

REPORT OF THE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE

4.1 The Chairman of the Scientific Committee, Mr O. Østvedt (Norway), introduced the report of the Committee. A large part of the work of the Scientific Committee and its three Working Groups had been directed at answering questions posed by the Commission in 1990 regarding the Scientific Committee's best estimate of a precautionary limit for krill in the various statistical areas (CCAMLR-IX, paragraph 8.5), and a management advice concerning finfish stocks in the Convention Area. In addition, questions pertaining to the integrated management of krill and finfish stocks in regard to potential yield, by-catch, incidental mortality and competition between fisheries and dependent parts of the ecosystem had been addressed by the Scientific Committee and its Working Groups.

4.2 M. Østvedt told the Commission that the availability of data to the Working Groups, reported by Dr I. Everson (UK) last year (CCAMLR-IX, paragraph 4.3) had not improved in 1990/91 and continued to hamper the work of the Scientific Committee. He noted that biological and haul-by data from the krill fishery was not being fully submitted despite requests from the Commission that this be done in some circumstances (CCAMLR-IX, paragraph 4.41; SC-CAMLR-X, paragraphs 3.89 to 3.91), although Poland and Chile had submitted some of the relevant data. For finfish, much data from the commercial fisheries was not submitted in time for consideration by the Working Groups. The most serious lack of data was that from the *Dissostichus eleginoides* longline fishery in Subarea 48.3, which indicated a partial non-compliance with Conservation Measure 26/IX.

4.3 The attention for the Commission was drawn to the fact that the catch of *Electrona carlsbergi* in Subarea 48.3 had increased by over 300% to 78 488 tonnes and was now the largest finfish fishery in the Convention Area. Catches of *D. eleginoides* in Subarea 48.3 (3 834 tonnes) were within the limit allowed by Conservation Measure 24/IX, although the fishery for *Champscephalus gunnari* in Subarea 48.3 had been unable to meet its catch limit of 26 000 tonnes, taking a total of only 93 tonnes. The total catch of krill in the Convention Area was 357 538 tonnes, 6% lower than in 1989/90.

4.4 In considering the report of the Scientific Committee, the Commission noted that there were many items concerning management, future work and data requirements that it might endorse without further discussion. These items are reported only briefly in the following paragraphs.

4.5 Other items were discussed in full by the Commission and are reported either here or under the appropriate agenda item of the report.

Rules of Procedures for the Participation of Observers

4.6 The Commission approved the Scientific Committee's agreed amendments to its Rules of Procedure regarding the attendance and participation of observers in the meetings of the Scientific Committee (SC-CAMLR-X, paragraph 2.2 and Annex 4).

Krill Resources

4.7 The Commission noted the agreement within the Scientific Committee that, if the impact of the krill fishery is ever to be fully assessed, there is a critical need for work on the

mortality of krill not retained in the trawls that arises as a result of the fishing process (SC-CAMLR-X, paragraph 3.23). The Japanese Delegation stated that information from their observers suggested that this mortality was not a large problem with respect to Japanese fishing operations.

4.8 All Members agreed, however, that there was a need for studies of krill mortality in the fishery and accordingly Members were urged to submit any available information on this subject as a matter of priority. The Working Group on Krill (WG-Krill) was asked to consider methods by which the collection of such data could be improved.

4.9 Paragraphs 3.56 and 3.57 of SC-CAMLR-X concerning approaches to management of krill were endorsed.

4.10 The Commission endorsed paragraphs 3.38 and 3.89 of SC-CAMLR-X and reiterated its endorsement of the Scientific Committee recommendation that:

- (i) length frequency data from the commercial fishery by fine-scale reporting areas should be submitted to the Secretariat; and
- (ii) haul-by-haul data from the commercial fishery should be collected and submitted to the Secretariat. As a priority these data should be submitted for areas within 100 km of land-based predator colonies and CEMP sites (CCAMLR-IX, paragraph 4.4 (i)).

The Commission noted the view of the Scientific Committee that the data referred to in (i) might best be collected by specially trained personnel (SC-CAMLR-X, paragraph 3.21).

4.11 Some Members expressed the view that they have legal and technical difficulties in submitting the data referred to in paragraph (ii) above (SC-CAMLR-X, paragraphs 3.90 and 3.91).

4.12 In view of the need to consider the provision and analysis of data for parts of statistical areas and subareas, the Commission requested the Scientific Committee to consider whether the further definition of statistical divisions might be appropriate.

Fish Resources

4.13 The Commission noted that many data requested by the Scientific Committee and specifically noted in CCAMLR-IX, paragraph 4.41 had not been submitted to the Secretariat. Omissions in data reporting were outlined in Appendix E, Annex 6, SC-CAMLR-X. The Commission most strongly urges Members to submit the data requested in this annex in an accurate and timely fashion, and endorses SC-CAMLR-X, paragraphs 4.14 and 4.104.

