

IUU FISHING IN THE CONVENTION AREA

Current level of IUU fishing

10.1 The SCIC Chair advised the Commission that according to calculations made by the Secretariat and approved by WG-FSA, the current level of IUU catches in the Convention Area is 3 615 tonnes (Annex 5, paragraph 3.16; SC-CAMLR-XXVI, Annex 5, paragraphs 8.4 to 8.8 and Table 3). Of serious concern to SCIC was the expansion of gillnet fishing by IUU vessels and the shifting of IUU fishing to high-seas areas and oceanic banks, in particular, in the Indian Ocean sector of the Convention Area.

10.2 The Commission noted that the Scientific Committee reiterated the serious concerns raised by WG-FSA on the increasing level of IUU catches in recent years and the shifting of the IUU fishery from 'traditional' grounds in Area 58, such as Division 58.5.1, to high-seas areas and oceanic banks, such as BANZARE Bank (Division 58.4.3b) closer to the continent (SC-CAMLR-XXVI, paragraph 8.3).

10.3 The Commission noted the Scientific Committee's advice that (SC-CAMLR-XXVI, paragraphs 8.5 and 8.6):

- (i) longlines are currently being replaced by gillnets in the IUU fishery;
- (ii) gillnets require no bait, can be deployed at any time and are more powerful than longlines in their ability to catch fish;
- (iii) no information is currently available on the incidental mortality of birds, mammals and other marine biota in gillnets deployed in the Convention Area;
- (iv) gillnets have the potential to become lost and drift through the water column for an unknown amount of time while still fishing to a large extent (ghost nets).

10.4 The Commission also noted the Scientific Committee's advice that the level of IUU fishing in Division 58.4.3b and other CCAMLR subareas and divisions is undermining CCAMLR efforts to provide for a sustainable fishery. It noted that current levels of IUU fishing had exceeded the legitimate catch level several times in the last three years (SC-CAMLR-XXVI, paragraph 8.4).

10.5 The Commission noted with alarm that estimated IUU catches in Division 58.4.3b were 2 293 tonnes out of the total IUU catch in the Convention Area of 3 615 tonnes (SC-CAMLR-XXVI, paragraph 4.142). The catch limit in Division 58.4.3b for the 2006/07 season was 300 tonnes and the estimated IUU catch was almost 10-times higher than the legal catch of 253 tonnes.

10.6 The Commission further noted that *D. eleginoides* caught on BANZARE Bank are large adult fish while juvenile fish have never been taken. The relationship of these fish to fish in other areas is still unknown. BANZARE Bank might represent a spawning area for fish which live as juveniles in other adjacent areas. The excessive exploitation of these fish in recent years by IUU vessels may have already caused substantial damage to the stock which is likely to take decades to reverse (SC-CAMLR-XXVI, paragraph 8.7).

10.7 South Africa reiterated its concerns at the increased incidence of gillnets in the Convention Area and noted that gillnetting compounds the IUU issue as it causes untold ecosystem damage. This uncertainty makes CCAMLR's work more complicated. In particular, it presents the Scientific Committee with considerable challenges in making any future recommendations. South Africa concluded that all Members should consider how the issue of gillnet fishing could be addressed, both by CCAMLR and within their domestic measures.

10.8 The European Community noted paragraphs 8.5 and 8.6 of SC-CAMLR-XXVI which indicated that gillnet fishing is a serious concern. The European Community noted that the Scientific Committee clearly expressed that IUU fishing is undermining any CCAMLR attempt to provide the basis for fishing to be sustainable (SC-CAMLR-XXVI, paragraph 8.4). The European Community called on all CCAMLR Members to take action.

10.9 Spain supported the concerns expressed by South Africa, particularly noting that gillnet fishing is occurring close to the Antarctic continent. Spain noted that gillnets are made of nylon which remains in the water column for significant periods of time and can result in ghost fishing leading to serious implications for the ecosystem around the Antarctic continent.

10.10 The UK agreed with Spain and the European Community in respect of activities of IUU vessels and noted that gillnet fishing was probably also occurring in areas shallower than 500 m and that such indiscriminate catches were utterly unsustainable.

10.11 Argentina recalled that the somewhat hasty assimilation of the concepts of IUU fishing which places these three situations on an equal footing, has generated not only confusion, but also contradictory consequences. Even though FAO's own International Plan of Action (IPOA) against IUU fishing has definitions that are partially ambiguous, a phrase at the end of its text makes it clear that not all unregulated fishing is illegal fishing.

