

NEW AND EXPLORATORY FISHERIES

New and Exploratory Fisheries in 1999/2000

9.1 One conservation measure relating to new fisheries and 13 conservation measures relating to exploratory fisheries were in force during 1999/2000. In only five of these 14 new or exploratory fisheries, did fishing actually occur during 1999/2000. Information on these fisheries is summarised in Annex 5, Table 19. In most cases, the numbers of days fished and the catches reported were very small. The notable exception was the exploratory fishery for *Dissostichus* spp. in Subarea 88.1 conducted under Conservation Measure 190/XVIII, where three vessels fished for a total of 162 days, taking 745 tonnes of *D. mawsoni*.

9.2 Reviewing the information in Annex 5, Tables 18 and 19, the Scientific Committee strongly reiterated its concern, expressed at previous meetings, about the number of times that new and exploratory fisheries have been notified but never actually activated. The Scientific Committee also noted that often the same or similar notifications have been made repeatedly, but in each case no fishing had eventuated. Of all the notifications made since 1995/96, two thirds had not been activated.

9.3 The Scientific Committee noted that each time a notification is made, WG-FSA is required to review it, and to the extent possible, provide advice on precautionary catch limits. Given the large number of notifications received over the last few years, an increasingly large proportion of the time available has had to be devoted to consideration of new and exploratory fisheries. Despite this, and despite notifications having been made for a large number of subareas and divisions, once again WG-FSA had received essentially no new information on *Dissostichus* spp. stocks in most of these areas. That concern is further heightened by the fact that substantial amounts of IUU fishing are believed to have occurred in these areas.

9.4 The large proportion of notifications following which no fishing activity occurred was discussed by the Scientific Committee. It was noted that although notifications were made in good faith, changes in the economic situation sometimes meant that fishing companies did not go to the notified areas for commercial reasons. Arising from this, repeat notifications were being made in subsequent years. Whilst accepting this view, the Scientific Committee decided that an assessment would be made following a first submission but, in the absence of fishing, no further assessments would be made until new data were received.

9.5 The Scientific Committee agreed that some of these difficulties may be alleviated if changes were made to the system of notification and classification of fisheries. This is discussed further under 'Regulatory Framework' (section 7).

9.6 The Scientific Committee discussed Conservation Measure 182/XVIII governing exploratory fisheries. This requires for each individual vessel that, once the catch in a small-scale research unit (SSRU) has exceeded a trigger level (10 tonnes or 10 hauls), then research hauls must be carried out and the results reported to CCAMLR. In only three of the active exploratory fisheries were the catches taken in SSRUs sufficiently large that the requirement to undertake research hauls was triggered. This occurred in SSRUs A, B and C in respect of the Uruguayan exploratory longline fishery in Division 58.4.4, in SSRUs A and B in respect of South African longline fishery in Subarea 58.6, and in SSRUs A, B, C and D in respect of the New Zealand exploratory longline fishery in Subarea 88.1.

9.7 The Scientific Committee noted that in many instances no research data were available for most of the SSRUs in which fishing had taken place (CCAMLR-XIX/BG/5 Rev. 1), and it was noted that failure to provide such data seriously undermines the ability of WG-FSA to make assessments, a notable exception being the extensive data submission provided by New Zealand.

9.8 Representatives from South Africa and Uruguay stated that some research data had been collected from their vessels in accordance with Conservation Measure 182/XVIII but their vessels, although ceasing to fish on 31 August 2000, had not returned to port until some weeks later. These data had now been submitted to the Secretariat.

9.9 The Scientific Committee noted that it is stated in Conservation Measure 182/XVIII that the last reporting date for which data collected as a result of fishing up to 31 August 2000 is 30 September 2000. The linkage to Annexes 182/A and 182/B could be made more explicit.

9.10 The Scientific Committee also emphasised that the research plans mandated by Conservation Measure 182/XVIII represented minimum research requirements. Thus, although the minimum requirement for a single vessel to fish is 20 research hauls, the assessments undertaken at this year's meeting of WG-FSA for Subarea 88.1 used data from about 100 hauls and even so, information from other localities had had to be used in order to complete that assessment. Accordingly it is likely that additional research data will need to be collected for a number of years before reliable assessments will be possible. In this context, WG-FSA encouraged the submission, wherever possible, of more comprehensive research plans, extending further than those required under Conservation Measure 182/XVIII.