4.14 The Soviet Union informed the Commission that it would submit haul-by-haul data from the longline fishery on *D. eleginoides* in the 1990/91 season as well as haul-by-haul data from previous seasons to the 1992 meeting of the Working Group on Fish Stock Assessment (WG-FSA).

4.15 The UK Delegation reminded the Commission that serious concerns had been expressed at last year's meeting regarding data submissions to the Commission (CCAMLR-IX, paragraphs 4.3 to 4.5). The situation this year was no better and once again the Scientific

Committee has requested the Commission to take urgent steps to ensure complete and timely data submissions. Lack of data and the consequent uncertainty in the scientific advice leaves the Commission with no alternative but to act conservatively in adopting conservation measures (CCAMLR-IX, paragraph 4.6). It was the opinion of the UK that when data submissions fell short of the requests by the Scientific Committee there was no alternative but to close fisheries and only consider re-opening them when the necessary data had been made available.

4.16 The Commission endorsed paragraphs 4.11 and 4.27 of SC-CAMLR-X. Accordingly, all conservation measures that were in force in 1990/91 for *Notothenia rossii*, *Notothenia squamifrons*, *Patagonotothen guntheri*, *Pseudochaenichthys georgianus*, *Chaenocephalus aceratus* were extended to the 1991/92 season (paragraph 9.2).

4.17 The Commission endorsed the advice of the Scientific Committee (SC-CAMLR-X, paragraphs 4.95, 4.97 and 4.99) concerning Division 58.5.1, that there should be a prohibition of directed fishing on *N. rossii* and that the catches of *D. eleginoides* and *C. gunnari* should not exceed 1 100 tonnes and 17 000 tonnes respectively.

4.18 The requirement for a workshop on survey design (SC-CAMLR-X, paragraph 4.109) was endorsed by the Commission.

Ecosystem Monitoring

4.19 The Commission endorsed SC-CAMLR-X, paragraph 6.74, and encourages Members with active programs of research directly and indirectly contributing to CEMP to participate in the meetings of the Working Group of the CCAMLR Ecosystem Monitoring Program (WG-CEMP).

4.20 The Commission noted the progress made by WG-CEMP in responding to the Commission's request that Members synthesise relevant data to provide estimates of krill requirements of predators in the CEMP Integrated Study Regions (SC-CAMLR-X, paragraph 6.78).

4.21 The Commission endorsed the recommendation of the Scientific Committee that an intersessional meeting of WG-CEMP should be held in 1992 and accepted an offer from the Chilean Delegation to host the meeting in Chile in August.

Protection of CEMP Sites

4.22 At its 1990 Meeting, the Commission adopted Conservation Measure 18/IX, which specified the procedure for CCAMLR to accord protection to CEMP sites (CCAMLR-IX, paragraph 6.5). It was agreed that proposals for site protection should be drafted as specified and brought forward for consideration in turn by WG-CEMP, the Scientific Committee, and the Commission.

4.23 A draft management plan for protection of the Seal Islands CEMP Site (SC-CAMLR-X/11) was reviewed by WG-CEMP and the Scientific Committee, which recommended that the Commission should adopt the management plan and take appropriate action to implement its observance (SC-CAMLR-X, paragraphs 6.72 and 6.80).

4.24 The Commission endorsed paragraph 6.72 of SC-CAMLR-X, and agreed that it was appropriate to accord protection to the Seal Island CEMP Site.

4.25 The Commission adopted Resolution 8/X.

RESOLUTION 8/X

Protection of the Seal Islands CEMP Site

1. The Commission noted that a program of long-term studies is being undertaken at the Seal Islands, South Shetland Islands, as part of the CCAMLR Ecosystem Monitoring Program (CEMP). Recognising that these studies may be vulnerable to accidental or wilful interference, the Commission expressed its concern that this CEMP site, the scientific investigations, and the Antarctic marine living resources therein be protected.
2. Therefore, the Commission considers it appropriate to accord protection to the Seal Islands CEMP Site.
3. Members are requested to comply, on a voluntary basis, with the provisions of the draft management plan for the Seal Islands CEMP Site pending the conclusion of consultations with SCAR, the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties and, if appropriate, the Contracting Parties to other components of the Antarctic Treaty System.
4. 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 are present in the Convention Area.

Development of Approaches to Conservation

4.26 The Commission noted that the Scientific Committee had considered definitions of New and Developing Fisheries and the CCAMLR Scheme of International Scientific Observation. The Scientific Committee's report on these matters is further discussed under Agenda Items 6 and 7.