (ICSEAF) was to hold its first session from 24 to 29 April 1972 and that it was possible that the Commission may desire to participate in the work of the Coordinating Working Party on Atlantic Fishery Statistics (CWP). The Committee agreed that it would be desirable for CWP to continue to extend its work over the whole Atlantic Ocean and recommended that the Council of FAO authorize the Director-General to make the necessary arrangements for the participation of ICSEAF, after consultation with the other Organizations participating in the CWP, including any desirable adjustments to the number of experts, which each participant was entitled to appoint.

MATTERS REQUIRING THE ATTENTION OF THE COUNCIL

87. The following matters specifically require the attention of the Council:

(a) Matters of substance on which Council attention is required

- (i) To approve the participation of the U.S.S.R. in the work of the Sub-Committee on the Development of Cooperation with International Organizations concerned with Fisheries of the Committee on Fisheries (paragraphs 31 and 32).
- (ii) To authorize the Director-General, subject to the necessary funds being available in accordance with the offer made by the Government of Canada, to convene early in 1973 in Canada a Technical Conference on Fishery Management and Development (paragraph 38).
- (iii) To authorize the Director-General to make the necessary arrangements for the participation of the International Commission for the Southeast Atlantic Fisheries (ICSEAF) in the work of the Coordinating Working Party on Atlantic Fishery Statistics (CWP) (paragraph 86).

(b) Subjects upon which some discussion in the Council might provide useful guidance for further consideration by the Committee

- (i) Functions of the Committee on Fisheries (paragraphs 26 to 32); Medium-Term Plan 1972-77 (paragraphs 55 to 67); policy and operational aspects of the field programme (paragraphs 69 to 78).
- (ii) Conference on the Law of the Sea (paragraphs 49 to 52).

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

Argentina

MASTRARRIGO, V.
Ingeniero Agrónomo
Servicio Nacional de Pesca
Paseo Colón 922
Buenos Aires

VALLEGA, J.
Consejero Agrícola
Embajada de la República Argentina
Piazza dell'Esquilino 2
00185 Roma

VIGNAUD, J.C.
Representante Permanente Alterno de
la República Argentina ante la FAO
Embajada de la República Argentina
Piazza dell'Esquilino 2
00185 Roma

Australia

SETTER, C.G.
First Assistant Secretary
Fisheries and Extension Services Division
Department of Primary Industry
Macquarie Street
Barton
Canberra, A.C.T. 2600

STAFFORD, J.A.
Agricultural Attaché
Embassy of Australia
Via Sallustiana 26
00187 Roma

Bahrain

REGNIER, A.
Représentant permanent adjoint
Représentation permanente de la Belgique
auprès de la FAO
Via Antonio Gramsci 9
00197 Roma

Belgium

Brazil

GUARISCHI BATH, S.F.
First Secretary
Embassy of Brazil
Piazza Navona 14
00186 Roma

Bulgaria

NEDEV, D.
Director-General
DSO
Ribno Stopanstvo
Burgas

ZVEZDOV, M.
Fisheries State Economic Board
8 Vela Peeva Street
Burgas

DEKOV, Prof. D.V.
Représentant permanent de la Bulgarie
auprès de la FAO
Ambassade de la République populaire
de Bulgarie
Via Sassoferato 11
00197 Rome

Cameroon

Canada

NEEDLER, Dr. A.W.H.
Special Advisor to the Ministry of
Fisheries
Department of the Environment
Sir Charles Tupper Building
Ottawa 8, Ontario

WRIGHT, D.S.
Second Secretary (Commercial)
Canadian Embassy
Via G.B. de' Rossi 27
00161 Roma

Central African Republic

KONZALE, M.E.
Directeur des Eaux,
Pêches et Pisciculture
Ministère des Eaux et Forêts
B.P. 830
Bangui

Ceylon

GOONEWARDENE, E.G.
Permanent Secretary
Ministry of Fisheries
P.O. Box 1707
Galle Face
Colombo 3

Chile

PIZARRO, S.
Ministro Consejero
Embajada de la República de Chile
Via Panisperna 207
00184 Roma

Costa Rica

DI MOTTOLA, Excmo Sr. D. Carlos
Embajador, Representante Permanente
de Costa Rica ante la FAO
Misión Permanente de Costa Rica ante la FAO
Viale Lungotevere Flaminio 24
00196 Roma

RUNNEBAUM VOLIO, F.
Representante Permanente Alterno de
Costa Rica ante la FAO
Misión Permanente de Costa Rica ante la FAO
Viale Lungotevere Flaminio 24
00196 Roma

Cuba

LAVASTIDA ROSADO, A.
Sub-Director General
Instituto Nacional de la Pesca
Habana

SANTANDER, M.A.
Jefe
Departamento de Asistencia Técnica
Instituto Nacional de la Pesca
Habana

RODRIGUEZ FRAGA, A.
Jefe
Departamento de Pesca
Junta Central de Planificación
Habana

GONZALEZ ROJAS, J.
Representante Permanente Alterno
Misión Permanente de Cuba ante la FAO
Via dei Monti Parioli 44/8
00197 Roma

Czechoslovakia

Denmark

LØKKEGAARD, K.
Head of Department
Ministry of Fisheries
16 Borgergade
Copenhagen

Ecuador

CUEVA EGUIGUREN, H.
Representante Alterno del Ecuador
ante la FAO
Consejero Comercial de la Embajada
Embajada del Ecuador
Via Feliciano Scarpellini 9
00197 Roma

Egypt, Arab Republic of

Ethiopia

KELECHA, W.M.
Assistant Minister
Fisheries Department
Addis Ababa

Finland

NISKANEN, P.
Assistant Counsellor of Fisheries
Central Board of Agriculture
Helsinki

France

THIBAUDAU, R.
Directeur adjoint des Pêches maritimes
Direction des Pêches maritimes
Secrétariat général de la Marine marchande
Ministère des Transports
3 Place de Fontenoy
75 Paris 7e

LAGARDE, R.A.
Sous-Directeur de la Réglementation et
des Relations extérieures
Direction des Pêches maritimes
Ministère de la Marine marchande
Place de Fontenoy
75 Paris 7e

LETACONNOUX, R.
Directeur-adjoint
Institut scientifique et technique des
Pêches maritimes
La Noë - Route de la Jonelière
44 Nantes

LACOUR, P.
Président
Caisse Centrale de Crédit coopératif
18 bis Avenue Hoche
75 Paris 8e

Gabon

Germany, Federal Republic of

MESECK, Dr. G.
Ministerialdirigent
Federal Ministry of Food,
Agriculture and Forestry
53 Bonn

NÖCKLINGHOFF, G.
Ministerialrat
Federal Ministry of Food,
Agriculture and Forestry
53 Bonn

Ghana

Greece

Honduras

Hungary

RIBIANSZKY, M.
Director
National Fishery Inspectorate
V Kossuth Lajos tér 11
Budapest

THURANSZKY, Dr. Z.
Senior Officer
National Fishery Inspectorate
V Kossuth Lajos tér 11
Budapest