9.11 In this regard the Scientific Committee recommended that proposals for new or exploratory fisheries with specific research plans endorsed by the Scientific Committee can be exempted from the general research requirements under Conservation Measure 182/XVIII, such as those submitted this year for trawl fisheries in Divisions 58.4.1, 58.4.2 and 58.4.3.

9.12 Concern was expressed that if several vessels made fewer than 10 hauls or caught less than 10 tonnes of fish in those hauls within an SSRU, thus obviating the need to undertake the research component of Conservation Measure 182/XVIII, a significant amount of fish might be taken from which very little research data might arise. Mechanisms by which this requirement might be strengthened for proposals for which an alternative research plan has not been endorsed were discussed in a subgroup and the following proposals applicable to each vessel entering the fishery made:

- (i) All catches of target species should be included in the catch limit. Catches of by-catch species are considered separately in paragraph 9.14.
- (ii) On first entry into an SSRU, the first 10 hauls, designated 'first series', whether by trawl or longline, should be designated 'research hauls' and must satisfy the criteria set out in Annex 182/B paragraphs 3(ii) to 3(iv).
- (iii) The next 10 hauls or 10 tonnes of catch, whichever trigger level is achieved first, are designated the 'second series'. Hauls in the second series can, at the discretion of the skipper, be fished as part of normal exploratory fishing. However, provided they satisfy the requirements of Annexes 182/A and 182/B, paragraphs 3(ii) to (iv), these hauls can also be designated as 'research hauls'.
- (iv) The nomination of 'research hauls' is to be made prior to or at the time of setting the gear.
- (v) On completion of the first and second series of hauls, if the skipper wishes to continue to fish within the SSRU, the vessel must undertake a second research phase which will result in a total of 20 'research hauls' being made. The second series of hauls should be undertaken during a single visit to a SSRU.
- (vi) On completion of 20 'research hauls' the vessel may continue to fish within the SSRU.

- (vii) When either the catch limit or the end of the fishing season is reached, all fishing within the designated area should cease.

9.13 The Scientific Committee endorsed the proposal from WG-FSA regarding Annex 182/B that while length-frequency and sex data should continue to be recorded for at least 100 fish, samples for biological studies (otoliths, scales, stomach contents) should be taken and gonad stages recorded for at least 30 fish.

9.14 The subgroup discussed by-catch provisions in Conservation Measure 182/XVIII noting that hauls made in previously unfished areas might take significant by-catches to the extent that they might account for much of the catch limit for a by-catch. Three options were considered, maintaining a 50 tonne catch limit for each statistical subarea (the current provision of Conservation Measure 182/XVIII), excluding the by-catch arising from the first 10 'research hauls' from the by-catch catch limit or altering the by-catch catch limit. The first option was considered inappropriate because the anticipated by-catch rates during the exploratory phase might be incompatible with current reporting requirements. Following discussion it was agreed that

- EITHER: by-catches arising from the first 10 'research hauls' should not be set against the by-catch catch limit although they should be included in reported catches;
- OR: the by-catch catch limit should be changed to 50 tonnes for each SSRU.

9.15 The Scientific Committee noted that an exploratory longline fishery and an exploratory trawl fishery were proposed for Division 58.4.2. The Scientific Committee had endorsed the fishing and research plans for the trawl fishery, noting that these plans aimed to identify whether bottom trawling for *D. mawsoni* would be detrimental to benthic habitats in this division. In this regard, these plans were intended to determine relationships between the densities of fish and benthic habitat features. Also, the plans were designed to provide for interim protection of habitats through the implementation of open and closed areas until a management plan can be developed for this region that will ensure appropriate protection of benthic habitats. The Scientific Committee recommended that the fishing and research plans for the longline fishery be consistent with the trawl fishery such that the system of open and closed areas be applied and the research plan helps understand the relationships between *D. mawsoni* and benthic habitats.

9.16 The Scientific Committee recommended that the procedure set out in paragraphs 9.12 to 9.14 might be taken forward for the forthcoming season and reviewed at next year's meeting of WG-FSA.

