

## PERFORMANCE REVIEW<sup>5</sup>

10.1 At its meeting in 2008 the Scientific Committee requested that the Chair form a Steering Committee to develop a ‘roadmap’ (plan of action) to provide direction to the various Scientific Committee working groups on how to address the three highest-priority recommendations: Items 2.4 (Protected Areas), 3.1 (Status of Living Resources) and 3.2 (Ecosystem Approach) (SC-CAMLR-XXVII, paragraphs 10.10 and 10.11).

10.2 A Steering Committee was established by the Acting Chair of the Scientific Committee, Mr Iversen, and included conveners of all working groups (WG-FSA, WG-EMM, WG-SAM, WG-IMAF and ad hoc TASO) and the CCAMLR Science Officer.

10.3 Their report, provided in SC-CAMLR-XXVIII/7, outlined a potential ‘way forward’ for the Scientific Committee in addressing the various Performance Review Panel (PRP) recommendations. The PRP recommendations were grouped according to seven general categories, the first five being considered as general scientific issues, a sixth category of cooperation with external bodies and a seventh category of recommendations for capacity building and burden sharing.

10.4 The Scientific Committee also considered the following papers in this discussion: SC-CAMLR-XXVIII/12, CCAMLR-XXVIII/31 and BG/29.

### Progressing scientific issues identified in the Performance Review Panel (PRP) Report

10.5 The Scientific Committee agreed that the science issues, in summary, were:

- (i) spatial management and area protection;
- (ii) monitoring of the status and trends of harvested, dependent and related species;
- (iii) integration of status and trend data into management;
- (iv) management requirements for CCAMLR fisheries categories, as well as for the transition between categories;
- (v) requirements for the orderly development of the krill fishery.

10.6 In respect of item (i), the Scientific Committee agreed that all recommendations relating to MPAs were being adequately addressed in its work program on MPAs (paragraphs 3.14 to 3.33).

---

<sup>5</sup> The Performance Review Panel Report is available on the CCAMLR website [www.ccamlr.org/pu/E/revpanrep.htm](http://www.ccamlr.org/pu/E/revpanrep.htm).

10.7 In respect of monitoring of the status and trends of harvested, dependent and related species, the Scientific Committee agreed that consideration should be given to:

- (i) how CEMP may be expanded to satisfy the needs of feedback management of the fisheries;
- (ii) developing indicators for assessing status and trends in different components of the ecosystem, undertaking coordinated activities with the CEP, SCAR and other international research programs;
- (iii) given the ecosystem modelling being developed in support of CCAMLR, developing recovery targets and recovery plans for depleted stocks using available tools;
- (iv) monitoring and assessments of depleted stocks, including non-target species. It is recommended that a risk assessment be undertaken for depleted stocks to ensure that current management practices, including fishing, do not negatively impact on such stocks;
- (v) how such a risk assessment of the impacts of fishing may be undertaken and how a long-term program for monitoring status might be developed;
- (vi) a review being undertaken to identify whether the Scientific Committee has the facilities and mechanisms to provide advice to initiate actions on emerging issues before problems arise.

10.8 Accordingly, the Scientific Committee formulated the following tasks for WG-EMM, WG-FSA and WG-SAM:

Task 1 (WG-EMM, WG-SAM and WG-FSA):

Identify standard status and trend indicators that could be developed and be of use to SC-CAMLR, including those utilising data from other programs such as SCAR and ACAP.

Task 2 (WG-EMM, WG-SAM and WG-FSA in respect of larval fish by-catch):

- (i) develop candidate feedback management systems for the krill fishery;
- (ii) advise on what development of the CEMP system will be required to satisfy the needs of each feedback management candidate;
- (iii) advise on the most appropriate system to practically develop, and mechanisms to support it.

Task 3 (WG-FSA, WG-EMM and WG-SAM as appropriate):

- (i) develop a list of species which appear to be depleted;

- (ii) identify factors that may have contributed to their current status, including changes to ecosystem dynamics and productivity, through observation, analysis of historical data and modelling;
- (iii) develop a risk assessment of these stocks to ensure that current management practices, including fishing, do not negatively impact on such stocks and will not inhibit their recovery.

10.9 In relation to the integration of status and trend data into management, the Scientific Committee asked the following question of WG-SAM:

Task 4 (WG-SAM):

Consider how risk-based assessments of status and trends of target and non-target species, habitat and ecosystems could be regularly made and reported to SC-CAMLR.

10.10 In respect of CCAMLR fishery categories, the Scientific Committee agreed that this was primarily a matter for the Commission, but considered that the Commission's debate could be informed by some advice from the Scientific Committee. Accordingly, it defined the following task:

Task 5 (WG-EMM and WG-FSA):

Provide advice on whether the current classification and transition system for CCAMLR fisheries compromises the ability of the Scientific Committee to provide advice on, and CCAMLR to manage, fisheries according to the requirements of Article II.

10.11 In respect of the orderly development of the krill fishery, the Scientific Committee noted that the recommendations of the PRP are consistent with the work plan of the Scientific Committee. Although some of the recommendations are not currently implemented by CCAMLR – for instance, data reporting requirements from the krill fishery, feedback management strategies, and an increased frequency of fishery-independent surveys – all recommendations of the PRP are currently being considered by WG-EMM, or will be satisfied in the execution of Task 2 above.