Iceland

JON JONSSON
Director
Marine Research Institute
Reykjavik

HANNES HAFSTEIN
Chief of Division
Ministry for Foreign Affairs
Reykjavik

India

ROSE, G.
Joint Secretary
Ministry of Agriculture
Krishi Bhavan
New Delhi

Indonesia

ZACHMAN, Admiral N.
Director-General of Sea Fisheries
Department of Agriculture
Djalan Salemba Raya 16
Djakarta

SOEGENG-AMAT
Permanent Representative of Indonesia to FAO
Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia
Via Piemonte 127
00187 Roma

ATMOWASONO, H.
Acting Director
Directorate of Planning
Directorate-General of Fisheries
Department of Agriculture
Djalan Salemba Raya 16
Djakarta

HAKIM, A.I.
Alternate Permanent Representative
of Indonesia to FAO
Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia
Via Piemonte 127
OO187 Roma

SIAGIAN, K.
Minister Counsellor
Chief, Economic Section
Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia
Via Piemonte 127
OO187 Roma

Iran

GOLESORKHI, E.F.
Technical Assistant
Fisheries Company of Iran
Zartash Avenue/Bahram Street 33
Teheran

Iraq

Ireland

O'SULLIVAN, D.
Assistant Secretary
Department of Agriculture and Fisheries
Dublin 2

Israel

Italy

DI BETTA, Dr. A.
Colonnello di Porto
Direttore di Divisione
Direzione Generale della Pesca Marittima
Ministero della Marina Mercantile
Viale Asia, EUR
OO144 Roma

SOMMANI, E.
Stabilimento Ittiogenico
Via della Stazione Tiburtina 11
OO162 Roma

Ivory Coast

Japan

ANDO, K.
Minister and Permanent Representative
of Japan to FAO
Embassy of Japan
Via Virginio Orsini 18
OO192 Roma

FUKUDA, Y.
Deputy Director
Far Seas Fisheries Research Laboratory
Fisheries Agency
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
2-1 Kasumigaseki
Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo

MIMURA, K.
First Secretary
Embassy of Japan
Via Virginio Orsini 18
OO192 Roma

SAITO, T.
Deputy Head
First Ocean Fisheries Division
Production Department
Fisheries Agency
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
2-1 Kasumigaseki
Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo

TANAKA, K.
Specialized Agencies Division
United Nations Bureau
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
2, 2-chome, Kasumigaseki
Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo

Kenya

ODERO, N.
Director of Fisheries
Ministry of Tourism and Wildlife
P.O. Box 40241
Nairobi

Korea

SUNG HWAN HA
Fisheries Attaché
Embassy of the Republic of Korea
Via Barnaba Orlandi 30
00197 Roma

Kuwait

AL SHARHAN, A.M.
Controller
Fisheries Department
Ministry of Public Works
Kuwait City

Liberia

Libyan Arab Republic

KHALIL, A.
Counsellor for FAO Affairs
Embassy of the Libyan Arab Republic
Via Nomentana 365
00162 Roma

Madagascar

RALISON, A.
Chef
Division de Recherches des Pêches maritimes
Service des Pêches maritimes
B.P. 291
Tananarive

Malaysia

BALACHANDRAN, B.
Assistant Director-General
Department of Fisheries
Kuala Lumpur

Malta

MOSKOVITS, Dr. I.
Permanent Representative of Malta to FAO
Embassy of Malta
Lungotevere Marzio 12
00186 Roma

Mexico

GONZALEZ RUIZ, F.
Contralmirante
Embajada de México
Via Lazzaro Spallanzani 16
00161 Roma

Morocco

LAYACHI, D.
Directeur général
Office national des Pêches
13-15 rue Chevalier Bayard
Casablanca

Netherlands

STOFFELS, A.
Cabinet Adviser in charge of International
Matters
Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
1e van den Boschstraat 4
's-Gravenhage

TUINMAN, Dr. A.S.
Minister Plenipotentiary
Permanent Representative of the
Netherlands to FAO
Via Australia 2, EUR
00144 Roma

DE VRIES, J.C.W.
Fisheries Division
Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
1e van den Boschstraat 4
's-Gravenhage

New Zealand

CUNNINGHAM, E.T.
Director of Fisheries
Marine Department
P.O. Box 10142
The Terrace
Wellington

Nicaragua

MATAMOROS, B.
Representante Alterno de Nicaragua
ante la FAO
Embajada de Nicaragua
Via Nicolás Porpora 12
00198 Roma

Niger

Nigeria

BAYAGBONA, E.O.
Director
Federal Department of Fisheries
P.M.B. 12529
Lagos

Norway

SUNNANÅ, Dr. K.
Director of Fisheries
Directorate of Fisheries
Raadstuplass 10
Bergen

SAETPERSDAL, G.
Director
Institute of Marine Research
Nordnesparken 2
Bergen

GUNDERSEN, G.
Director
Fiskeridirektoratet
Bergen

KUAMMEN, E.
Consultant
Ministry of Fisheries
Oslo

Pakistan

KHALIL, M.I.K.
Agricultural Counsellor
Embassy of Pakistan
Lungotevere delle Armi 22
00195 Roma

Panama

PANIZA DE BELLAVITA, S.E. la Sra. D.a Miria
Representante Permanente de Panamá ante la FAO
Misión Permanente de Panamá ante la FAO
Via Giovanni Vaccari 53
00194 Roma

Peru

ARRIOLA SARMIENTO, Excmo Sr. D. Santiago
Embajador
Representación del Perú ante la FAO
Viale Ciotto 3-E
00153 Roma

PEREZ, Dr. R.
Director General de Cooperación Técnica
y Económica
Ministerio de Pesquería
Lord Cochrane 351
Miraflores, Lima

SALAMANCA REGALADO, A.
Consejero
Embajada del Perú ante la Santa Sede
Viale Bruno Buozzi 38
00197 Roma

Philippines

MANE, A.M.
Commissioner of Fisheries
Philippine Fisheries Commission
Manila

GARCIA, H.B.
First Secretary
Embassy of the Republic of the Philippines
Via San Valentino 12-14
00197 Roma

Poland

PIETRASZEK, R.
Vice-Minister of Shipping
Swietokrzyska 12
Warsaw

GRUZEWSKI, A.
Deputy-Director
Fisheries Central Board
Odrowaza Street 1
Szczecin

KOWALEWSKI, Dr. B.
Sea Fisheries Institute
Aleja Zjednoczenia 1
Gdynia

Portugal

BOTELHO DE SOUSA, Comodoro A.V.
Diretor
Gabinete de Estudos das Pescas
Avenida da Liberdade 211
Lisboa

VILELA, Dr. H.
Inspector Superior
Secção de Fomento Marítimo
Ministerio da Marinha
Lisboa 2

VALDEZ, V.
Diretor
Centro Biocologia e Pescas
Rua Luis de Camoes 110/6/b
Lisboa

Romania

POPESCU, L.
Conseiller Economique
Centrale des Pêches
Intrateea Spătarului 7 sIII
Bucarest