9.17 A further practical problem arises when there are multiple exploratory fisheries operating in a subarea or division. Conservation Measure 182/XVIII requires that fishing in any fine-scale rectangle shall cease when the reported catch reaches 100 tonnes, and that only one vessel at a time may fish in any fine-scale rectangle. Currently catches within SSRUs are monitored by the Secretariat via the five-day reporting system. It is clear from CCAMLR-XIX/BG/5 however, that the timeliness of five-day report submissions last season was not very good. If similar performance occurs next season, the five-day reporting system may not be sufficient to monitor accurately compliance with the requirements of Conservation Measure 182/XVIII with respect to SSRUs, when more than one exploratory fishery is operating in an area. In principle, the presence of VMS on each vessel would allow accurate monitoring of vessel position. But without a central coordinating body it is difficult to see how this information could be used (Annex 5, paragraph 4.87).

9.18 The only exploratory longline fishery for which WG-FSA was able to make an assessment was for *D. mawsoni* in Subarea 88.1. The Scientific Committee was pleased to note that new data from 489 longline hauls had been supplied by New Zealand. A total of 76 fine-scale rectangles has been fished in the past three years (Annex 5, paragraph 4.15). These data included a large amount of biological information on the species.

9.19 An estimate of yield was made by using a similar approach to that used at last year's meeting to calculate precautionary catch limits for Subarea 88.1. Yields were estimated for Subarea 88.1 by relating the CPUE from research sets and biological parameters for *D. mawsoni* to the CPUE, biological parameters and yield estimate for *D. eleginoides* in Subarea 48.3. The method, along with descriptions of modifications to that used in 1999, is described in Annex 5, paragraphs 4.20 to 4.32.

9.20 The resulting estimates of yield are based on the known adult habitat of *D. mawsoni* in Subarea 88.1. The Scientific Committee endorsed the view of WG-FSA that the best available estimate of yield for *D. mawsoni* in Subarea 88.1 is 3 778 tonnes (NB: this estimate had been revised during the Scientific Committee meeting (see paragraph 5.45)).

9.21 The Scientific Committee noted that, whilst the current assessment provided several improvements to earlier assessments of this area, there was still considerable uncertainty present. This stems from uncertainty in biological and fishery parameters for both *Dissostichus* spp., and the assumption of the relationship between CPUE and density. However, values appear to be similar for both species (Annex 5, paragraph 4.30).

9.22 In light of this uncertainty, the Scientific Committee agreed that some discount still needs to be applied to the results of this assessment. The Scientific Committee noted that in previous years a range of discount factors (from 0.25 to 0.5) has been applied to new and exploratory fisheries for *Dissostichus* spp.

9.23 Currently CPUE is the main source of information to provide indices of relative abundance and information from alternative methods, such as tagging, is urgently required.

9.24 It was noted that a tagging program directed not only at *D. mawsoni*, the target species, but also at skates, a significant component of the by-catch, is in progress in Subarea 88.1. The results from these studies are likely to provide much useful information towards reducing the uncertainty over assessments. The Scientific Committee noted this study and encouraged other participants in the fishery in Subarea 88.1 to undertake similar tagging studies.

New and Exploratory Fisheries Notified for 2000/01

General Issues

9.25 A total of nine notifications for new or exploratory longline or trawl fisheries for *Dissostichus* spp. in the 2000/01 season pertaining to 16 subareas or divisions had been received. All had been received by the Secretariat on or before the due date. Recalling the experiences of the previous year, WG FSA had recommended that in future years it would not consider any notifications received after the due date. This was endorsed by the Scientific Committee.

9.26 Dr K. Sullivan (New Zealand) stated that it is New Zealand's position that it did not support proposals for expanded effort in the Ross Sea, an area with which New Zealand has had a long association and commitment to manage and protect the environment from any adverse impacts. In any previous year of the exploratory fishery in Subarea 88.1 a maximum of three vessels have operated. However, this year there are notifications of a total maximum of

10 vessels (Annex 5, Table 25). New Zealand does not believe this escalation in effort is warranted for the purposes of researching this exploratory fishery. There is also the danger that the current research program may be undermined in the following manner:

- (i) there is potential for the short total season length to be further shortened if the catch limit was reached. This would then restrict the collection of research data to a shorter period than required;
- (ii) difficulties may be encountered in trying to replicate research sets previously fished within SSRU's for research purposes; and
- (iii) interpretation of longline CPUE data is confounded by changes in vessels from year to year.

9.27 Dr Sullivan further advised that New Zealand could not support proposals for multiple exploratory fishing operations in Subarea 88.1 unless a fisheries management system was developed to address practical issues which will arise relating to compliance with Conservation Measure 182/XVIII. In particular, the current requirement for the maintenance of a maximum of only one vessel per fine-scale rectangle presents a major difficulty to operational management.