10.12 Furthermore, Argentina pointed out its view that when fishing in the Convention Area is incompatible with the obligation to preserve the marine environment, for example, when it is of a predatory nature, or when the obligation to cooperate on the high seas is not fulfilled, either by States or by international organisations, such situations constitute infringements of UNCLOS, and therefore represent situations of illegality and not of non-regulation.

10.13 Argentina stated its view that the high level of catches and the use of destructive fishing gear by non-Contracting Party vessels in the Convention Area, well above the catch limit for *Dissostichus* spp. that was estimated by the Scientific Committee on the basis of the best scientific evidence available, may constitute an infringement of UNCLOS, in particular of Articles 117, 118 and 119.

10.14 Argentina stated its view that fishing outside the dates specified in Conservation Measure 41-07 may contravene UNCLOS and would make Flag States responsible and liable for damages to the scientific research being conducted on behalf of the Commission in the terms of UNCLOS Article 263.

10.15 In further considering the Scientific Committee's advice on exploratory fishing (see paragraphs 12.5 to 12.12), Members made a number of comments in relation to IUU fishing in Division 58.4.3b.

10.16 The European Community thanked Australia for its proposal to undertake research surveys (SC-CAMLR-XXVI, paragraphs 4.147 and 4.148) in order to obtain more information on stocks from Division 58.4.3b, as well as for its patrol operations in the area.

10.17 The European Community noted that, in the words of Hemingway, 'the bell was tolling' for CCAMLR. The level of IUU catches recorded in the BANZARE Bank can be defined as astonishing if compared to the level of legal catches. This demonstrates that the tools at the disposal of this Commission are insufficient to fight against illegal fishery and to meet the objective of the organisation to conserve marine living resources and to ensure their rational use, therefore other measures, currently under the examination of the Commission, shall be urgently adopted.

10.18 The European Community noted that the proposed research survey by Australia would allow the opening of the area only after completion of the research survey and doubted that fishing would be possible in the area due to ice coverage at such a time.

10.19 The European Community therefore believed that this would effectively close the area to legal fishers and stated that it was important not to penalise all those fishers who make an effort to respect CCAMLR conservation measures.

10.20 The technical closure of the area will unlikely have any effect on decreasing IUU fishing and would reduce the likelihood of IUU activities being reported by legal vessels in accordance with Conservation Measure 10-02.

10.21 The European Community stressed its availability for considering a reduced catch limit in Division 58.4.3b also in order to give legal fishers the opportunity of recovering tagged fish.

10.22 It further expressed the concern that external parties reading CCAMLR reports would conclude that CCAMLR had not taken effective action against IUU fishing and therefore, further actions should be taken by the Commission, in particular adopting the market-related measures proposals.

10.23 The European Community reiterated that the reason for increased levels of IUU fishing is that IUU catches can easily find a market to be sold.

10.24 Australia stated that the Commission should not be seen to be undermining the Convention by engaging in unsustainable fisheries and that CCAMLR Members should not take the approach that they should take all available stocks before IUU fishers had the opportunity. Australia also clarified to the European Community that scientific research was intended to be conducted by late March before the commercial fishery commenced, which should allow fishing sooner than 1 June, thereby decreasing the risk of ice coverage reducing fishing access. Australia also considered it arguable whether the presence of legal fishers or Members' fishing vessels in the CCAMLR area acts as a deterrent against illegal fishers, given that on a number of occasions IUU fishers have actually driven away Members' vessels from fishing grounds. Australia concluded that the scientific evidence clearly indicated that a survey was required in Division 58.4.3b.

10.25 Brazil expressed its concern at the figures for Division 58.4.3b but disagreed with the European Community view that CCAMLR might be perceived as failing to act. Brazil

pointed out that the IUU catches from Division 58.4.3b had not been caught in accordance with the catch limits agreed by CCAMLR. Brazil acknowledged that a solution would be difficult and reiterated that it was willing to examine ways to tackle the IUU problem but that any solutions would need to conform with international law.

10.26 Argentina proposed the introduction of a statement to define IUU fishers in Division 58.4.3b as 'predatory' as a term of direct relevance to UNCLOS which could be used as a tool to combat IUU operators.

