

## ASSESSMENT AND AVOIDANCE OF INCIDENTAL MORTALITY

### Reports of Members

5.1 The Commission, in considering this item, had reports from Australia, Japan, the Republic of Korea, the USSR, the United Kingdom and the United States describing steps that had been taken to assess and to avoid mortality of Antarctic Marine Living Resources caused by entanglement in and ingestion of persistent marine debris of human origin and by accidental catch during commercial fishing operations.

### Marine Debris

5.2 The Commission, considering the report of the Scientific Committee, noted that the UK intended to continue with beach surveys at South Georgia and encouraged Members to introduce the methods applied at South Georgia to other areas.

### Longline Fishery

5.3 Recollecting the discussions concerning incidental mortality of seabirds in longline fisheries which led to the adoption of Resolution 5/VII (CCAMLR-VIII, paragraphs 24 and 107), noting the papers submitted by Australia (CCAMLR-IX/14 Rev. 1 and CCAMLR-IX/BG/17), noting particularly the advice of the Scientific Committee (SC-CAMLR-IX, paragraph 7.14), the Commission agreed that the conduct of longline fisheries should be regulated so as to minimise incidental mortality of seabirds.

5.4 The Commission, therefore, agreed to adopt the recommendation of the Scientific Committee in respect of the longline fishery in the Convention Area (SC-CAMLR-IX, paragraph 7.14):

- (i) that information on incidental mortality specified in paragraph 52, CCAMLR-VIII be reported. (This is now included in Conservation Measure 26/IX);
- (ii) that the data required to determine the best method of reducing the incidental mortality of seabirds be provided, viz:

- position on ship of deployment of longline and branchlines (side, stern or stern quarter);
  - length of branchlines;
  - number of branchlines (= number of hooks);
  - weight of branchlines and placement of weights on main line;
  - average weight of bait;
  - average ship's speed during setting;
  - time of start of set and end of set (local time);
- (iii) that until such time as the data required under (i) and (ii) above are provided and evaluated, the following modifications to longline fishing techniques be implemented:
- the deployment on all longline vessels of a 'tori' pole and streamer line (as specified in CCAMLR-IX/BG/14, Rev. 1);
  - the requirement that the fishing operation be conducted in such a way that the baits sink immediately they are in the water;
  - the setting of longlines only at night;
  - the prohibition of dumping trash or offal while longline operations are in progress; and
- (iv) steps should be taken to place scientific observers on longline vessels.

5.5 Some Members felt that the measures in paragraph 5.4 (iii) above would benefit from further development and implementation in the form of a conservation measure. A draft Conservation Measure (Annex 6) was proposed but some Members felt that the technical detail of these additional measures required further consideration by national experts. Other delegations felt that the additional measures should be implemented as soon as possible.

5.6 The Commission agreed that Members would investigate the use of and, where possible, apply the additional measures contained in the draft Conservation Measure. It was also agreed that the formal adoption of the Conservation Measure would be discussed again at the next meeting of the Commission.

5.7 Regarding paragraph 5.4 (iv) above, the Delegation of the USSR extended an invitation to Members for observers to come aboard Soviet longline vessels to observe fishing techniques and to monitor any incidental mortality which may occur.

## Driftnet Fishery

5.8 In accordance with Rule 13 of the Commission's Rules of Procedure the Chairman invited the representative of ASOC to address the Commission. The representative drew the Commission's attention to two recent studies on the incidental mortality associated with driftnet operations. These studies, one in the Tasman Sea and one in the North Pacific, indicated that there was a significant mortality of sharks, marine mammals, marine turtles and birds in these fisheries.

5.9 Several delegations drew the attention of the meeting to large-scale unregulated driftnet fisheries in marine areas adjacent to the CCAMLR Convention Area, possibly by non-members, and expressed concern over the effects of these fisheries on Antarctic marine resources, as well as to the threat to the marine ecosystem posed by lost or abandoned nets. These nets may cause mortality on marine organisms and contribute to the accumulation of debris at sea.

5.10 Some delegations stressed that driftnetting threatened the marine environment both within and beyond the limits of national jurisdiction and should therefore be addressed by CCAMLR in a global context.

5.11 The United States presented a proposal calling for a ban on the use of driftnets in the Convention Area (CCAMLR-IX/13). It was pointed out that large-scale pelagic driftnet fisheries indiscriminately catch large numbers of marine mammals, sea birds and other non-target species, including commercially valuable fish species (SC-CAMLR-IX/BG/8).

5.12 The Commission noted that the UN General Assembly had recently passed a resolution (UNGA 44/225) which recommends, *inter alia*, that expansion of large-scale driftnet fisheries should be prohibited until such time as there is statistically reliable evidence that driftnet fishing would not have unacceptable impacts.

5.13 The Delegation of Japan drew the attention of the Commission to the fact that the moratorium established by the UN Resolution would take effect from 30 June, 1992 and was subject to review pending scientific investigation. This delegation understood that there was no possibility of any driftnetting being initiated in the Convention Area under this moratorium.

5.14 The Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR) reviewed the issue of driftnet fishing at its last meeting in Brazil in July 1990 and adopted a resolution calling upon the Commission to ban driftnets in the Convention Area. Reviewing these actions, and recognising that at present there are no driftnet fisheries in the Convention Area, the Scientific Committee expressed the

understanding that the introduction of driftnet fisheries is prohibited (SC-CAMLR-IX, paragraph 7.22).

5.15 The Commission adopted Resolution 7/IX, which declared that, in accordance with UNGA Resolution 44/225, there will be no expansion of large-scale pelagic driftnet fishing into the Convention Area.

5.16 In this regard, it was also agreed, in accordance with Article X, that the Commission would draw the Resolution to the attention of any State that is not a Party to the Convention, whose nationals or vessels engage in large-scale pelagic driftnet fishing.

### **RESOLUTION 7/IX**

#### **Driftnet Fishing in the Convention Area**

1. The Commission endorsed the goals of the UN General Assembly Resolution 44/225 on large-scale pelagic driftnet fishing, which calls, *inter alia*, for a cessation of any further expansion of large scale pelagic driftnet fishing on the high seas. Recognising the concentration of marine living resources present in Antarctic waters, it was noted that large-scale pelagic driftnet fishing can be a highly indiscriminate and wasteful fishing method that is widely considered to threaten the effective conservation of living marine resources. Although no Member is currently engaged in large-scale pelagic driftnet fishing in the Convention Area, the Commission expressed concern about the potential impact on marine living resources if large-scale pelagic driftnetting were to expand into the Convention Area.
2. To this end, the Commission agreed, in accordance with UN Resolution 44/225, that there will be no expansion of large-scale pelagic driftnet fishing into the Convention Area.
3. It was agreed that, in accordance with Article X, the Commission would draw this Resolution to the attention of any State that is not a Party to the Convention and whose nationals or vessels engage in large-scale pelagic driftnet fishing.