9.28 Mr B. Watkins (South Africa) indicated that the Scientific Committee had offered clear advice concerning the notifications for exploratory fisheries in Subareas 88.1 and 88.2. In his view the matter alluded to in paragraphs 9.26 and 9.27 were for the Commission to consider and were not well placed within the Scientific Committee's deliberations.

9.29 Dr E. Barrera-Oro (Argentina) and Prof. J. Croxall (UK) supported the views of Mr Watkins.

9.30 Concern was expressed that many notifications failed to specify an anticipated level of fishing effort or total catch. In some instances the total catch specified was the same as the catch limit for the appropriate statistical subarea. It was agreed that WG-FSA should develop for its next meeting, criteria to determine whether the information contained in notifications was acceptable.

9.31 Some notifications had been received which applied to subareas or divisions containing national EEZs. It was accepted that such notifications referred to waters within the subarea or division that are outside the relevant EEZ.

9.32 WG-FSA had noted that there were notifications of intent to fish in Subareas 48.1, 48.2 and 58.7. Conservation Measures 72/XVII, 73/XVII and 160/XVII clearly state that the taking of finfish in these subareas, other than for research purposes, is prohibited until such time as a survey of stock biomass is carried out, its results reported to and analysed by the Working Group, and a decision that the fishery be reopened is made by the Commission based on the advice of the Scientific Committee. As these conditions have not yet been met, the Scientific Committee recommended that new or exploratory fisheries for finfish should not take place in these subareas in the coming season. For Subarea 58.7, no information was available to indicate what activities are intended arising from the French notification.

9.33 The Brazilian notification (CCAMLR-XIX/5) also indicated an intent to fish for *D. eleginoides* in Subareas 48.3 and 48.4. The fisheries in these subareas are regulated under Conservation Measures 179/XVIII and 180/XVIII respectively. The Scientific Committee welcomed what it believed to be the primary intent of the Brazilian notification, which is to inform CCAMLR that Brazil intended, for the first time, to participate in fisheries in these areas.

9.34 The Scientific Committee noted that for Divisions 58.5.1 and 58.5.2, the amount of fishable ground lying outside national EEZs was very small and that new or exploratory fisheries are unlikely to be viable. This view had been endorsed by the Commission (CCAMLR-XVIII, paragraph 7.23).

9.35 In all but one of the nine other subareas and divisions, more than one new or exploratory fishery notification had been made and three or more notifications had been made for six of these. In Division 58.4.4, six notifications had been made involving up to a maximum of 14 vessels. It was noted that this strongly affects the average catch available per vessel and, since such a catch would most likely be taken within a short period of time, might result in a serious overshoot of the catch limit.

9.36 Regarding Conservation Measure 182/XVIII, WG-FSA had discussed the appropriateness of the 100 tonne catch limit per fine-scale rectangle (Annex 5, paragraph 4.88). This had been included to ensure that exploratory fishing occurs over as wide a geographic area as possible. In most cases, the reported catches per fine-scale rectangle have been less than 50 tonnes and catches over 50 tonnes have only been recorded in Subarea 88.1. Obviously a reduction of the 100 tonne limit per fine-scale rectangle would encourage a wider geographical distribution of effort. It was agreed that this topic should be reviewed at the next meeting of WG-FSA.

9.37 Pending the review by WG-FSA, the Scientific Committee recommended that the 100 tonne catch limit in fine-scale rectangles be retained. As such, it endorsed the method by which the Commission determined overall catch limits for statistical areas for these fisheries (CCAMLR-XVIII, paragraphs 7.10 to 7.17).

9.38 Both longline and trawl fisheries have been notified for Divisions 58.4.1, 58.4.2 and 58.4.3. WG-FSA had considered these in terms of gear selectivity on the stocks, impact on benthos and the amount and type of information likely to accrue from such fishing activities (Annex 5, paragraphs 4.88 to 4.91). Arising from the discussions, WG-FSA had recommended that precautionary catch limits in Divisions 58.4.1 for Elan Bank should be 145 tonnes for trawl and 145 tonnes for longline fishing. In Division 58.4.3, for BANZARE Bank, the recommended precautionary catch limits were 150 tonnes for trawl fishing and 150 tonnes for longline fishing. The Scientific Committee endorsed these recommendations.

