## COOPERATION WITH OTHER ORGANISATIONS

11.1 The Scientific Committee noted the following papers of relevance to this agenda item:

(i) SC-CAMLR-XIX/BG/7, BG/8, BG/12, BG/13, BG/15, BG/16, BG/19, BG/20, BG/24, BG/25, BG/31; and

(ii) CCAMLR-XIX/BG/21 and BG/34.

11.2 It was suggested that plenary discussion be confined to key points.

### Cooperation with the Antarctic Treaty System

#### CEP

11.3 Dr Miller noted that CEP was in a process of evolution (SC-CAMLR-XIX/BG/17). The delineation between the objectives of CEP to protect the environment and the dual goal of CCAMLR to achieve conservation and rational use, will need to be developed.

#### SAER

11.4 The Chairman drew attention to CCAMLR-XIX/BG/25 where Dr Walton, the convener of GOSEAC, requested the assistance of the Scientific Committee in preparing a SCAR paper on *The State of the Antarctic Environment Report (SAER)* for the 2001 meeting of CEP. The input requested from CCAMLR was information on the extent of data available on the Southern Ocean fisheries.

11.5 In response to SCAR's request, the Scientific Committee agreed to provide:

(i) copies of all volumes of the *Statistical Bulletin*;
(ii) *Understanding CCAMLR's Approach to Management*; and
(iii) Constable et al., 2000.

11.6 Furthermore, the Science Officer would be indicated as the liaison point within CCAMLR.

11.7 Dr Fanta volunteered to also assist in undertaking this activity.

11.8 The Scientific Committee noted that *The State of the Antarctic Environment Report* was a daunting undertaking and that the recent report of WG-EMM provided guidance on what is required to assess the status of the Antarctic marine ecosystem. This is likely to take five to 10 years to complete.

#### Balleny Islands Proposal (Annex 4, paragraphs 5.38 to 5.51)

11.9 The Convener of WG-EMM reported that the Working Group had considered the Balleny Islands management plan at the request of the Commission. It was noted that the plan had been modified based on advice from GOSEAC in 1999 and that the modified plan had been recommended for approval by SCAR WG-Biology.

11.10 The Scientific Committee noted that, at the request of WG-EMM, the boundary of the proposed protected area was adjusted in the latest proposal (CCAMLR-XIX/21) so as to include the whole Balleny seamount.

11.11 The Scientific Committee agreed that the proposal contained the only scientific evidence available at this time and is therefore the best evidence available.

11.12 After extensive discussions in both WG-EMM and the Scientific Committee, there were two views concerning the proposal to enlarge the Balleny Islands Specially Protected Area.

11.13 Several Members did not support the scientific merits of the proposal to expand the Balleny Islands Specially Protected Area on the basis that:

(i) the area was an important area in respect to potential future fishery;

(ii) more research was needed before it would be possible to evaluate the significance of the region, for example, the proposed area is excessively large and not justified on the basis of known foraging areas;

(iii) WG-EMM has only just begun to develop criteria for assessing proposals for marine protected areas and these needed to be developed first before a decision could be taken; and

(iv) there were no research plans indicating how CEMP sites are to be developed or on how this proposal relates to understanding the ecology of the region including dependent species and predators.

11.14 Many Members supported the proposal on the basis that:

(i) this proposal would not diminish rational use of resources in the Convention Area;
(ii) it would provide an undisturbed reserve with rich biodiversity; and
(iii) this proposal is consistent with the precautionary approach used by CCAMLR.

11.15 The CEP Observer (Dr A. Press) advised the Scientific Committee that CEP is required to consult CCAMLR to determine if a proposed marine protection area under the Madrid Protocol would conflict with CCAMLR.

11.16 To that end, the Scientific Committee agreed that it needed to determine whether the proposal contained the best scientific evidence available. Given the responsibilities of the Scientific Committee of CCAMLR, it was considered difficult for it to judge against criteria set by the Madrid Protocol and by CEP. The extent to which the proposal is in conflict with the work of the Commission is a matter for the Commission to consider.

11.17 The Scientific Committee noted that the divergent views in paragraphs 11.13 and 11.14 were relevant to discussions as to whether the proposal would assist in the management of fisheries according to Article II of the Convention. To this end, the Commission may wish to consider how the precautionary approach may be applied in this regard. It requested guidance from the Commission on how the Scientific Committee could proceed in this matter.

Terra Nova Bay Proposal (Annex 4, paragraphs 5.32 to 5.37)

11.18 The Convener of WG-EMM reported that the Working Group had reviewed a proposal to establish a Special Site of Scientific Interest at Terra Nova Bay. The values to be protected at this site included a unique marine benthic community and a colony of Adélie penguins. A long-term research program established at the site was also described. The proposal had been submitted simultaneously to both SCAR WG-Biology and WG-EMM. WG-EMM welcomed the proposal, but noted that the plan has been referred to GOSEAC for comment.

