

MANAGEMENT UNDER UNCERTAINTY

Regulatory Framework

7.1 The Scientific Committee noted the further progress in developing a unified framework for providing management advice on all fisheries in the Convention Area (Annex 5, paragraph 4.333).

7.2 The Secretariat has developed fishery plans for krill and *C. gunnari* in the intersessional period. These plans were scrutinised by WG-EMM and WG-FSA respectively at their annual 2001 meetings. Comments are provided in Annex 4, paragraphs 4.16 to 4.22 and Annex 5, paragraphs 4.333 to 4.345. Furthermore, WAMI had commented on the fishery plan for *C. gunnari* (Annex 5, Appendix D). The Scientific Committee agreed that these comments be incorporated into the fishery plans, and final versions of the two plans should be available early next year.

7.3 The Scientific Committee agreed that the next step should be to prepare these fishery plans for other fisheries in the Convention Area. Priority fisheries are those for *D. eleginoides* in Subarea 48.3 and Division 58.5.2, *Dissostichus* spp. in Subarea 88.1 and *C. gunnari* in Division 58.5.2. Other fisheries were considered of a lower priority.

7.4 The Scientific Committee recalled that an important aim of the framework was to streamline the process of an annual review of fisheries by the Scientific Committee and its working groups. In this regard, when addressing new and exploratory fisheries notifications, WG-FSA had developed a summary table (Annex 5, Table 19) incorporating recent information on all fisheries in the Convention Area. This table includes information on most recently reported catches, notifications of intentions to take part in the fishery and advice about the currency of the most recent assessment for each fishery.

7.5 Notification is an essential component of the framework. Problems arising from multiple notifications in the same area need to be highlighted to the Commission, for example there is a comparatively low catch limit in Division 58.4.4 of 103 tonnes. However, the Secretariat received notifications from Members indicating that 10 vessels wished to fish in this area in the forthcoming season (paragraph 9.5).

7.6 The fisheries summary should be considered annually both in the context of the assessments conducted and as an important item in the regulatory framework. Dr Parkes stressed that for many of the CCAMLR fisheries, the most recent assessment is described in Annex 5, Table 19 as the 'prospecting default arrangement'. This refers to the default exploratory harvesting arrangements that have been put in place by the Commission in the absence of a formal assessment of these fisheries. The currency of this advice is described in Table 19 as 'multi-year in the absence of surveys or fishery-based research information'. In many cases, despite multiple notifications of intentions to fish over several years, there has been little or no fishing. For those fisheries notified previously, and for which notifications were received again this year, but for which no new information was available, no new assessment was undertaken. The Scientific Committee agreed that until new information is received, WG-FSA should not attempt to undertake any further work on these fisheries. Hence, the 'prospecting default arrangement' would remain in place as the current advice.

7.7 The Scientific Committee agreed that the fishery summary was a useful complement to the fishery plans developed under the framework, and that it should continue to be developed and used routinely to provide guidance to the Scientific Committee and WG-FSA on priorities for assessment work.

7.8 Regarding future development of the framework, the Scientific Committee recalled the extensive discussion at last year's meeting recorded in SC-CAMLR-XIX, paragraphs 7.2 to 7.20. The Scientific Committee provided a detailed plan of action for future work, particularly with respect to the generalisation of the notification process, research and fishery operation plans and data collection procedures (SC-CAMLR-XIX, Tables 7 and 8). The Scientific Committee agreed that this guidance remained the basis for future developments of the framework and looked forward to further progress at next year's meeting.

Review of Existing Conservation Measures by the Secretariat

7.9 The Secretariat had prepared two papers in advance of the meeting in order to provide suggestions on how the process of establishing conservation measures could be further streamlined and unified: CCAMLR-XX/20 Rev. 1 and BG/4. Both papers were reviewed by WG-FSA and comments have been provided in Annex 5, paragraphs 4.339 to 4.443.

7.10 CCAMLR-XX/20 Rev. 1 described two alternative approaches on how this process of streamlining could be simplified. The Scientific Committee thanked the Secretariat for preparing these documents and agreed that the first of the two approaches was preferable because it was easier to follow than the second without having to refer to other documents. This approach followed a standard format for providing management advice which included the setting of catch limits and other regulatory measures. However, non-standard approaches will still be possible. The same formats which apply to finfish fisheries are envisaged to apply to krill fisheries. The headings in the proposal were found to be very useful. Dr Constable suggested that a different numbering system might be needed in order to better group the conservation measures.

7.11 The Scientific Committee agreed to suggest to the Commission to adopt this approach for future descriptions of conservation measures.