9.39 For Division 58.4.2, the Scientific Committee recommended that the method for calculating precautionary catch limits apply to this division (paragraph 9.37). It also recommended that catch limits be consistent with the principles outlined in paragraph 9.12 and that the catch limit for *Dissostichus* spp. should be split evenly between trawl and longline fishing.

9.40 For Subareas 48.6, 58.6 and 88.2 and Divisions 58.4.3 and 58.4.4, precautionary catch limits for *Dissostichus* spp. had been set at CCAMLR-XVIII. The Scientific Committee recommended that the provisions of Conservation Measures 184/XVIII, 187/XVIII, 188/XVIII, 189/XVIII and 191/XVIII be carried forward for a further year. However, Conservation Measure 172/XVIII prohibits directed fishing for *Dissostichus* spp. in subareas and divisions for which no specific conservation measures have been adopted. Accordingly, WG-FSA had agreed that, until it had gained more information on areas currently fished for *Dissostichus* spp. under new and exploratory fishery regimes and more experience with the operations of SSRUs, it would be inappropriate to open previously unfished areas to fishing for *Dissostichus* spp., or to reopen areas that have not been fished for *Dissostichus* spp. in recent years. The Scientific Committee therefore recommended that Subarea 48.5, the Antarctic coastal part of Division 58.4.1 south of 64°S, and Subarea 88.3 be closed to directed fishing for *Dissostichus* spp.

9.41 In the Uruguayan exploratory fishery during 1999/2000 in Division 58.4.4, 55 tonnes of *D. eleginoides* had been taken outside designated SSRUs. As catches outside SSRUs do not

have the potential to trigger research activities regardless of their size, the Scientific Committee recommended that the entire area of Division 58.4.4, currently not contained in designated SSRUs, be designated as an SSRU.

9.42 The ASOC Observer made the following statement:

‘ASOC calls for a moratorium on all toothfish fisheries, in light of this, ASOC must oppose all new and exploratory fisheries. Regardless of ASOC’s call for a moratorium, opening any new and exploratory fisheries is a step in the wrong direction.

ASOC argues that a critical short-term measure toward ending IUU fishing and its devastating by-catch of endangered albatrosses and petrels is for CCAMLR to establish a moratorium on legal fisheries for Antarctic and Patagonian toothfish. It is insupportable to continue the legal fishery when the real catch is already far above what CCAMLR estimates as a precautionary level. The large IUU fishery substantially undermines CCAMLR’s capacity for scientific and environmental management of the impact of fishing activities on both target species and on highly endangered by-catch species. ASOC reminds this Committee that the fish stock assessment estimates that as many as 333 000 seabirds have been drowned by IUU fishers since 1996.

The moratorium would be a short-term measure to remain in place until: IUU fishing has been eliminated in CCAMLR waters; the incidental catches of albatross and petrels has been eliminated; robust and independent scientific data has been acquired on the status and demographic trends of toothfish stocks; and CCAMLR has a fully functioning catch certification system integrated with the more broadly based trade regulation system available under CITES.’

Review of Individual Notifications

9.43 Argentina had submitted a notification (CCAMLR-XIX/12) for exploratory longline fisheries for *Dissostichus* spp. in Subareas 48.1, 48.2, 48.6, 58.6, 88.1, 88.2, 88.3 and Divisions 58.4.1, 58.4.2, 58.4.3, 58.4.4 and 58.5.1 outside EEZs.

9.44 Aside from the recommendation above regarding Subareas 48.1 and 48.2, the Scientific Committee noted that the available area outside national EEZs in Divisions 58.5.1 and 58.5.2 was small, so appropriate precautionary catch limits for these areas should also be similarly small.

9.45 Australia had submitted a notification (CCAMLR-XIX/10) for exploratory bottom trawl fisheries for *Dissostichus* spp. in Divisions 58.4.1 and 58.4.3, and a notification (CCAMLR-XIX/11) for an exploratory trawl fishery for *Dissostichus* spp., *Chaenodraco wilsoni*, *Lepidonotothen kempfi*, *Trematomus eulepidotus*, *Pleuragramma antarcticum* and other species in Division 58.4.2. The second notification was a resubmission of a notification made last year.

9.46 It was noted that, due to the presence of rough ground, most of the area of Divisions 58.4.1 and 58.4.3 was unsuitable for trawling. The research plan includes specific experiments to examine the effects of bottom trawling on benthic communities.

