

## REPORT OF THE CCAMLR PERFORMANCE REVIEW PANEL

10.1 The Scientific Committee reviewed the Report of the CCAMLR Performance Review Panel (PRP) (CCAMLR-XXVII/8) as mandated by the Commission at its meeting in 2007 (CCAMLR-XVI, Annex 7, paragraph 10). This item was considered as a separate item on the Scientific Committee's agenda.

10.2 The Scientific Committee considered general aspects of the PRP report and derived a plan for how recommendations made in the report could be considered, both during 2009 and beyond. PRP recommendations and subitems considered to be applicable to the Scientific Committee's work were identified in CCAMLR-XXVII/BG/39 and are provided in Table 5. However, the Scientific Committee agreed that all subitems under each recommendation should be examined to determine which ones were applicable to its work and how they were to be undertaken.

### General comments

10.3 The Scientific Committee congratulated the PRP for their diligence in providing a very comprehensive report written over a very short period. The Scientific Committee agreed that the PRP's analysis of the scientific mission and activities was very thorough and illustrated a deep understanding of science in CCAMLR and how it relates to the Commission's objectives on the conservation of Antarctic marine living resources as contained in Article II.

10.4 The Scientific Committee appreciated comments made by the PRP concerning the status of advice provided to the Commission. The Scientific Committee was pleased to note that the PRP recognised the 'uniqueness' of CCAMLR because of its strong conservation credentials along with the precautionary principle and ecosystem approach (CCAMLR-XXVII/8, Item 1.3). The Scientific Committee noted that the PRP recognised that CCAMLR is particularly advanced in its development and use of methods to manage prey species so as to protect dependent predators, in assessing and limiting fishery impacts on by-catch species, and in providing a structured and precautionary process for the orderly development of new and exploratory fisheries (CCAMLR-XXVII/8, paragraph 3.1.1.16). The Scientific Committee acknowledged several similar views of the various scientific aspects of CCAMLR were provided by the PRP.

10.5 The Scientific Committee noted that readers, especially non-CCAMLR readers, stood the danger of concluding that CCAMLR performance was deficient if they only read the Executive Summary and Summary of Recommendations sections of the report. Failure to read the entire report would result in the reader not being aware of the many positive aspects identified by the PRP.

10.6 The Scientific Committee further noted that the PRP had indicated that for almost every aspect of the report, recommendations of additional work were identified. Many of these, if implemented, would require a large amount of resources, both of financial and personnel.

10.7 The Scientific Committee recognised the role that science in CCAMLR plays in the Antarctic Treaty System and in the international community as a whole. It was noted that science in CCAMLR has recently expanded its role from the traditional fishery-oriented role to a broader international role (e.g. climate change, MPAs etc.).

10.8 However, as discussed elsewhere in this report, the Scientific Committee recognised that it lacked the resources to adequately meet its objectives. This is because of several reasons, including costs associated with sending scientists to meetings, loss of expertise to other competing national programs, and failure of some Members to send representatives to working group meetings (paragraph 16.7).

10.9 The Scientific Committee endorsed the proposal that a way to ensure that critical information reaches the Scientific Committee and its working groups was to invite submission of relevant papers (e.g. VME/benthos, climate change etc.) from non-Member scientists. These papers could be submitted with long lead times, maybe two months prior to the start of a working group meeting. The Chair of the Scientific Committee and the conveners of the working groups could then decide which papers were relevant to its agenda and then distribute appropriate papers. This would not result in additional travel costs or time associated with attending the meeting.

#### PRP recommendations relative to the Scientific Committee

10.10 The Scientific Committee agreed that all aspects of the 10 general recommendations (Table 5) made by the PRP, as well as those found in the subitems, should be considered. The Scientific Committee further agreed that three recommendations should be reviewed during the coming intersessional year and that the additional recommendations should be taken up on a longer-term basis. The three recommendations to be considered during this coming year are Items 2.4 (Protected Areas), 3.1 (Status of Living Resources) and 3.2 (Ecosystem Approach).

10.11 The Scientific Committee requested that the Chair, during the intersessional period, form a Steering Committee to develop a 'roadmap' (plan of action) to provide direction to the various Scientific Committee working groups on how the three highest-priority recommendations can be addressed and how the remainder might be addressed in the future. The objective of this work is to ensure the Scientific Committee is able to provide advice to the Commission on these topics at its 2009 meeting.