10.27 The European Community expressed some doubt in respect of the suggestion made by Argentina that UNCLOS or other institutions could take responsibility.

10.28 Uruguay expressed support for the views of the European Community and Brazil and believed that an important principle that must be maintained in terms of controlling IUU fishing was to ensure that any action should not have a negative impact on legal fishers. In other words, the issue is not so much unregulated fishing but striving to make fishing a legal activity by generating favourable conditions that will keep fishers as legal operators.

10.29 The USA stated that the objectives of the Convention must be adhered to and that CCAMLR should not authorise fishing with respect to stocks that have been depleted.

10.30 Norway observed that a very serious situation existed in respect of Division 58.4.3b in that the total catch was estimated to be 2 600 tonnes when the precautionary catch limit was only 300 tonnes. This was not sustainable and should be taken seriously. Norway agreed with the USA that CCAMLR should not authorise fishing with respect to stocks that have been depleted and suggested that the results from the research survey proposed by Australia could be awaited before opening the 2008/09 exploratory fishery in Division 58.4.3b.

10.31 Argentina pointed out that the scenario mentioned by Uruguay in paragraph 10.28 would constitute a case of unregulated fishing. Whilst that could also include illegal fishing, Argentina noted problems with the definitions contained in the FAO IPOA in relation to IUU fishing. Argentina recalled that those definitions included reference that IUU fishing does not necessarily constitute illegal fishing. Unregulated fishing is, *inter alia*, fishing by third parties in the CCAMLR context and any question of its illegality would arise from incompatibility with specific provisions of the 1982 Law of the Sea Convention. The majority of States are party to the Law of the Sea Convention and, if not, they recognise those specific provisions as customary law. Argentina believed that CCAMLR needed to regard the situation as a case of 'predatory fishing' in UNCLOS terms which would provide a basis for action or measures in accordance with international law. Illegality would arise from the incompatibility with UNCLOS Article 118 and other related articles. Argentina acknowledged that some Members may not agree with recourse to international law in accordance with UNCLOS, but believed that this would provide a solution as it would avoid contravening international law.

10.32 The USA responded to Argentina that it was important to work in international fora to combat IUU fishing globally, but nevertheless CCAMLR needed to move forward in its own right and adopt new measures such as the proposed trade measure.

10.33 India noted that all Members of CCAMLR had a strong interest in controlling IUU activities. It believed that if all CCAMLR Members were united in combating IUU fishing, references to such activities would be removed from Commission reports in 10 to 20 years.

10.34 Germany reminded the Commission that the concept of IUU fishing is different to illegal fishing, as some measures are not necessarily binding on certain third-party States that allow their vessels to engage in activities that undermine the measures of fisheries organisations. Germany also urged the Commission to bear in mind that all States have an obligation to cooperate with each other if they exploit common resources on the high seas. States which allow their flag vessels to engage in activities which undermine measures contravene their obligation to cooperate with other States. Germany stated that CCAMLR should therefore be open to all measures to ensure cooperation, including trade-related measures.

10.35 Brazil questioned whether CCAMLR had the legal basis for imposing such trade sanctions against non-Parties as there was no UN mandate for fisheries-related organisations to go beyond requiring their cooperation with CCAMLR.

10.36 The UK noted the increase in IUU fishing from some areas of the Convention Area, particularly Division 58.4.3b, and expressed concern that the current trend indicates that catches from these areas will continue to increase beyond unsustainable levels. The UK stated that CCAMLR must act now. The UK believed that measures in place now were not sufficient and that consideration needed to be given to adopting trade measures.

10.37 Chile noted that CCAMLR has displayed leadership in combating IUU fishing. Chile also noted that this position had not been easy to achieve, taking into account that most of the current conservation measures, as well as VMS, CDS and the list of IUU vessels, had required lengthy deliberations by the Commission but now they provided a reference point for other organisations.

10.38 Chile believed however that, innovation notwithstanding, it is time to recognise that CCAMLR is not perfect and it is time to continue to progress by adopting new conservation measures to combat IUU fishing in the Convention Area. Chile noted that the UN called for international organisations to take effective measures against IUU fishing and, in Chile's view, CCAMLR could not ignore calls from international fora to which many of its Members also belong.

