With respect of IUU fishing, many countries made statements in support of a new binding instrument that would require parties to apply a minimum standard of port state measures to fishing vessels that enter their ports. The instrument remains under development with several countries of the view that it should be limited to fishing vessels only. In IUCN's view, in order to be an effective tool to counter IUU fishing, the new agreement must apply to all vessels involved with fishing activities, to include transport and supply vessels.

Also subject to discussion under this agenda item was work undertaken through the FAO to develop a Global Record of fishing vessels. Again, this would be most useful if it included information on all vessels involved in fishing efforts, to include transport and supply. The Global Record would be a Record and not a Registry, in other words it would serve as a meta database of information about vessels with electronic links to other databases and could serve as an information resource to national fisheries managing authorities. There was a concern expressed among some delegates that the development of the Global Record might be delayed because of a lack of funds.

Information on vessel monitoring, control and surveillance was also exchanged. Members were encouraged to attend the Third Global Fisheries Enforcement Workshop planned for Maputo in September 2010. The delegation of Argentina during a side event provided an interesting and helpful presentation on its observer programs and on technology that ties GPS monitoring with onboard cameras. Also at that presentation, Argentine authorities noted that they had been able to rebuild hake stocks through the use of temporal closed areas.

Another major theme of this agenda item was by-catch and discards. Many spoke in favor of a new COFI process to develop guidelines on by-catch management and discard reduction.

With respect of climate change and its impact on fisheries and aquaculture, many delegates noted that the effects of climate change are already visible on terrestrial and marine species. Some delegates urged reduction in energy consumption, including by reducing fishing capacity, which almost all agree is above optimum and sustainable levels. Several delegations addressed climate change with respect of the Arctic, urging that fisheries be closed until such time as scientific investigation and assessments are conducted and concluded, thus allowing for any new or developing fisheries to be conducted sustainable.

The United States hosted a side event at which it noted that the Arctic is warming; range and distribution of some or all fish stocks will shift; there is a limited understanding of Arctic ecosystems and fish stocks and a need for research. It was noted that all Arctic coastal states have delimited exclusive economic zones (EEZs) and that there are high seas areas in the Arctic, including in the central Arctic that have never been fished. There are existing legal instruments with respect of the Arctic, for example the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). The NEAFC Convention area stretches to the North Pole, thus a part of the central Arctic is within an area managed through an RFMO.

The relevant U.S. fisheries management council has closed a large area within the U.S. EEZ that is north of the Bering Strait to new and commercial fisheries until such time as scientific investigation and assessment has been completed, though subsistence indigenous fishing may continue. Neighboring states were invited to consider adoption of similar measure. The United States suggested that consideration be given to establishment of a regional arrangement for managing fisheries in advance of their development and will work with neighbors bilaterally with respect of potential straddling stocks within EEZs. A participant at the side event suggested that a CCAMLR-like instrument be adopted for the Arctic, though another participant was of the view that this would be inappropriate.

With respect of management of deep sea fisheries in the high seas the Secretariat introduced International Guidelines for the Management of Deep-Sea Fisheries in the High Seas and that they had been finalized and adopted through technical consultations in August 2008. A number of delegations supported the guidelines as a way forward to

Argentina stated that RFMOs do not have the authority to establish rules for states that are not party to that particular RFMO.

COFI received a report from the Subcommittee on Fish Trade which had met in Bremen during the past year. Some delegations expressed the fear that ecolabelling schemes could represent barriers to trade. There was discussion of whether it would be beneficial to harmonize ecolabelling schemes. The Secretariat explained that there would be legal difficulties for it to take on such an activity, but at the urging of many members agreed to consider the issue further. It was agreed that the Secretariat should develop best practice guidelines for catch documentation schemes and for traceability for consideration at the next meeting of the Subcommittee. On CITES it was agreed that FAO should continue to provide technical advice with respect of listing proposals for relevant aquatic species. It was also agreed that FAO should continue to provide technical assistance with respect of fisheries subsidies at discussions at the World Trade Organization (WTO).

There was discussion of FAO's program of work on fisheries and aquaculture and on which priorities FAO should set with respect of its work in this area. Differing views were expressed. COFI received a report from the Subcommittee on Aquaculture which had wheah by Brefrin W-arga State 0:000813cd 0:0000813cd 0:000813cd 0:000813cd

agreed to ask the Secretariat to consider ways to protect small-scale fishers and their communities.

There was a discussion about the role of Subcommittees and of the technical consultations with one regional group of the view that such bodies did not have the competence to adopt or approve guidelines and other documents, which should be submitted to COFI itself for adoption. Others were of the view that COFI could and had delegated this authority to relevant sub-bodies and that this practice should continue.