11.19 The Scientific Committee endorsed the views of WG-EMM that it was premature to make comments regarding the plan in the absence of comments from GOSEAC.

Management Plans forwarded by the ATCM
(Annex 4, paragraphs 5.52 to 5.61)

11.20 The Convener of WG-EMM reported that the Working Group considered further development of a methodology for the assessment of proposals for marine protected areas forwarded to CCAMLR by the ATCM in accordance with Annex V of the Protocol of Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty. The view was expressed that management plans forwarded by the ATCM were written to further the objectives of the ATCM and not necessarily those of CCAMLR. It was agreed, however, that this should not be considered a negative aspect of a plan and that the main focus of the CCAMLR review process should be to determine whether the plan would prejudice the objectives of CCAMLR. Nevertheless, the review of management plans affords the opportunity for CCAMLR to review such plans for proposed research and/or monitoring in the area subject to notification, to consider whether the closure of a marine area could be of value to CCAMLR, and to evaluate the plan with respect to fisheries. The Working Group agreed that the potential application of marine protected areas by CCAMLR for its own purposes should be evaluated in the context of experiences in other parts of the world. While there was insufficient time for a complete review of the topic by WG-EMM, some progress was made in the development of a methodology for the assessment of proposals for marine protected areas forwarded to CCAMLR by the ATCM.

11.21 The Scientific Committee agreed that future proposals on marine protected areas should include:

(i) information on the values for which protection is required (e.g. unique habitat, species diversity); and

(ii) sufficient details in the text, maps and figures for a scientific review.

11.22 The Scientific Committee also agreed that future proposals should include an assessment of available information relevant to CCAMLR and its objectives, such as:

(i) location of breeding sites of seals and seabirds;
(ii) location of foraging areas of seabirds and seals;
(iii) description of known marine fauna;
(iv) description of current or potential fisheries;
(v) location and details of research directly relevant to CEMP; as well as
(vi) any other matters which may be relevant to the implementation of Article II of the Convention.

11.23 The Scientific Committee recognised the value of transmitting the scientific interests and concerns of CCAMLR to ATCM as a means to improve the protected area process in relation to marine areas and thus further the aims of both organisations. The Scientific Committee supported the need for further work on defining a methodology for the review of management plans forwarded by the ATCM and endorsed the process instituted by WG-EMM to carry the matter forward (Annex 4, paragraphs 5.57 and 5.59).

11.24 The Scientific Committee noted the discussion of WG-EMM on further development of a methodology for the assessment of proposals for marine protected areas forwarded to CCAMLR by the ATCM in accordance with Annex V of the Protocol of Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty (Annex 4, paragraph 5.47). The Scientific Committee

endorsed the examination of potential application of marine protected areas by CCAMLR for its own purposes and that it could be evaluated in the context of experiences in other parts of the world.

11.25 The Scientific Committee endorsed the WG-EMM recommendations on information requirements for future proposals (Annex 4, paragraphs 5.57 to 5.59) and on interactions with ATCM (Annex 4, paragraphs 5.60 and 5.61). The Scientific Committee agreed that attention needs to be given to how proposals for marine protected areas need to be considered and requested advice from the Commission on how it should proceed in this regard.

11.26 Prof. Moreno pointed out that marine protected area criteria should be evaluated in both WG-EMM and WG-FSA and that protected areas should be thought of as both modern conservation instruments and as a management tool.

Reports of SC-CAMLR Representatives at Meetings
of Other International Organisations

IWC

11.27 Dr Kock, IWC Observer, drew attention to the planned cooperation described in CCAMLR-XIX/BG/11 between the IWC and CCAMLR in respect to analyses from the recent synoptic survey.

11.28 The Scientific Committee agreed that the Chairman should write to the IWC and invite participation in the planned CCAMLR-2000 Survey analysis in Cambridge, UK, in 2001. The IWC should also be asked for information in respect to its plans for any future joint IWC/CCAMLR workshop.

SCAR

11.29 Dr Fanta, SCAR Observer, noted CCAMLR-XIX/BG/34 and emphasised:

(i) The SCAR Biology Symposium will occur from 27 August to 1 September 2001 in Amsterdam, Netherlands, and all Antarctic biology scientists were encouraged to participate.

(ii) SCAR WG-Biology had discussed chiefly on the basis of the proposed listings in the IUCN Red List (see paragraphs 4.92 and 4.93) specially protected species and agreed that *Arctocephalus* spp. no longer need to be considered as protected species, but that Ross seals should retain specially protected status. Birds were also discussed. The suggestion was made to include *Dissostichus* spp. as specially protected species in recognition of high levels of fishing on these species in the Southern Ocean.

