

NEW AND EXPLORATORY FISHERIES

New and Exploratory Fisheries in the 1997/98 Season

7.1 Last year, the Commission had endorsed seven new fisheries and five exploratory fisheries for the 1997/98 season (SC-CAMLR-XVI, paragraphs 9.3 to 9.10). New fisheries for *Dissostichus* spp. had been notified in Subareas 48.1, 48.2, 48.6, 88.2, 88.3, Divisions 58.4.3 and 58.4.4. Exploratory fisheries for *Dissostichus* spp. had been notified in Subareas 58.6, 58.7, 88.1 and Division 58.4.3. In addition, one exploratory fishery for squid (*Martialia hyadesi*) had been notified in Subarea 48.3.

7.2 As part of the requirements of the conservation measure in force, Chile had conducted a longline survey to determine the feasibility of new fisheries in Subareas 48.1 and 48.2; this cruise had also included fishing in Subarea 88.3. The cruise was conducted during February and March 1998, and the observed catch rates for *Dissostichus* spp. were well below the criterion of 0.1 kg/hook required to invoke Conservation Measures 134/XVI and 135/XVI (CCAMLR-XVI, paragraph 9.29). Consequently, the new fisheries in Subareas 48.1 and 48.2 were not opened in 1997/98.

7.3 In addition, New Zealand had fished in Subarea 88.1, south of 65°S, and taken 39 tonnes of *Dissostichus* spp., and South Africa had conducted limited fishing outside its EEZ in Subareas 58.6 (1 tonne of *D. eleginoides*) and 58.7 (<1 tonne of *D. eleginoides*). No fishing had taken place under the notifications for new and exploratory fisheries for *Dissostichus* spp. in Subareas 48.6, 88.2, Divisions 58.4.3 and 58.4.4 and *M. hyadesi* in Subarea 48.3.

New and Exploratory Fisheries Notified for the 1998/99 Season

7.4 The Commission noted that the Scientific Committee had considered notifications for new and exploratory fisheries for the 1998/99 season from Australia, France, New Zealand, South Africa, Spain and Uruguay.

7.5 Australia submitted a notification for exploratory trawl fisheries for *Dissostichus* spp. in Divisions 58.4.1 and 58.4.3 (CCAMLR-XVII/11).

7.6 France submitted a notification for new fisheries for *D. eleginoides* in Subareas 58.6 and 58.7 and Divisions 58.4.3, 58.4.4, 58.5.1 and 58.5.2, outside EEZs in all subareas and divisions (CCAMLR-XVII/9 Rev. 1). The Commission noted that during the meeting of WG-FSA, Prof. G. Duhamel (France) had clarified that the notification no longer applied for Divisions 58.5.1 and 58.5.2. As such, the Scientific Committee considered only the notifications for Subareas 58.6 and 58.7 and Divisions 58.4.3 and 58.4.4 (outside EEZs). The notification was for longline fisheries in all subareas and divisions nominated, and trawl fisheries in Subarea 58.6 and Division 58.4.4. At the time of drafting the conservation measures, the European Community advised that France had withdrawn its notification in relation to the trawl fisheries.

7.7 New Zealand submitted a notification for an exploratory longline fishery for *Dissostichus* spp. in Subarea 88.1 (CCAMLR-XVII/13 Rev. 1).

7.8 South Africa submitted a notification for new longline fisheries for *Dissostichus* spp. in Subarea 48.6 and Division 58.4.4 (CCAMLR-XVII/10), and a notification for exploratory longline fisheries for *Dissostichus* spp. in Subareas 58.6 and 58.7, outside EEZs (CCAMLR-XVII/14).

7.9 The Delegation of Japan explained that Japan had received various requests from industry for new and exploratory fisheries for *Dissostichus* spp. in the Convention Area.

However, Japan had decided not to proceed with any notification because it believed that there was insufficient information available for the expansion of fisheries on *Dissostichus* spp. It stated that whatever may be agreed on conservation measures relating to new and exploratory fisheries should not be construed as prejudicing the rights of other Members to participate in those fisheries in the future.

7.10 Spain submitted a notification for an exploratory longline fishery for *D. eleginoides* in Division 58.4.4 (CCAMLR-XVII/12).

7.11 Uruguay submitted a notification for a new longline fishery for *D. eleginoides* in Division 58.4.4 (CCAMLR-XVII/19).

7.12 A notification was received during the course of the Commission's meeting from the UK and the Republic of Korea of intention to undertake an exploratory fishery for *M. hyadesi* in Subarea 48.3 (CCAMLR-XVII/42).

7.13 The Commission noted that some notifications for new and exploratory fisheries had been submitted after the deadlines set out in Conservation Measures 31/X and 65/XII, but that these had still been evaluated by the Scientific Committee. Regarding this aspect, the Scientific Committee had sought the guidance of the Commission as to how late submissions of fishery notifications should be handled in the future.

7.14 The European Community expressed the view that the deadlines were necessary to permit parties to have sufficient time to evaluate proposals.

7.15 The Commission reiterated that notifications for new and exploratory fisheries must be submitted by the deadlines stated in Conservation Measures 31/X and 65/XII so as to ensure that each notification was thoroughly evaluated.