Senegal

Sierra Leone

JABATI, His Excellency Sulainam A.
Ambassador and Permanent Representative
of Sierra Leone to FAO
Via Paolo Frisi 44
00197 Roma

SHORUNKEH-SAWYER, J.T.
Chief Fisheries Officer
Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources
Freetown

MACAULAY, Mrs. D.L.D.
Second Secretary
Embassy of Sierra Leone
Via Paolo Frisi 44
00197 Roma

TAYLOR, G.
First Secretary
Embassy of Sierra Leone
Via Paolo Frisi 44
00197 Roma

Somali, Democratic Republic

Spain

MARCITLLACH GUAZO, F.
Director General de Pesca Marítima
Ministerio de Comercio
Ruiz de Alarcón 1
Madrid

SANZ PASTOR, J.M.
Jefe de Desarrollo Mundial
Subdirección General de Cooperación
para el Desarrollo
Ministerio de Asuntos Exteriores
Madrid

VERA KIRCHNER, J.
Jefe de la 2a Sección
Dirección General de Pesca Marítima
Ministerio de Comercio
Ruiz de Alarcón 1
Madrid

Sudan

KHALIL, A.A.
Permanent Representative of the Democratic
Republic of the Sudan to FAO
Embassy of the Democratic Republic of
the Sudan
Via dei Monti Parioli 48
00197 Roma

Sweden

HULT, Dr. J.
Director-General
National Board of Fisheries
Fack
S-402 20 Göteborg

LAGERFELT, C.-H.
Secretary
Swedish FAO Committee
Ministry of Agriculture
Jakobsgratan 26
S-111 52 Stockholm

CORNELL, E.
Permanent Secretary of Sweden to FAO
The Royal Swedish Embassy
CP 7901
00161 Roma

Tanzania

Thailand

BANDHUKUL, S.
Director-General
Department of Fisheries
Ministry of Agriculture
Rajadamnern Avenue
Bangkok

Trinidad and Tobago

CADOGAN, Miss J.
Second Secretary
Permanent Mission of Trinidad and Tobago
to the Office of the United Nations
35-37 rue de Vermont
1101 Geneva
Switzerland

Tunisia

BEL HADJ, S.
Chef de la Division de la Production
et de la Vulgarisation
Direction des Pêches
Tunis

Turkey

ÇAKIM, T.
Director
Water Products and Fishing Department
Ministry of Commerce
Ankara

BAYHAN, S.
Head of Fishery Division
Ministry of Agriculture
Ankara

SOLAK, U.
Assistant Director
Fishery Division
Ministry of Agriculture
Ankara

Uganda

KANYIKE, E.S.
Senior Fisheries Officer
Ministry of Animal Resources
P.O. Box 4
Entebbe

United Kingdom

GRAHAM, J.
Fisheries Secretary
Ministry of Agriculture,
Fisheries and Food
Great Westminster House
Horseferry Road
London SW1 5DH

DIXON, G.N.
Head of Branch B
Fisheries Division III
Ministry of Agriculture,
Fisheries and Food
Great Westminster House
Horseferry Road
London SW1 5DH

HALL, Dr. D.N.F.
Fisheries Adviser
Foreign and Commonwealth Office
Overseas Development Administration
Eland House, Stag Place
London SW1 5DH

LAMARQUE, W.G.
Permanent Representative of the
United Kingdom to FAO
British Embassy
Via XX Settembre 80-A
00187 Roma

United States of America

ROEDEL, P.M.
Director
National Marine Fisheries Service
National Oceanic and Atmospheric
Administration
U.S. Department of Commerce
Washington, D.C. 20235

BRITTIN, B.H.
Deputy Coordinator of Ocean Affairs
and Deputy Special Assistant to the
Secretary for Fisheries and Wildlife
Department of State
Washington, D.C. 20520

ALVERSON, D.L.
Director
North Pacific Research Center
National Marine Fisheries Service
U.S. Department of Commerce
2725 Montlake Boulevard East
Seattle, Washington 98102

COBURN, H.
Deputy Permanent Representative of
the U.S.A. to FAO
Embassy of the United States of America
Via Vittorio Veneto 119-A
00187 Roma

FOX, Mrs. P.I.
Foreign Affairs Specialist
Office of International Affairs
National Oceanic and Atmospheric
Administration
U.S. Department of Commerce
Washington, D.C. 20235

PEASE, N.L.
Regional Fisheries Attaché
Embassy of the United States of America
B.P. 1712
Abidjan, Ivory Coast

Uruguay

ZORRILLA DE SAN MARTIN, D.
Representante Alterno ante la FAO
Misión Permanente del Uruguay ante la FAO
Via SS. Quattro 47/5
00184 Roma

Venezuela

PIETRANTONI, L.
Economista/Coordinador de Asuntos Pesqueros
Oficina Nacional de Pesca
Ministerio de Agricultura y Cria
Avenida Los Pinos Qta. Iremar
Alta Florida, Caracas

BRUGNOLI CRUCIANI, A.
Representante Permanente Alterno de
Venezuela ante la FAO
Embajada de Venezuela
Viale Bruno Buozzi 109
00197 Roma

SIMPSON, J.G.
Project Manager
Fishery Research and Development Project
Apartado 2578
Caracas

Vietnam

Zaire, Republic of

Zambia

MABAYE, A.B.E.
Project Co-Manager
Research Institute
P.O. Box 100
Chilanga

OBSERVERS

Burundi

NGOMIRAKIZA, M.
Directeur du Département des Eaux et Forêts
Ministère de l'Agriculture et de l'Elevage
B.P. 1850
Bujumbura

Colombia

RUIZ, H.
Representante Permanente de Colombia
ante la FAO
Embajada de Colombia
Via Giuseppe Pisanelli 4
00196 Roma

GOENAGA, J.M.
Segundo Secretario
Embajada de Colombia
Via Giuseppe Pisanelli 4
00196 Roma

Malawi

STONEMAN, J.
Chief Fisheries Officer
Department of Fisheries
Ministry of Agriculture
P.O. Box 206
Zomba

MATHOTHO, A.
Fisheries Officer
Department of Fisheries
Ministry of Agriculture
P.O. Box 206
Zomba

Paraguay

FERNANDEZ, A.
Consejero de Embajada
Embajada del Paraguay
Via Emilio de' Cavalieri 12
00198 Roma

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

LAFITSKY, Dr. V.G.
Ministry of Fisheries
Rozhdestrensky 12
Moscow

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

UNDP

RIPLEY, Dr. W.E.
Senior Technical Adviser
Technical Advisory Division
United Nations Development Programme
United Nations
New York, U.S.A.

ILO

SEMPRINI, Mrs. V.
ILO Branch Office in Rome
Via Panisperna 28
00184 Roma, Italia

IBRD

UL HAQUE, I.
Trade Policies and Export Projections
Division
Economics Department
International Bank for Reconstruction
and Development
1818 H Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20433, U.S.A.