(iii) Discussions about disease in Antarctic wildlife emanated from the report of the Workshop on Diseases in Antarctic Wildlife. It was also suggested to develop a proposal to SCAR WG-Biology for a research program on pathology of wildlife.

(iv) The proposal of the new SCAR EVOLANTA Program is focused on providing a framework for research to improve our understanding of the evolutionary history and biology of the Antarctic biota. Molecular genetics will be a useful tool for these studies facilitating the identification of species and populations (paragraph 4.13(iii)) as well as studies of their interrelationships.

(v) The idea of a spatial information network on Antarctic biodiversity to also include CCAMLR information was discussed without reaching conclusion about the implementation.

(vi) Close cooperation between SCAR WG-Biology and CCAMLR is encouraged.

11.30 Prof. Torres, in response to the disease agenda of SCAR WG-Biology, noted SC-CAMLR-XIX/BG/10 where more information on seal pathogens was provided. He indicated that this paper will be tabled at WG-EMM's next meeting.

11.31 At the time of the adoption of the report Dr Fanta made the following statement:

> 'An important link exists between CCAMLR and SCAR, and this is the research that is developed on Antarctic organisms or Antarctic ecosystems. The presence of SCAR and CCAMLR observers or representatives at each other's meetings promotes the exchange of information, facilitating possible collaborations, for the benefit of both SCAR and CCAMLR. In several countries the Antarctic National Programs have no contact with the science developed by CCAMLR and vice versa. The reports that are presented at the SCAR and the CCAMLR meetings at least try to establish connections, and make both organisations aware of their common interests. Research within national Antarctic programs includes, inter alia, food chains, predator–prey interactions, molecular biology for the definition of species or populations, birds, seals and fish biology, pollution, all of which are related to CCAMLR's interests. I want to express my concern about the fact that very little time was allowed to the CCAMLR Observer to SCAR, or the SCAR Observer to CCAMLR, to report. Simple cross reference to background papers in the Scientific Committee's report is of limited use because these background papers are not included as attachments to the Scientific Committee report, and therefore the information they contain may be lost. I would like to recommend that at the next Scientific Committee meeting, more consideration be given to the agenda item on cooperation with other organisations, especially in relation to the collaboration with SCAR.'

SCOR

11.32 Prof. Croxall, SCOR Observer, drew attention to SC-CAMLR-XIX/BG/15, reporting on the GLOBEC–IOC initiative relating to the use of environmental indices in the management of pelagic fish populations. This topic is very relevant to the interests of WG-FSA. Although the closing date for requesting attendance at the first workshop for this program is imminent (10 November 2000), he felt that WG-FSA should receive a report on the meeting outcome and on any other relevant developments in this program. He suggested that Dr Everson might be well placed to arrange this. The Scientific Committee concurred.

11.33 Prof. Croxall also reported that the International Southern Ocean GLOBEC Program (see also Annex 4, paragraphs 4.121 to 4.123) will commence in the austral summer 2001 with the start of a major marine research program by the USA in the Marguerite Bay area of the Antarctic Peninsula. This program will address shelf-circulation processes and their effect on sea-ice formation and Antarctic krill (*E. superba*) distribution and will also examine the factors that govern krill survivorship and availability to higher trophic levels. Full details of this year's program, which will involve two sets of two-ship surveys and process studies in April–May and July–August 2001, can be obtained from the US GLOBEC website (www.usglobec.org).

Future Cooperation

11.34 The Scientific Committee noted a number of international meetings of relevance to its work and nominated the following observers:

(i) International Fishers' Forum – Solving the Incidental Capture of Seabirds in Longline Fishing Operations, 6 to 9 November 2000, Auckland, New Zealand – Mr West;

(ii) Fifteenth Scientific Technological Symposium – Responsible Fishing in the New Millennium, 22 to 24 November 2000, Mar del Plata, Argentina – Dr O. Wöhler (Argentina);

(iii) International Fisheries Symposium, 4 to 6 December 2000, Bergen, Norway – no nomination;

(iv) Albatross and Petrel Agreement Meeting, 26 January to 9 February 2001, Cape Town, South Africa – Dr Miller;

(v) SCAR–GOSEAC, April 2001, College Station, Texas, USA – Dr Fanta;

(vi) Fifty-third Meeting of IWC Scientific Committee, July 2001, London, UK – Dr Kock;

(vii) Committee for Environmental Protection (CEP), May 2001, St Petersburg, Russia – Scientific Committee Chairman;

(viii) Nineteenth Session of CWP, 10 to 13 July 2001, Noumea, New Caledonia – Dr Ramm;

(ix) VIIIth SCAR Antarctic Biology Symposium, 27 August to 1 September 2001, Amsterdam, the Netherlands – Dr Fanta;

(x) ICES Annual Science Conference, 26 September to 9 October 2001, Oslo, Norway – Mr W. Vanhee (Belgium).