## CCAMLR SCHEME OF INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC OBSERVATION

6.1 In accordance with the CCAMLR Scheme of International Scientific Observation, scientific observers were deployed on all vessels in all finfish fisheries in the Convention Area.

6.2 Information collected by scientific observers on board longline, finfish trawl, pot and krill trawl cruises were summarised by the Secretariat in SC-CAMLR-XXVII/BG/2.

6.3 The Scientific Committee also noted the discussions on the observer program by WG-IMAF (Annex 6, paragraphs 7.1 to 7.29), WG-FSA (Annex 5, paragraphs 11.1 to 11.8) and WG-EMM (Annex 4, paragraphs 4.28 to 4.66).

### Ad hoc TASO

6.4 The Scientific Committee recalled that it had endorsed the establishment of ad hoc TASO at its last meeting (SC-CAMLR-XXVI, paragraphs 7.9 to 7.12).

6.5 The Co-conveners of ad hoc TASO, Mr Heinecken and Dr Welsford, presented the report from the first meeting, held in conjunction with WG-EMM and WG-SAM in St Petersburg, Russia, on 19 and 20 July 2008 (SC-CAMLR-XXVII/BG/6).

6.6 The agenda of the first meeting of ad hoc TASO covered the design and operation of gear types used in fisheries in the Convention Area, observer priorities in the trawl, longline and pot fisheries, and the future work plan and terms of reference of the ad hoc group.

6.7 The Scientific Committee endorsed the terms of reference as developed by ad hoc TASO (SC-CAMLR-XXVII/BG/6, paragraph 4.2).

6.8 The Scientific Committee endorsed the long-term work plan of ad hoc TASO to include (i) ensuring an equivalent level of training and accreditation for observers across the Convention Area, and (ii) facilitating the exchange of expertise and experience between technical coordinators and experienced observers on methods of recruit training.

6.9 The Scientific Committee noted that many of the recommendations from ad hoc TASO had been useful to the work of the Scientific Committee and had been welcomed by WG-FSA (Annex 5, paragraph 11.4), WG-EMM (Annex 4, paragraphs 4.41 to 4.46) and WG-IMAF (Annex 6, paragraph 13.4).

6.10 The Scientific Committee considered plans for the next meeting of ad hoc TASO. While it noted that the meeting could be held separately to other working group meetings in the future to assist with the development of capacity building in Members' observer programs and fleets, it agreed that the meeting in 2009 be held in conjunction with WG-EMM and WG-SAM.

6.11 Dr Iversen was pleased to extend Norway's invitation to host WG-EMM, WG-SAM and ad hoc TASO in 2009.

6.12 The Scientific Committee requested that specific items referred to ad hoc TASO by the working groups be considered by the Co-conveners in developing their agenda.

6.13 Dr Barrera-Oro considered that the experts brought together in ad hoc TASO, including industry representatives, may be able to provide information on IUU operations using gillnets and requested that this be considered at the next meeting of ad hoc TASO.

6.14 Prof. O. Pin (Uruguay) agreed and considered that industry stakeholders and national observers that have experience outside of the Convention Area are likely to be able to provide valuable information to SC-CAMLR regarding the activities and impacts of IUU fishing.

6.15 Prof. Moreno noted that ad hoc TASO was evidently capable of dealing with a wide variety of technical issues. However, he noted that any Members with information on the activities and impacts of IUU fishing were obliged to report such information and that ad hoc TASO may not be an appropriate forum for such issues.

Advice from WG-FSA

6.16 The Scientific Committee considered and approved recommendations from WG-FSA concerning the aspects of the CCAMLR Scheme of International Scientific Observation discussed in Annex 5, paragraph 11.8.

Advice from WG-IMAF

6.17 The Scientific Committee considered and approved recommendations from WG-IMAF concerning the aspects of the CCAMLR Scheme of International Scientific Observation discussed in Annex 6, paragraphs 7.3, 7.13 to 7.20 and 7.29.

Advice from WG-EMM

6.18 The Scientific Committee noted that six scientific observer logbooks were submitted to the Secretariat for the 2006/07 season from observations conducted by CCAMLR scientific observers on the *Saga Sea* (Norway), *Niitaka Maru* (Japan) and *Dalmor II* (Poland) (Annex 4, paragraph 4.28).

6.19 The Scientific Committee also noted that the Secretariat had received five notifications of the placement of CCAMLR international scientific observers on krill fishing vessels in Area 48 in 2007/08 (Annex 4, paragraph 4.29). This information was updated at WG-IMAF (Annex 6, paragraph 2.20 and Table 7).

6.20 The Scientific Committee noted that the percentage of tows observed varied greatly between observers, seasons and vessels. For example, in 2006/07 between 20 and 86% of the tows were observed per observer trip, including both the traditional trawling method and the

continuous fishing system, noting that this represented a much lower proportion of the total number of tows conducted in the fishery because of the overall level of observer coverage (Annex 4, paragraph 4.30).