7.16 The Commission noted that the Scientific Committee had been unable to provide yield estimates for mixed-gear fisheries notified for 1998/99 (SC-CAMLR-XVII, paragraph 9.22). A series of assessments were, however, given for either a longline or a trawl fishery in these areas (SC-CAMLR-XVII, Table 7). This was done under the assumption that only one of these gear types would be used and in this respect the assessments should be considered as very separate entities and not additive. The Scientific Committee considered that the maximum catch for a statistical area should be no more than the yield estimated for longlining, as this is greater than the yield for trawling in this case. Also, the catch for the trawl component of the mixed fishery should be no greater than the yield estimated for the trawl fishery. The Scientific Committee agreed that the yield for the respective gear types should be discounted in some way when the other gear type is also being used in the same management area, but could not determine a suitable scientific method for achieving this at this meeting.

7.17 The Commission noted the comments of the Scientific Committee for mixed-gear fisheries in the 1998/99 season, and requested the Scientific Committee to develop further methods to address catch limits for mixed-gear fisheries at its next meeting.

7.18 The European Community noted the catch limits provided in Table 8 of the Scientific Committee report, and that these had been obtained by applying an arbitrary discount factor to the yields estimated by the GYM. The European Community sought advice as to whether the Scientific Committee had used the same procedure as in previous years, and if progress had been made with respect to the discount factors used and the assessment methodology.

7.19 The Chairman of the Scientific Committee informed the Commission that the latest work of the Scientific Committee and WG-FSA had followed the procedure of the past two years, and had been limited by the paucity of information in areas notified for new and exploratory fisheries. However, significant developments had taken place since CCAMLR-XVI. Validation of the GYM had been conducted by the Secretariat (SC-CAMLR-XVII,

paragraph 5.36) and revised estimates of seabed areas within fishable depths had enabled WG-FSA to consider scale of management units.

7.20 The Commission noted that the Scientific Committee is unable to consider fully the notifications of new fisheries because not all notifications include details of minimum levels of catch on which to base viable exploratory activity. The Commission considered that such information would be useful, particularly because it would help the Scientific Committee assess the potential for interaction with other proposed fishing activities. The Commission also noted that information concerning the management units of interest to the nominees (as discussed in SC-CAMLR-XVII, Annex 5, paragraphs 3.151 to 3.154 and Figure 1) would help in these assessments. The Commission requested that future proposals for new fisheries should include this information for consideration by the Scientific Committee.

7.21 The USA had expressed concern over the development of fisheries targeting *D. mawsoni*. This species was one of the few target species which occurred entirely within the Convention Area, and which had only recently been subject to fishing. Although some research on this species had been conducted in the Ross Sea, very little basic information was available on its distribution, abundance and population dynamics. The USA had urged the Commission to make every effort possible to ensure that fisheries for *D. mawsoni* develop under strict precautionary principles. The matter was discussed further under Agenda Item 10.

7.22 In the light of earlier discussions, Norway had asked the Chairman of the Scientific Committee how the Commission could reconcile the views of the Scientific Committee regarding the setting of catch limits and the grave threat to the stocks of *D. eleginoides* which had been brought about through illegal, unregulated and unreported fishing.

7.23 In relation to the fishery in Subarea 48.3, Dr Miller explained that the Scientific Committee had felt confident with the assessment of *D. eleginoides*. This species had been the focus of detailed research, and illegal, unregulated and unreported fishing has probably been low in that subarea in recent years (SC-CAMLR-XVII, Annex 5, Table 6).

7.24 More generally, Dr Miller noted that the Scientific Committee had been concerned by the scarcity of information available for assessing stocks of *Dissostichus* spp. targeted by the new and exploratory fisheries. The Scientific Committee had conducted assessments based on the best available information. However, the Scientific Committee had addressed specific concerns by identifying the following high-priority tasks (SC-CAMLR-XVII, paragraph 5.134):

- (i) consider the currency of assessments for both *D. eleginoides*, as well as other species;
- (ii) subject to the advice of the Scientific Committee and the Commission, define a start date for fisheries for *Dissostichus* spp. and review the 35-year period of which stock trajectories are projected with the GYM, especially in terms of reconciling the outputs of the GYM and information derived from CPUE;
- (iii) identify stock structure;
- (iv) analysis and interpretation of CPUE data;
- (v) develop and validate growth models for *D. eleginoides* and *D. mawsoni* in different parts of their range;
- (vi) obtain recruitment data for areas where none are currently available;
- (vii) derive recruitment indices from mixture analyses and analysis of their sensitivity to expected outcomes from growth and mortality functions; and

(viii) develop methods for calculating catch limits in mixed-gear fisheries.

7.25 The Scientific Committee had also considered the possibility that discrete stocks of *Dissostichus* spp. may occur over smaller spatial scales than the management areas currently used by CCAMLR. Given this possibility, the Scientific Committee advised that the most precautionary approach was to assume that discrete stocks of *Dissostichus* spp. may occur over small spatial scales, and that the management units identified (SC-CAMLR-XVII, paragraph 5.39) should form the basis of the Commission's decisions regarding the allocation of effort in fisheries targeting these species (SC-CAMLR-XVII, paragraph 5.37).