IMCO

ANDREEV, A.
Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative
Organization
Marine Science Section
101-104 Piccadilly
London W1V 0AE, England

CPFS

BOBENRIETH ASTETE, Dr. R.
Secretario General Encargado
Comisión Permanente del Pacifico Sur
Apartado Postal 261-A
Quito, Ecuador

ICA

LACOUR, P.
Chairman, International Cooperative
Alliance, Fisheries Sub-Committee
(see France)

ICCAT

RODRIGUEZ-MARTIN, O.
Executive Secretary
International Commission for the
Conservation of Atlantic Tunas
General Mola 17
Madrid 1, Spain

ICES

TAMBS-LYCHE, H.
General Secretary
International Council for the
Exploration of the Sea
Charlottenlund Slot
DK-2920 Charlottenlund, Denmark

OECD

BUTCHER, L.
Principal Administrator
Fisheries Division
Organization for Economic Cooperation
and Development
2 rue André Pascal
75 Paris 16e, France

GUEST SPEAKER

Mr. L.J.C. Evans
Director, Agricultural Projects Department
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development

OFFICERS OF THE COMMITTEE

Chairman	Mr. E.G. Goonewardene (Ceylon)
First Vice-Chairman	Mr. F. Marcitllach Guazo (Spain)
Vice-Chairmen	Iran Panama Sierra Leone U.S.A.

DRAFTING COMMITTEE

Argentina	Mr. J.C. Vignaud
France	Mr. R.A. Lagarde
Indonesia	Admiral N. Zachman
Kenya	Mr. N. Odero
U.S.A.	Mr. P.M. Roedel

NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE

Representatives of:	Australia
	Brazil
	India
	Kenya
	Libyan Arab Republic
	Netherlands
	Poland
	U.S.A.

DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES

Assistant Director-General (Fisheries)	F.E. Popper
Director of Programme Coordination	H.C. Winsor (acting)
Programme Leader - Indian Ocean Fisheries Survey and Development Programme	J.C. Marr
Director for Operations	H.C. Winsor
Director, Fishery Resources Division	M. Ruivo
Director, Fishery Economics and Institutions Division	J.A. Storer
Director, Fishery Industries Division	H. Watzinger

SECRETARIAT

Secretary	J.A. Storer Director, Fishery Economics and Institutions Division
Assistant Secretaries	H. Rosa, Jr. Chief, Fishery Liaison Unit
	J.E. Carroz Senior Legal Officer (International Fisheries)
	V. Shah Technical Officer
Meetings Officer	Mary Clare de Freitas

* * * * *

ADDRESS BY THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL AT THE OPENING SESSION

Mr. Chairman, distinguished delegates,

On behalf of the Director-General who is absent from Rome, it is my pleasure and privilege to welcome you to the Seventh Session of the Committee on Fisheries. You will appreciate, I am sure that I am anxious to add my own personal message of welcome to you on this occasion. Since we last met, both the Committee and I have undergone a transformation. The Committee has seen its membership enlarged from the previous limit of thirty-four Member Nations to that of a committee open to all interested nations, with a current membership of seventy-eight Member Nations. During the same period there has been a change in my responsibilities within the Organization.

I am certain that this change in the character of the Committee on Fisheries will serve to strengthen its role and reputation as the leading intergovernmental body concerned with fisheries. The interest displayed by seventy-eight Member Nations taking up membership in the Committee is a reassuring sign of the importance they attach to it and of the Committee's evident ability to fulfil its functions effectively. It can be said, with some justification, that the experience of our governing bodies with the Committee on Fisheries contributed directly to the decision to establish two other Committees of the Council, one dealing with Agriculture and the other with Forestry.

The existence of these three Committees, with very similar terms of reference, is bound to have some influence on the Council's future expectations from the Committee on Fisheries. In addition, it will be of great assistance to the work of the Council that the specialist guidance from the three Committees on the areas of FAO's work and on international problems in their respective sectors will be governed by a common approach.

All three Committees have a distinctive and yet common role to play in guiding the development of the Organization's Medium-Term Plan. In a sense, this does not involve any change in the basic responsibility of the Committee on Fisheries. According to its terms of reference, your Committee has always examined the programme of work of FAO in the field of fisheries as well as its implementation. In practice, this has involved the work of not just one biennium, but of several thereafter. There are, however, two new factors which will affect your consideration of this matter. The first is that the Medium-Term Plan has been developed with a certain format and methodology for the work of the entire Organization. The second is that your examination of the fisheries aspects of the Plan will be matched by that of your two sister-Committees, on Agriculture and Forestry respectively. The Conference, at its Sixteenth Session, has therefore considered it appropriate to establish certain procedures and a schedule for the rational development of the Medium-Term Plan. Your task is two-fold: on the one hand to re-examine the trend indicators for the fishery sub-programmes for the period 1974-77 and the flexibility of the various modes of action; on the other hand to examine sub-programme proposals for the period 1974-75, with a view to recommending priorities which should be established as well as the possible elimination of low priority activities in the preparation of the Programme of Work and Budget for that biennium.

Your recommendations will be made available to the Regional Conferences which will be held during the period August to October of this year. In the light of the views expressed at these meetings, and after consultation with the Programme and Finance Committees, the Director-General will present to the Council, in November, his proposals on programme priorities for inclusion in the Programme of Work and Budget for 1974-75. Moreover, a revised Medium-Term Plan for the period 1974-79 will be submitted to the Sixtieth Session of the Council, in the Spring of 1973, and to the Seventeenth Session of the Conference toward the end of that year. This matter is to be considered under item 6 of your provisional agenda.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the consideration of the Medium-Term Plan be undertaken in the light of four significant factors: the financial situation confronting the Organization; the main problems affecting world fisheries to which FAO can effectively direct its attention; the demands on FAO likely to arise from action in other intergovernmental fora; and current trends in the field programme. I should like to comment briefly on each of these factors.

The Director-General's Programme of Work and Budget for 1972-73 proposed a working budget of about \$87 million for the current biennium. Subsequent reductions of slightly over \$1 million proposed by the Director-General and the Programme and Finance Committees were agreed to by the Conference which approved approximately \$86 million for the biennium, an increase of 17.5 percent over the previous biennium for cost increases and 1.6 percent for programme increases.

In accordance with the principle of "full budgeting", the sum of about \$2 million was included to cover increases for post and wage index adjustments and other costs during the biennium. Between the time of initial preparation and final approval by the Conference, it became apparent however that FAO would be faced with costs well in excess of this amount as a result of changes in dollar exchange rates, and a more rapid increase in operating costs than originally projected.

Recognizing that the \$86 million working budget would be inadequate to meet these increased demands, the Conference authorized the Director-General to withdraw \$1 million from the Working Capital Fund at the beginning of the 1972-73 biennium and the Director-General agreed to make further savings of \$600 000 during the biennium. In addition the Conference recognized the possibility that withdrawal of an additional \$2 million from the Working Capital Fund might be required later in the biennium.

Since that time, FAO's financial situation has further deteriorated owing to changes in dollar exchange rates and increasing costs. While the situation changes almost daily, projections of costs and an exchange rate of Lire 586 to the dollar (the present rate is slightly below this level) indicate a deficit of between \$6 and \$6.5 million for the biennium. Assuming that no more than the previously envisaged total withdrawals of \$3 million from the Working Capital Fund were to be approved by the Council, FAO would still be faced with a gap of between \$3 to \$3.5 million.