10.39 Argentina expressed support for Brazil's position and that the Commission was not in full agreement on the adoption of trade measures since all other legal means had not been fully explored. Argentina noted that international cooperation is a two-way situation and agreed with Germany that any breaches of international cooperation must be considered with regard to available solutions consistent with UNCLOS. Argentina regretted that CCAMLR had previously acted prematurely against IUU fishing and, in doing so, had too promptly assimilated the concept of unregulated fishing with illegal fishing, which has had counter-productive effects. Argentina urged caution in following the solutions attempted at other organisations as these may be legally possible and also desirable under certain situations, but that such solutions needed to take into consideration the different membership and objectives of organisations other than CCAMLR, to ensure that trade measures were not contrary to international law.

10.40 France reminded the Commission that a number of documents and figures presented to the Commission across a range of agenda items indicated that IUU fishing is causing major damage on the ecosystem and on target stocks. France stated that it was time for CCAMLR to arrive at a solution to end IUU fishing as soon as possible. It stated that this responsibility

could not be left to others and that the UN gives authority to organisations in terms of measures which they should adopt. France considered that commercial measures could be implemented quickly and effectively.

10.41 Spain advised the Commission that the principal victims of IUU operators were legal fishers, and recalled the situation in Division 58.4.3b during the current season when Spanish-flagged vessels were forced to leave the area due to the large number of gillnet vessels. Spain noted that the provisions in Conservation Measure 10-02, requiring legal vessel masters to provide information on IUU activities, was of little use since they only served to put individual masters at risk. Spain stated that the fight against IUU fishing would be won via political and economic means instead of by legal means, lending effective impact to the closing of ports and denial of re-supply services. Spain reiterated that a trade measure was necessary and important.

10.42 Italy expressed its astonishment at the report of the Scientific Committee and was of the view that the Commission has responsibility to address IUU fishing via all possible measures. Italy believed that trade measures were an effective tool and appropriate to the common objectives of the Commission. Italy did not believe that such a measure was incompatible with international law, noting that the World Trade Organization (WTO) preamble listed sustainable development and environmental protection amongst its objectives. Italy believed that environment and trade were internationally recognised to be mutually supportive and noted the example offered by conventions such as CITES which have successfully applied trade measures.

10.43 South Africa reiterated its alarm at the levels of IUU fishing activities which have impacted on exploratory fisheries. South Africa recalled that the Valdivia Symposium had identified IUU fishing as an immediate threat to the objectives of the Convention. The rapid depletion identified in the report of the Scientific Committee should be cause for genuine concern to all Members and, therefore, cooperation was required. South Africa recalled Argentina's point that other solutions had not been explored and requested that Argentina offer some alternatives.

10.44 Ukraine reminded the Commission that the previous experience of CCAMLR in restricting exploratory fisheries had unfortunately led to an increased level of IUU fishing. Ukraine believed that the inclusion of Division 58.4.3b in a management plan would be a restrictive factor. Ukraine was of the view that measures, such as restricting Members fishing and conducting more inspections, would have only minor results. Ukraine also considered that international agreements complicated CCAMLR's work and needed review, for example, some provisions of the WTO and UNCLOS had been drafted 20 years ago and do not adequately deal with the state of humanity and marine resources today. Therefore, trade measures should be strengthened and this should be possible as IUU fishing is an effect of market demand and that nearly all toothfish markets consist of CCAMLR Members. Ukraine believed that the adoption of stricter trade measures by CCAMLR would have a more beneficial effect than restricting exploratory fishing by Members.

10.45 Sweden supported the views of the European Community and Norway, stating that it found IUU figures to be shocking and alarming. Sweden agreed with Italy that trade measures had been successfully applied by other organisations and concluded that more effective measures, such as trade measures, were required.

10.46 Australia disagreed with Ukraine's view and stated that a research survey in an area was not in any way restrictive as it would provide information necessary to manage the area. Australia recalled that the last time CCAMLR dealt with an area that had suffered a similar level of degradation, the area had been closed. Whilst this did not deter IUU fishers, Australia reiterated that CCAMLR Members should not be seen to be contributing to the degradation of harvested stocks in areas under its control.

10.47 Russia supported Ukraine's position on the restriction of exploratory fisheries, noting that it would not help CCAMLR to combat IUU fishing. In Russia's experience, the restriction of legal fishing vessels only encouraged IUU operators. Russia advised the Commission that it had adopted and had pending national regulations against IUU fishing. These included increasing the responsibility placed on companies, the ban of sales of all IUU-derived products and the confiscation of vessels and gear. Russia believed that such measures removed the incentive for IUU operations.