6.21 The Scientific Committee endorsed the advice from WG-EMM regarding revision of the instructions in the *Scientific Observers Manual* to reflect the changed priorities for data collection (Annex 4, paragraphs 4.47 to 4.54).

6.22 The Scientific Committee noted the discussions on the level of scientific observer coverage for the krill fishery. It further noted that the Working Group had agreed that 100% vessel coverage (i.e. a minimum of one observer on each vessel for all the period that the vessel is in the Convention Area) using government-appointed or international observers should be undertaken as soon as possible (Annex 4, paragraph 4.58).

6.23 The Scientific Committee noted the request from the Working Group to consider the most practical way of initiating such coverage commencing in December 2009 (Annex 4, paragraph 4.59).

6.24 The Scientific Committee noted that after a two-year period of 100% observer coverage, WG-EMM would be in a position to provide advice on the level of ongoing observer coverage required (Annex 4, paragraph 4.61).

6.25 The Scientific Committee also noted the recommendation that any new entrants (Members or vessels) and vessels using new fishing methods must comply with a two-year 100% vessel-time coverage by government-appointed or international observers, noting that this could be reviewed after two years to determine the required coverage for subsequent years (Annex 4, paragraph 4.62).

6.26 The Scientific Committee also noted that vessels with increased catch and processing capacity may need more than one observer (Annex 4, paragraph 4.63).

6.27 All Members, except Japan, Republic of Korea and China, endorsed WG-EMM's plan for 100% scientific observer coverage across the entire krill fleet for two years, commencing in December 2009.

6.28 Mr Matsushima made the following statement:

> 'Japan has been putting great importance on collecting scientific data and biological samples from the krill fishery. In this regard, Japan has voluntarily dispatched scientific observers and also accepted observers from other Members on its krill fishing vessel, and provided scientific information and data to CCAMLR. We believe that such scientific contribution by Japan has been highly appreciated by SC-CAMLR.
>
> In this sense, Japan submitted a plan for systematic scientific observer coverage to WG-EMM in 2008 in response to the request by the Scientific Committee. However, unfortunately, Japan did not receive any feedback about how its plan was scientifically insufficient to achieve the objective which is mentioned in SC-CAMLR-XXVI, paragraph 3.7.
>
> Furthermore, in SC-CAMLR-XXVI, paragraph 3.14, the Scientific Committee agreed that WG-EMM should carry out an assessment of the consequences to the data

collection effort of the different approaches which are suggested in paragraphs 3.10 and 3.11. However, there is no result of such an assessment in the report of WG-EMM.

In this regard, Japan cannot find any scientific reason why 100% observer coverage is necessary, therefore, it cannot accept 100% observer coverage recommended by WG-EMM, even if it is initially for a period of two years.

Having said so, Japan suggested that it will be able to deploy government-appointed observers to provide at least 50% observer coverage from the 2009/10 fishing season.'

6.29 Dr Shin queried the details of the assessment undertaken during WG-EMM regarding the consequences of employing different levels of observer coverage. He considered that an analysis to support the indispensableness of full coverage is still lacking, which his delegation continued to seek over the years. He regretted that the utility of the suggested high-level coverage was not sufficiently explored. He further noted that there is, however, a common ground for systematic coverage at a substantial level even for the present time, and hoped that this scope could still be utilised.

6.30 Dr Zhao expressed his understanding of the initiative leading to the recommendation with respect to 100% observer coverage. However, he also expressed his concern over the potential difficulties that may arise from such a sudden increase in observer coverage, as also mentioned in the deliberations made by Japanese and Korean delegates. Subsequently, Dr Zhao suggested that a more practical, stepwise-increase approach be adopted to accomplish the same objective.

6.31 Dr Zhao also noted, with regard to the recommendation in paragraph 6.24, that a distinction should be drawn between new entrants and new fishing methods, as they belong to two different categories. He further noted that no additional mandatory requirements should be placed on new entrants without a sound scientific justification.

6.32 Most Members expressed strong disappointment with the position taken by Japan, Republic of Korea and China on the issue of 100% observer coverage. Most Members considered that WG-EMM had indeed thoroughly evaluated Japan's proposal for 50% observer coverage (WG-EMM-08/34). The Working Group had agreed that after a two-year period of 100% coverage, it would be in a position to provide advice to the Scientific Committee on the level of ongoing observer coverage, given the expectation of systematic coverage of not less than 50% vessel-days in the krill fishery (Annex 4, paragraph 4.61).

6.33 These Members further expressed confusion at Japan's position, considering its full participation in the discussions leading up to WG-EMM's advice, and considered that such a position had the potential to seriously undermine the role of the Scientific Committee and its working groups.

6.34 The Scientific Committee agreed that an annex containing the text and paragraph numbers from prior discussions on observer coverage in the krill fishery be included for the Commission to use in its deliberations on this issue (Annex 9).

6.35 The Scientific Committee noted that its ability to conduct its work was contingent on the efforts of observers in collecting data, and requested that Members ensure that this gratitude be conveyed to all observers after the meeting.