In these circumstances and their implications for 1974-75, assuming continuation of current attitudes and trends, it is absolutely necessary that we formulate our future policies and programmes in a rather austere way and be ready to modify our pattern of activities, eliminating some in the process, and give evidence of flexibility in mode of action to increase our efficiency and effectiveness.

The consideration of international fishery problems with a view to their solution is among your most important functions. It is also the basis for guiding the programme of work of FAO in the fisheries sector. I suggest that the main problems affecting world fisheries today stem from the needs for their rational utilization. The term "rational utilization" embraces development of fisheries, where possible, to encourage participation by countries with emerging fishing industries; the management of fisheries so as to ensure, from a biological and economic viewpoint, the most suitable scale of exploitation; and the optimum mode of utilization of fish catches for human consumption. All three concepts are dealt with under item 4 of your provisional agenda - "Inter-governmental cooperation in the rational utilization of fishery resources".

The Conference, at its last Session, emphasized that problems of development and management could not be separated in promoting the rational growth of international fisheries. It endorsed the views expressed by your Committee, at your Sixth Session, regarding the role FAO could appropriately and competently assume in this regard. And it agreed that regional arrangements, both within and without the framework of FAO, represented the most viable solution for the rational utilization of fishery resources at the present time.

The progress of regional bodies established by FAO regarding the assessment of stocks and the formulation of regulatory measures is reviewed in document COFI/72/5. This progress has to be viewed in the light of the prevailing urgency and in several cases does not perhaps leave room for much satisfaction.

World fisheries are faced with seemingly paradoxical problems. While the world fish catch continues to rise, certain disturbing features of fishery exploitation and utilization have been in evidence for some time. These relate to the comparatively small share of many developing countries in world fisheries, the effect of long-range fishing operations of certain countries with developed fisheries, and the generally increasing need for resource management, particularly of stocks exploited by a number of nations. There is general agreement on the need for effective measures to ensure rational utilization of fisheries but considerable disagreement on what the measures should be. Basically the difference is between the unilateralists who look to individual governments to take action, perhaps eventually in concert, and the multilateralists who look to inter-governmental bodies to develop an effective and harmonious regime for the living resources of the oceans. I do not think that these two approaches are as contradictory as they may sometimes seem. In any event I believe that inter-governmental bodies could play an important role. But to retain the confidence of governments and industry they will have to prove their ability to take action promptly and decisively; to develop a capacity for sound judgement based on partial facts and an empirical approach rather than emphasizing the comprehensiveness of scientific proof which requires so much time that there may be no problem because a resource may have been depleted; and they will have to be given the authority to enforce management measures universally. These are complex problems, indeed, but ones which have to be faced and resolved. Depending on the processes leading to their solution and the mode of solution to be adopted, this Committee may be called upon to assume wider functions than it currently exercises. The Conference realized this possibility and recommended that you review this matter. Document COFI/72/6 submits an analysis and indicates the alternative courses you may wish to consider.

In referring earlier to demands on FAO likely to arise from action in other inter-governmental fora, I had in mind particularly the forthcoming United Nations Conferences on the Human Environment and on the Law of the Sea.

The role played by FAO in preparing for the Stockholm Conference was noted by your Committee at its last Session. An updated report is submitted under item 5 of your provisional agenda. I should like to remind you of the views of the FAO Conference on three important matters: Firstly, the Conference noted that the Action Plan to be considered at Stockholm contains several proposals closely related to FAO's programme of work, particularly under the programme objective, War on Waste. The Council has been requested to review the implications of this Action Plan, when approved, both on priorities in this biennium as well as in the Medium-Term. The outcome of the Stockholm Conference and the Council's examination of the same will determine any new FAO action in the field of environment. Secondly, the FAO Conference approved the views of the Director-General that the establishment of new international institutions or mechanisms to deal with environmental matters separately from development activities should be avoided. And thirdly, the FAO Conference recommended that FAO should take a leading role in the protection of the environment and in the conservation of natural resources at the international level, thereby assisting in protecting the vital interests of agriculture, forestry and fisheries.

The preparations for the Conference on the Law of the Sea have called for an even greater contribution by the Department of Fisheries. Detailed reports on discussions in the Sea-Bed Committee since your last Session are submitted to you, as well as documents which the Sea-Bed Committee has requested from us. In accordance with the wishes you expressed at your last Session, these documents have been submitted to the Sea-Bed Committee in draft, pending your comments. I would hope that, as this information has been prepared insofar as possible in association with your fisheries' authorities, it will on the whole meet with your ready approval.

The fourth main factor which will influence the Medium-Term Plan, Mr. Chairman, is the field programme. As requested by your Committee at its last Session, we have arranged for you to review this matter again. It comes up under item 6(b) of your provisional agenda.

The importance of the field programme can readily be seen in relation to the total regular programme of FAO. Whereas the latter amounts to just under \$86 million in the present biennium, the field programme during the same period is likely to bring an estimated \$249 million to be administered by FAO. As the United Nations Development Programme is responsible for some 80 percent of this amount, it is natural that any discussion of trends in field programmes implemented by FAO should tend to be overshadowed by considerations regarding the UNDP. One cannot be very optimistic about the future level of UNDP resources. With the current policies of the major donors on multilateral aid, it seems rather doubtful that the pledges to UNDP will rise at the annual rate of just under 10 percent assumed by the Governing Council when it formulated its Consensus in 1970. The increase in pledges in 1971 over the previous year had been estimated at a lower rate just over 8 percent, to yield \$245 million. In fact, pledges in 1971 amounted to \$239 million. The preparation of the first country programmes has shown, moreover, that the real needs of developing countries far exceed the resources.

The percentage of Special Fund projects - now called large-scale projects - for which FAO is designated participating and executing agency, has fallen, in terms of value, from 40 percent in 1960 to 35 percent in 1971, although the decline has not by any means been steady. The analysis of project approvals at the most recent session of the UNDP Governing Council is rendered a little more difficult than in the past because a part of the funds was approved for 19 country programmes and the remainder, as in the past, for individual projects. FAO's share of the funds approved for country programmes amount to some 31 percent and of those for individual large-scale projects to 24 percent. The fisheries sector has been fortunate in having 16 percent of the total number of large-scale projects approved, for which FAO is designated as participating and executing agency, compared to the level of some 12 percent in recent years. A similar level cannot necessarily be expected in the coming years. Moreover, the fisheries sector is expected to suffer from the limited amount of UNDP funds reserved for regional and inter-regional projects. Work in fisheries is particularly suitable to be undertaken on a broad regional basis and this limitation of resources is particularly disadvantageous.

Another source of funds for field programmes, which is growing rapidly, is the government cooperative programmes, through which bilateral aid agencies channel a part of their technical assistance funds through FAO. The fisheries sector has already given some evidence of its capacity to utilize such funds effectively, in activities which support the regular programme work and are coordinated with projects supported with multilateral funds. I sincerely hope that this kind of support and coordination will be intensified.