9.47 Brazil submitted a notification (CCAMLR-XIX/5) for exploratory longline fisheries for *D. eleginoides* in Subareas 48.2, 48.3, 48.4 and 48.6 and Divisions 58.4.4, 58.5.1 and 58.5.2 (outside national EEZs of South Africa, France and Australia).

9.48 Comments regarding these subareas and divisions are given in paragraphs 9.32 to 9.41.

9.49 France had submitted a notification (CCAMLR-XIX/13) for new and exploratory longline fisheries for *D. eleginoides*, *Raja*, *Bathyraja* and *Macrourus* in Subareas 58.6 and 58.7 and Divisions 58.4.3, 58.4.4, 58.5.1 and 58.5.2 outside the EEZs of South Africa, Australia and France.

9.50 Aside from noting that clarification was needed of the intentions within Subarea 58.7, comments regarding the other subareas and divisions are given in paragraphs 9.32 to 9.41. In addition, it was noted that it was a strict requirement of Conservation Measure 182/XVIII that exploratory fishing vessels should carry an observer under the CCAMLR Scheme of International Scientific Observation.

9.51 New Zealand submitted a notification (CCAMLR-XIX/17) for an exploratory longline fishery for *Dissostichus* spp. in Subarea 88.1. This represents a continuation of the exploratory fishing program carried out by New Zealand in previous years in this subarea, for which considerable catch and research information has been submitted.

9.52 Arising from the data submitted for this subarea, WG-FSA had been able to provide an estimate of sustainable yield (paragraph 9.20). Furthermore, consideration of the implementation of the research plan had been instrumental in considerations of suggested revisions to Conservation Measure 182/XVIII that have been described in paragraphs 9.12 and 9.14.

9.53 South Africa had submitted a notification (CCAMLR-XIX/6) for exploratory longline fisheries for *Dissostichus* spp. in Subareas 48.6, 58.6, 88.1 and 88.2 and Division 58.4.4. No specific comments were made regarding this notification.

9.54 Ukraine had submitted a notification (CCAMLR-XIX/7) for an exploratory longline fishery for *Dissostichus* spp. in Division 58.4.4. No specific comments were made regarding this notification.

9.55 Ukraine is also carrying out longline research in Division 58.4.4 under the provisions of Conservation Measure 64/XII, with an estimated catch of less than 50 tonnes. It was noted that the provisions of this conservation measure are incompatible with those of Conservation Measure 182/XVIII. This topic is discussed further under 'Research Exemption' (paragraph 8.7).

9.56 Uruguay had submitted a notification (CCAMLR-XIX/15) for exploratory longline fisheries for *Dissostichus* spp. in Subareas 88.1, 88.2 and 88.3 and Division 58.4.4.

9.57 Recalling that Uruguay had conducted an exploratory longline fishery in Division 58.4.4 during 1999/2000, but that data for that fishery had been received too late for consideration by WG-FSA, no assessment of the various fishery and research plans proposed in the notification could be made.

9.58 Uruguay had submitted a notification (CCAMLR-XIX/16) for an exploratory pot fishery for *D. eleginoides* in Subarea 48.3. It also submitted a notification (CCAMLR-XIX/16) for an exploratory pot fishery for crabs in Subarea 48.3. In accordance with Conservation Measure 64/XII, the UK had submitted a notification (CCAMLR-XIX/9) of research vessel activity involving pot fishing for *D. eleginoides* with an expected catch over 50 tonnes in Subarea 48.3. The USA had also notified (CCAMLR-XIX/BG/18) its intention to participate in the crab fishery in Subarea 48.3 in accordance with Conservation Measure 181/XVIII.

9.59 The Scientific Committee reaffirmed its recommendation of 1999 (SC-CAMLR-XVIII, paragraphs 8.3 to 8.5) that pot catches of *D. eleginoides* should be counted against the *D. eleginoides* catch limit for Subarea 48.3. Similarly any retained catch of crabs should be counted against the crab catch limit for Subarea 48.3.

9.60 The Republic of Korea and the UK submitted a notification (CCAMLR-XIX/8) for an exploratory jig fishery for *M. hyadesi* in Subarea 48.3.

9.61 The Scientific Committee noted that, in accordance with Conservation Measure 148/XVII, it was mandatory for VMS to be installed on the exploratory fishing vessel. It also noted that Conservation Measure 183/XVIII requires the presence of a CCAMLR scientific observer.