10.48 Belgium fully supported trade-related measures to complement other measures aimed at combating IUU fishing. In adopting such measures, CCAMLR would be joining the work of other organisations by reinforcing compliance measures.

10.49 Poland associated itself, in particular, with the statement made by Sweden and indicated its support for effective measures against IUU fishing.

10.50 In reflecting on the above discussions, the Commission reiterated its view stated in the past that IUU fishing continues to compromise conservation efforts to sustainably manage fisheries in the Convention Area and that IUU fishing is unfair to legal operators. It also agreed that IUU fishing remains a priority item on the Commission's agenda which, if not effectively addressed, would continue to undermine CCAMLR's conservation efforts.

Procedures for the estimation of IUU catches

10.51 The Commission endorsed the following SCIC recommendations that:

- (i) the traditional methodology for the estimation of IUU catches employed by CCAMLR in the past should continue to be used (Annex 5, paragraph 3.17);
- (ii) the application of the matrices developed by the Joint Assessment Group (JAG) and SCIC for the estimation of IUU catches will only be necessary where levels of uncertainty in IUU fishing information would require it (Annex 5, paragraph 3.17);
- (iii) the Secretariat was requested to consider developing of a measure (index) to identify the local density of licensed vessels on fishing grounds which would improve future estimates of IUU catches (Annex 5, paragraph 6.21).

Review of current measures aimed at eliminating IUU fishing

IUU Vessel Lists

10.52 The Commission approved the Proposed NCP-IUU Vessel List for 2007 (Annex 6) which was considered and adopted by SCIC (CCAMLR-XXVI, Annex 5, Appendix III).

10.53 The NCP-IUU Vessel List for 2007 contains the following three vessels: *Aldabra* (Togo), *Toto* (currently reported to be flagless) and *Tritón-1* (Sierra Leone).

10.54 The Commission considered the combined List of IUU vessels for 2003–2006 and agreed that the vessel formerly named *Apache I* should be removed from the adopted NCP-IUU Vessel List as it had been re-deployed as a French naval vessel and renamed *Le Malin*.

10.55 The Commission also agreed with SCIC's recommendation that the Panamanian-flagged vessel *Seed Leaf* remain on the adopted NCP-IUU Vessel List. The basis for this decision was that after consideration by SCIC of information submitted by Panama (SCIC-07/6), the Committee found that information from the Lloyds Registry indicated a link between the former and the current operators of the vessel (Annex 5, paragraph 3.23).

10.56 The Commission considered the matter of the vessel *Volna* which remained on the Provisional CP-IUU Vessel List for 2006 (CCAMLR-XXV, paragraph 9.40). The matter was discussed by SCIC with several Members drawing the Committee's attention to the fact that Russia had not submitted licence notifications to the Commission for either the *Volna* or *Yantar* for the 2006/07 season, although both vessels had fished in the Convention Area. Russia agreed to provide licence details for the *Volna* and *Yantar* (Annex 5, paragraph 3.28).

10.57 Russia recalled that some Members had raised questions in relation to licence details for the vessels *Volna* and *Yantar*. Russia advised that, after CCAMLR-XXV, Russian authorities had administratively extended the licences of both vessels and that the licences were therefore valid for the 2006/07 season. An administrative decision was taken between 21 and 28 November 2006 which was immediately communicated to both vessels and they were consequently permitted to enter the Convention Area. Decisions relating to fisheries beyond Russian EEZs and subject to international agreements require a formal order from the Russian Minister for Agriculture. Therefore, the two vessels were strictly instructed not to begin fishing until the procedure had been finalised. The vessels entered Subarea 88.1 on 29 November 2006 and, following their instructions, did not begin fishing until the relevant order of the Agricultural Ministry (No. 477) was signed on 22 December 2006. After this order had been conveyed to the vessels' masters, both vessels commenced fishing.

10.58 Australia recalled discussions from CCAMLR-XXV and stated that it believed that the *Volna* should have been included on the CP-IUU Vessel List at that time. Australia noted that if the licence had been extended it should still be possible for Russia to make details of the extended licence available to CCAMLR. Australia also noted that communication had occurred between the *Volna* and a New Zealand inspector in which a licence number had been referred to (Annex 5, paragraph 3.28).