I should also like to take note of the important role in fisheries development played by the IBRD and the regional banks in their financing of fisheries projects. In this connection I am particularly pleased to note that later in your programme you will be hearing an address by Mr. L.J.C. Evans, Director, Agricultural Projects Department of the IBRD.

While most of my remarks, Mr. Chairman, have been directed at drawing your attention to the major matters you will be considering in the coming days, I should like to take this opportunity to inform you of the Director-General's renewed and continuing efforts to increase the effectiveness of the Organization. During the past weeks he established a Group on Objectives and Policies of the Organization with a view to orienting FAO's programme toward identified major problems. With its members coming from a broad range of professional grades, all serving in their personal capacities, the Group brought together a variety of independent views in the form of an interesting and provocative report.

This report represents, of course, only one contribution to the process through which the Director-General will arrive at his decisions and proposals to our governing bodies. Currently the issues raised are being discussed among all levels of the staff, at Headquarters and in the field. A substantial contribution is also expected from the in-depth study of the role and functions of Headquarters, regional offices and country offices, which was requested by the Conference at its Sixteenth Session, and which is under way. It is premature at this stage to put any views to you as the process of consideration has barely begun. Nevertheless, the Director-General felt that you would wish to be informed of this initiative.

To conclude, Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Director-General and on my own behalf, I wish you success in your deliberations on the important matters in your heavy agenda. Both the Director-General and I will follow them closely. I trust that the Session will be as interesting for you as it will be valuable for us.

* * * * *

Appendix C

AGENDA

1. Opening of the session
2. Adoption of the agenda and arrangements for the session
3. Election of officers
4. Inter-governmental cooperation in the rational utilization of fishery resources:
 - (a) Some problems of management
 - (b) Developments in regional fishery bodies in regard to management
 - (c) Functions of the Committee on Fisheries
5. Cooperation in the United Nations system in relation to fisheries
6. Review of the programmes of work of the Organization
 - (a) Medium-Term Plan 1972-77
 - (b) Policy and operational aspects of the field programme
7. Matters considered by the Council and Conference of FAO
8. Reports and records of the Committee on Fisheries
9. Date and place of next session
10. Adoption of report
11. Technical Conference on Fishery Management and Development

* * * * *

LIST OF DOCUMENTS

COFI/72/1	Provisional agenda
2	Annotated provisional agenda
3	Provisional timetable
4	Some problems of management
5	Developments in regional fishery bodies in regard to management
6	Functions of the Committee on Fisheries
7	Cooperation in the UN system in relation to fisheries
Sup. 1	Second Session of the Enlarged Sea-Bed Committee for the Conference on the Law of the Sea, Geneva, 19 July to 27 August 1971
Sup. 2	Further FAO contribution requested by the Sea-Bed Committee at its February-March 1972 Session
8	Review of the Programme of Work of the Organization in the Field of Fisheries: Medium-Term Plan 1972-77
9	The Field Programme
10	Artisanal fisheries in developing countries
11	Matters considered by the Council and Conference of FAO
12	Reports and records of the Committee on Fisheries
13	Canadian proposal that FAO convene a Technical Conference on Fishery Management and Development
14	Report of the Working Group on the functions of the Committee on Fisheries
COFI/72/Inf.1, Rev. 1	List of documents
2	Information for participants
3, Rev. 1	List of participants
4	Department of Fisheries Field Projects, 1972
5	Report of the Eleventh Session of the IMCO Sub-Committee on Safety of Fishing Vessels to the Maritime Safety Committee

COFI/72/Inf.6	Report on Regulatory Fishery Bodies
7	Conservation problems, with special reference to new technology
8	Fishery country profiles
9	The Living Resources of the Sea: an Illustrative Atlas
10	Summary Record of the Sixth Session of the Committee on Fisheries
11	The Medium-Term Plan
12	Address by Mr. L.J.C. Evans, Director, Agricultural Projects Department, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
13	United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, Stockholm, 5-16 June 1972
14	Address by the Deputy Director-General at the opening session

* * * * *

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE
ACMRR WORKING PARTY ON MARINE MAMMALS

In response to the concern expressed by the Committee on Fisheries members as regards the welfare of the marine mammals and the specific suggestions of the United States of America that FAO, through ACMRR, arrange for an independent assessment to be made of the world's major populations of marine mammals, a meeting of officers of ACMRR was convened on Saturday, 8 April. The Officers agreed to recommend the establishment of a working party of ACMRR that would concern itself with this subject.

The Working Party would be given the specific objectives of examining and evaluating existing scientific data regarding:

1. The distribution, abundance and general life story of the major populations of marine mammals
2. The status of stocks which have been or are subject to man's exploitation
3. The status of stocks (seals and porpoises) which are killed incidental to exploitation of other living resources or which suffer from human maritime activities in general

On the basis of this study the Working Party would prepare a report of its findings.

In order to widen and strengthen the scope of the study, the draft report of the Working Party should be submitted to a larger group of scientists associated with national and international marine mammal committees or organisations. The report would eventually be discussed at a small technical seminar to be attended by all those concerned, and which could be co-sponsored by the various organizations interested. The report and the comments of the consulted scientists would subsequently be submitted to the Committee on Fisheries.

The Officers are pleased to report that it is expected that the ACMRR Working Party on Marine Mammals can be financed with funds now available to ACMRR and contributions from interested parties. The establishment of this Working Party has been made possible through altering the working schedules and priorities of some existing and planned working parties. The Officers recommended that the Working Party be convened by Dr. S.J. Holt, a leading world authority on living marine resources.

* * * * *

Appendix F

ADDRESS BY L.J.C. EVANS

Director, Agriculture Projects Department
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I would like first to express my appreciation for having been given this opportunity to meet and to address such a distinguished gathering. Although there must be a wide variety among us in the technical and geographic focus of our interests, we share, I believe, a common commitment to the proper development of the fisheries sector throughout the world and particularly in developing countries.

I propose to speak first about the past and future activities of IBRD in the fisheries sector; on this I can speak with some knowledge. Secondly, I would like to use this occasion to offer some thoughts about the situation of the fisheries sector as viewed against the general economic needs of the countries with which we are concerned. On this second subject I can speak with much less assurance, partly because most of my experience has been in agricultural development, especially in tropical agriculture, rather than in fisheries development.

Most of you know the story of the three fishermen who had fished together in the North Atlantic during many summers but whose activities were sharply curtailed during the icy winters. One of the three succumbed to the attractions of the big city and went inland to Toronto. From there he wrote to his two friends, advising them that fishing did not apparently have to stop in mid-winter; he had seen people catching fish even in the most icy conditions - all you had to do was to cut a hole in the ice. His two friends decided to try it and left their homes early one day to do so. It was nightfall before they returned, looking somewhat dejected, and obviously empty-handed. But their wives, as wives will, enquired whether they had had any luck, and where were the fish? "Fish!", the men replied, "it took us the whole day to cut a hole in the ice big enough to get the boat in." Mr. Chairman, neither of those men happened to be me but my ignorance of fishing techniques is such that it almost might have been!

May I now turn to the past and possible future role of the IBRD (or the World Bank group as it is sometimes called) in fisheries development. Up to the end of 1969, only three loans had been made by the Bank for fisheries development for a total loan volume of 20 million dollars. During the same period 164 loans had been made for agricultural development for a total volume of just over 1.6 billion dollars (1 600 million dollars). Fisheries development had received, therefore, only between 1 percent and 2 percent of the resources which the Bank had devoted to agriculture and fisheries combined.

During the next three years, 1970-1971-1972, our support accelerated somewhat and in three years we made four loans in four countries for a total of about 10 million dollars. I expect that in the coming year we may make three or four loans for perhaps 60 million dollars, which would still be less than 10 percent of the total volume of lending by IBRD for agriculture and fisheries combined. Looking further ahead, the Bank's increasing support for fisheries development may mean that the Bank may soon become, if it has not already become, the largest of the public sector donors transferring capital to support fisheries in developing countries.

However, Mr. Chairman, though these figures show an upward trend, I doubt that they seem particularly impressive to the distinguished delegates here today. And, for my part, I want to assure you that I do not regard them as satisfactory at all.

The fact is that though the Bank is making more loans each year for fisheries, it is still not making very many! On the other hand, it is not turning down many loan applications either. Why do we not receive more well-thought-out requests for fisheries development than we do? It may be worthwhile to explore this further.

If there is in fact only a rather small potential need for transfers of capital to the developing countries for fisheries development, then we would not need to be concerned. But I do not believe this is the case.

Is it, then, that bankers tend to view loans for fisheries with some mistrust, or that they are believed to do so? There may be some truth in this, Mr. Chairman, and I confess that I myself become nervous when a loan is requested which proposes the purchase of a second-hand boat. Buying a satisfactory second-hand boat is almost as difficult as buying a horse! Then again bankers may be alive to the fact that, even after a lengthy marine resources survey, fish are not always found where you expect to find them. In my, admittedly limited, experience they are inclined to wait around obediently while their numbers and characteristics are being catalogued, but by the time you have completed financial arrangements and sent men and boats to catch them, they have moved off somewhere else!

Joking apart, Mr. Chairman, we in the Bank are ready to entertain proposals for soundly conceived fisheries projects and the range of purposes for which we can lend includes:

- Vessels, equipment and gear
- Construction of fishing ports
- Cold storage, processing, transport, marketing
- Provision of credit
- Training of skilled and semi-skilled personnel

We are equally as interested in fish farming as in marine fishing, and I shall have more to say about this later.

I must make it plain, however, that we make loans only to member countries of the Bank or to entities supported by them, so a request needs to come from a member country and not from a specialized agency or non-governmental authority. Why are governments of our member countries not more often requesting financial support for fisheries development? I would not be surprised if many of you here may be able to suggest an answer. For instance, how many times has not a fisheries expert received a discouraging reaction from his government when he has requested support for a fisheries proposal?

The fact is, of course, that the economic needs of most countries are increasingly pressing and ever more complex, and the choices which have to be made between competing claims are becoming harder to make. To receive support, a proposal not only has to be good, it has also to be adjudged to have some priority. It may therefore be worthwhile to ask ourselves what are the current concerns of heads of state and planners and decision-makers in developing countries.

Earning and saving foreign exchange (which is one of FAO's chosen areas of concentration) is of fundamental importance. Fisheries development can contribute importantly to it. But so can many other kinds of development. In any case, economic growth as indicated solely by increases in volume and value of production is not by itself enough.

There is rising concern about availability of future food supplies, about malnutrition, underemployment and income distribution. If we ask ourselves what contribution fisheries development is making - or could (perhaps with significant changes) begin to make - we may arrive at some kind of evaluation of the relative priority of fisheries development or, in the modern jargon, its "relevance" in the present and fast-changing economic and social scene.

All of you know the statistics better than I do, and some of the figures which I quote may be imprecise or out of date. It is only the orders of magnitude to which I wish to draw attention. I believe that only 2 percent or 3 percent of human food is provided by fish products, most of which is derived from wild fish taken from the seas. International trade in fish and fish products amounts to less than 2 percent of world trade. In our experience, many governments provide less than 1 percent of their budgetary resources for fisheries. Why are not these percentages much higher?

On the face of it, the fisheries sector would appear to have some significant advantages, or "plusses" as my American friends would say.

In the earning and saving of foreign exchange an important aspect is the market outlook for the commodity in question. Whereas the outlook for a number of commodities of concern to FAO and the Bank is clouded, I would suppose that the outlook for certain types of fish products is rather strong. In a few developing countries exports of fish products do indeed contribute importantly to the earning of foreign exchange.

Growth of food supply is particularly important because of the startling growth in population that will continue for many years to come, whatever may be done to arrest it. Increased food production will be of even greater importance if, as we all hope, the poorest segments of the population share in the income growth. If the rate of population grows by 3 percent and per capita income also grows by 3 percent, total demand for food can be expected to grow in typical cases by 5 percent. Moreover, rising incomes also generate demands for a higher quality and more varied diet. As a main source of protein, fish ought to be important in improved nutrition. With its backward and forward linkages, fishery development ought to be important also as a stimulator of employment in related industries such as boat building and repairing, fishing gear production, ice-making, refrigeration, processing in many forms, transport and marketing.

With these apparent advantages, why is the fisheries sector in many countries a backward sector? Are there some "minusses" which affect the "plusses" that I have mentioned? What problems are there and how can they be solved? It is not surprising that the answers are by no means clear and that, as in every field of economic endeavour, we are faced with dilemmas with which it is most difficult to deal.

For instance, the contribution which the fisheries sector can make to the world's food needs will be related to the price of fish. In too many countries it seems to me that fish is on the way to becoming the rich man's food. I remember forty or fifty years ago, though my family lived about as far from the sea as it is possible to be in England, we expected to have fish several times a week. On the other hand, chicken was regarded as an exceptional treat which we very seldom had. Why is it that the technology of chicken production has enabled the comparative price of chicken to be drastically reduced, whereas fish is becoming relatively more expensive?

To what extent, also, can we look to fisheries as making an important contribution toward resolving the protein problem? Rich people commonly consume more protein than they need. But as I understand it, malnutrition and protein deficiency in their most serious forms are linked with poverty and they are found to occur particularly in certain population groups, namely pregnant and nursing mothers, and in babies a few months before and a few years after birth. Can we claim that the fisheries sector makes any relevant contribution to the nutritional needs of these special groups or of the masses of poor people generally?

Turning now to the problem of unemployment or underemployment, the figures, whatever projections one uses, are startling. I believe that the latest FAO figures suggest that between 1970 and 1985, the "agricultural" population in South Asia will grow by 24 percent (from 490 million to 606 million); in East Africa by 31 percent (from 80 million to 105 million); in Latin America by 14 percent (from 118 million to 135 million). Technical advisers, economists and government planners constantly need to consider whether their

policies may not be favouring capital-intensive production techniques which provide fewer opportunities for employment. It is plain that price distortions of various kinds often exist which encourage capital-intensive rather than labour-using production methods. Examples are trade and fiscal policies that result in imported equipment being underpriced; certain types of labour and social legislation that result in labour being overpriced; and the use of artificially low interest rates which encourage misuse of resources by borrowers.