10.59 The UK also recalled discussion from CCAMLR-XXV and agreed with Australia's position. The UK recalled that it had been agreed last year that measures against the *Volna*

would be taken and communicated to CCAMLR in a timely fashion. The UK expressed disappointment that *Volna*'s licence had been extended immediately after CCAMLR-XXV and stated that details of this should be submitted to CCAMLR.

10.60 The European Community agreed with Australia and the UK and recalled that it had intervened at length at CCAMLR-XXV. The European Community also expressed the view that the procedures of Conservation Measure 10-06 required improvement. The European Community stressed that it was not suggesting the amendment of Conservation Measure 10-06, rather that the Commission should agree that Members with a flag vessel on the Provisional CP-IUU Vessel List should abstain from the decision-making process. The European Community stressed that this should not imply a derivation from the rule of consensus, rather that it would improve the effectiveness of the measure and the credibility of CCAMLR.

10.61 New Zealand associated itself with the views of Australia and the UK and requested that Russia make the *Volna* licence details available to the Commission.

10.62 The USA noted that Russia had not complied with Conservation Measure 10-02, which requires specific information to be submitted to the Secretariat within seven days of issue of the licence. Whilst the USA appreciated that an extended licence had been issued, it suggested that Russia should submit all details in accordance with Conservation Measure 10-02.

10.63 Russia advised that its administrative procedures had conveyed the permissions to the vessels. Russia acknowledged the lateness of the notification but explained that this was due to internal technical and administrative reasons. Russia reminded the Commission that it had made a statement in SCIC explaining the measures taken against the *Volna* following an investigation of the incident (Annex 5, paragraph 3.27). Consequently, Russia had concluded that the incident was of a technical and non-deliberate nature. Russia reminded Members that the *Volna* had demonstrated full compliance with conservation measures and national and international regulations, including tagging levels, during the current season. In doing so and in demonstrating complete compliance, the vessel and operator have proven that the incident was of a technical rather than of a legal nature. From the point of view of Russian authorities, the case of the *Volna* was therefore closed and Russia could see no reason to continue to include the vessel on the list, nor to continue discussion of the matter.

10.64 Australia agreed that further discussion would be unproductive and noted that the vessel had not been notified to participate in exploratory fisheries this season. Australia trusted that it would not be included in any future notifications.

10.65 Russia stated that, in the course of the meeting, it had submitted documentary evidence of licence details for both the *Volna* and *Yantar* to the Secretariat and requested the issue be closed. Russia also advised that it had contacted some delegations bilaterally on this subject.

10.66 The Executive Secretary confirmed the receipt, on 2 November 2007, of certain licence details for the *Volna* and *Yantar*.

10.67 Consequently, the Commission decided not to retain the *Volna* on the Provisional CP-IUU Vessel List 2006 or to include it in the adopted CP-IUU Vessel List.

10.68 The Commission also noted that the Secretariat and Chile would collate additional information on the sighting of the Panamanian-flagged cargo vessel *Rosa* during the 2007/08 intersessional period and report back at CCAMLR-XXVII.

10.69 The Commission agreed that the ownership details for the *Perseverance* be amended (Annex 5, paragraph 3.25). Spain requested that Members which had any additional information about the vessel provide it to the Secretariat.

10.70 The combined adopted CP and NCP-IUU Vessel Lists for 2003–2007 are provided in Annex 6.

10.71 The USA noted a number of SCIC documents prepared by the Secretariat which referred to Taiwan. The USA requested that the terminology ‘Taiwan, Province of China’ not be used by the Secretariat in future, but that the nomenclature ‘Chinese Taipei’ be used, as was customary in other organisations.

10.72 The UK supported the position of the USA on this matter, noting that other terminology had been accepted in other fora.

10.73 China advised that it cannot accept the suggestion of the USA and expressed a preference for the nomenclature that was employed in many cases by the Secretariat and there was no reason to change it.

10.74 The Chair requested the Parties involved to find a solution.

10.75 The Chair of SCIC informed the Commission that Ms K. Dawson-Guynn (USA) had been elected Vice-Chair of SCIC until the end of 2008 (Annex 5, paragraph 7.2). The SCIC Chair congratulated Ms Dawson-Guynn on her appointment and reminded the Commission that Ms Dawson-Guynn would be the next Chair of SCIC at its 2009 meeting.