Such distortions may affect not only employment but also income distribution. Operators who have access to cheap credit or access to foreign exchange, and who perhaps also are subject to minimum wage controls, have an incentive to operate in a capital-intensive manner. They may actually displace labour or merely fail to provide the additional jobs that their expanding operations might normally be expected to create. The effect may be to widen the disparity between incomes of persons employed in a "modern" sector on the one hand, and those on the other hand who are either unemployed altogether or employed, if at all, in the remaining traditional sector.

Mr. Chairman, it is certainly not my intention to deliver a jeremiad and dishearten my audience by cataloguing the difficulties which face them. As in other economic sectors, such as agriculture, so in fisheries do we have to be aware of the dilemmas which face us. How can we greatly improve production to meet the needs of many millions of additional consumers of fish; and how can we arrange things so that the producer earns sufficient to provide him with an incentive to produce, and at the same time charges consumers prices which they can afford? How can we improve efficiency in production without reducing the employment opportunities in the fishery industry? Can we improve and disseminate technology so as to improve productivity and reduce costs, without worsening the gap between a small prosperous modernized industry on the one hand and a traditional, poorer industry on the other?

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that you would not expect any one person, even a guest speaker at a distinguished gathering, to try to provide simple answers to such problems. Moreover, in my view, no single class of person can reasonably come up with adequate answers, whether he be an experienced fisherman, a marine biologist, a fisheries economist, a marketing specialist, a government planner; certainly a banker cannot. This industry, after all, is a particularly complex one with its horizontal and vertical linkages and its need for effective cooperation between government and private interests and between all classes of professional know-how. I recollect that as long ago as 1955 in Ceylon, FAO made a policy statement on the following lines:

"With regard to fishery development programmes, piece-meal approaches to special problems can rarely succeed, and one factor alone, namely the extreme perishability of the commodity, dictates a simultaneous approach to related problems in production and marketing, in order that the incentives, as well as the means, can be found to increase production. In practice this will involve a very considerable strengthening of most government services to undertake the work of research, technical training, administration, financial assistance, marketing organization and, in many cases, the creation of specially constituted development agencies."

I suppose that FAO might say much the same today, only that in addition to mentioning the need to increase production, a concern would also be stated in respect of nutrition, employment and income distribution.

The responsibility of governments for economic development generally and for fisheries development in particular, includes, to a greater or lesser extent, a general responsibility to manage the economy; a responsibility to provide public services and financial support,

particularly where these are not provided by the private sector; and an obligation to provide an institutional framework within which economic development and social progress can thrive. Public services in the fisheries sector and public financing may be concerned with construction, maintenance or operation of ports and roads, transport and marketing services; with basic or applied research; with training and advisory services; with provision of credit; with management of cooperatives. As I have said, all of these are activities which might be considered for financing by the Bank.

In some countries the concept of the investment "project" may still be fairly new and it is not uncommon to find that governments have difficulty in identifying, preparing and carrying out development projects; nor is this surprising, in view of the complexity of the job and the pressures under which most government planners have to work. In this sphere I believe that FAO has a particularly valuable role to play.

Formal cooperation between FAO and the Bank began in 1964 and in most of the fisheries projects which the Bank has financed or which we have "in the pipeline" FAO and Bank staff have worked jointly with the government concerned. One thing which both institutions have to avoid is conceiving and planning exotic projects and then "wishing" them on their member countries. Our golden rule should be to provide the assistance that is needed, without attempting to do the whole job ourselves, and to design the project to meet the technical and economic needs of the situation, the wishes of the member country and the capacity of the project authority to plan and carry out a project which it regards as its own.

Projects which the Bank has already financed have included tuna fishing with large modern ships, offshore fishing by improved traditional methods, and more recently a project for catching and exporting shrimps.

One possibility in which I am particularly interested is that part of a loan which the Bank made to the rural development banks in the Philippines may be used for making loans to small farmers who wish to have fish ponds. Further than this, I am interested to know what scope there may be for greatly expanded activities in fish farming and whether IBRD support would be appropriate.

I suppose that the contrast between fish production and meat production methods has frequently been pointed out and that you are tired of being asked the question, with all its latent oversimplification, why in the second half of the twentieth century the world still has to obtain 85 percent of its fish supply by hunting wild fish in the oceans whereas we gave up dependence on wild animals for our meat supply many centuries ago. I am told that promising possibilities exist for farming fish in new ways, that the productivity of fish farms per acre of water and per dollar invested can be high. I should like to know much more than I do about the possibilities and problems and how fish farming in ponds or lakes or estuaries or in coastal waters compares with the hunting of wild fish in the seas; I would like to know this not only in relation to productivity, but also in relation to returns to the entrepreneur, prices to the consumer, and particularly in relation to employment generation. I sense that many developing countries might like to have assistance in developing profitable fisheries in inland or coastal areas in addition to, or instead of, being offered help in ocean fishing.

Once or twice already I have referred to the technological improvements and should like to dwell on this subject before closing my address.

As recently as ten years ago, the agricultural sector in many developing countries seemed to be stagnant and neither politicians nor planners were willing to give the sector the support which many of us believed it deserved. The situation now has changed dramatically for many reasons which are well known and which do not need to be repeated now. But undoubtedly one reason why there is now more confidence in the probability that the agricultural sector can respond to the vastly increased support it is now receiving is the evident success of the recent technological breakthroughs, especially in wheat and rice, and in other directions also.

What possibilities are there that similar breakthroughs could be achieved in fisheries research? Are fish susceptible to the kind of biological engineering that has been successfully applied to many plants and to some animals?

Such questions are of more than academic importance because the chances seem better now than before that well-conceived international research may attract the financial support it needs. As many of those present here today will know, a newly founded international group of governments and organizations has recently indicated an intention to make approximately 15 million dollars available in 1972 for a number of specific research programmes designed to raise the quantity and quality of food production in developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The actions taken by the Consultative Group were based on consideration of the recommendations of the Group's Technical Advisory Committee, an international group of 12 distinguished experts under the chairmanship of Sir John Crawford, Vice Chancellor of the Australian National University. The Technical Advisory Committee is meeting in FAO Headquarters this week and has been asked amongst other things to consider the possibility that research in aquaculture might be suitable for consideration by the Consultative Group.

Mr. Chairman, let me say in conclusion that I have esteemed it an honour to be allowed to address your distinguished gathering, that this is one more instance in which my close association with FAO has been not only interesting but also very pleasant. Even though you will have by now perceived that I am not in a position to prescribe any panacea for this most important industry, I hope that my deep interest in it is not in doubt. I can truthfully say, as the fish-and-chip merchant remarked to the newspaper proprietor, that "My business is wrapped up in your business."

* * * * *