Coordinating the work of CCAMLR with external bodies

10.12 The Scientific Committee noted that the relationship between itself and the CEP is a mandatory one because of the responsibilities in the Antarctic Treaty and the Convention of CAMLR. This is different from other bodies. It was also noted that there is a need to continue receiving advice from bodies such as SCAR and ACAP, even though the relationship is more of an advisory one.

10.13 The Scientific Committee noted the need to continue developing its positive relationship with the CEP, as had occurred at the Joint Workshop in April 2009, which provided a major advance in establishing a joint understanding of how these two bodies might

work together in the future. In the work of developing indicators for assessing status and trends in different components of the ecosystem, CCAMLR should coordinate the activities with the CEP, SCAR and other international research programs as appropriate.

10.14 Enhanced coordination with ICED, SOOS and Sentinel would also be useful to the Scientific Committee's work.

#### Capacity building and burden sharing

10.15 One of the most important institutional issues identified by the PRP and the Steering Committee is that of burden sharing. Achieving a more appropriate distribution of the scientific burden in a voluntary process requires appropriate incentives. The three essential steps in a process to identify such incentives are to:

- (i) identify difficulties that Members may have in contributing to the scientific process;
- (ii) identify potential mechanisms to facilitate burden sharing amongst Members;
- (iii) building capacity amongst Members to participate in the work of SC-CAMLR.

10.16 One approach that has a precedent in CCAMLR is to establish a Scientific Capacity Fund, payment into which could either be voluntary or pro rata with catches, to be utilised to address Scientific Committee priority science to be undertaken by cross-Member consortia.

10.17 The Scientific Committee further considered the proposals for burden sharing and capacity building in SC-CAMLR-XXVIII/12, CCAMLR-XXVIII/31 and BG/29. The key issues to be overcome are presented below:

- (i) understanding and communication of the work of SC-CAMLR amongst scientists within SC-CAMLR and its working groups;
- (ii) participation by scientists in the work of SC-CAMLR;
- (iii) achieving tasks of SC-CAMLR.

10.18 Understanding and communication of the work of SC-CAMLR amongst scientists within SC-CAMLR could be addressed by:

- (i) inclusion on the website under *Understanding CCAMLR's Approach to Management* of details of the tasks and procedures of the SC-CAMLR working groups and other groups;
- (ii) consideration of how to present reports to SC-CAMLR, including:
  - (a) during its meeting, projecting document numbers and working group report paragraphs pertaining to an agenda item being considered by SC-CAMLR;

- (b) mechanisms for presenting concepts/decisions/recommendations during discussions of working group reports.

10.19 Regarding enhanced participation by Member scientists at workshops and working groups, a number of things could be implemented immediately to build capacity:

- (i) meeting support, including training in managing meetings and preparing reports
- (ii) mentoring (Annex 4, paragraph 8.8)
- (iii) co-facilitation of small groups
- (iv) co-rapporteurship
- (v) tutorials at working group meetings
- (vi) more time for small group discussions.

10.20 A number of longer-term capacity building suggestions were also made:

- (i) New Zealand has offered to run an intensive training course for users of CASAL and SPM in 2010;
- (ii) scholarship schemes (Annex 4, paragraph 8.7);
- (iii) sharing/exchange of readers/manuals within the CON, rather than just otoliths;
- (iv) exchange of scientists in field programs, analytical and modelling work.

10.21 SC-CAMLR-XXVIII/7 included a proposal for a Scientific Capacity Fund, which would contribute to burden sharing and capacity building, and could be used for a variety of purposes, such as those considered in paragraphs 10.19 and 10.20.

10.22 The Scientific Committee endorsed the concept of this fund, and agreed that the mechanism in which contributions are made to such a fund should be discussed by the Commission.

10.23 To take these issues further, the Scientific Committee created an *ad hoc correspondence group to develop options to build SC-CAMLR capacity in science to support CCAMLR*. It was agreed that this group, which should have a wide membership, would make use of web-based communication systems and two telephone conferences over the forthcoming intersessional period (May and August), and would work to the following terms of reference:

To develop options for consideration by SC-CAMLR on approaches and mechanisms for:

- (i) increasing participation in the work of SC-CAMLR working groups and developing an increased awareness and understanding of the work of SC-CAMLR;
- (ii) resourcing and delivering scientific activities, including field programs, needed for providing advice by SC-CAMLR to the Commission;

- (iii) improving the flow and availability of information in the work of SC-CAMLR and its working groups, including the manner in which information may be presented in meetings;
- (iv) the objective, rules of operation and administrative mechanisms of the Scientific Capacity Fund, and the criteria whereby funds should be allocated to tasks and projects;
- (v) the proposal for a focus discussion, to be held during the Scientific Committee meeting in 2010, on the intersessional working group timetable and priorities.

It was agreed that the group would be convened by the Chair of the Scientific Committee with the assistance of Dr Constable.

#### Reporting progress

10.24 The Scientific Committee agreed that it would retain an item on its agenda for reporting progress against the recommendations of the PRP, and that a summary of this progress should be reported on the CCAMLR website.

10.25 The Scientific Committee agreed that it will review the plan and the tasks raised above, and revise or add to these tasks as necessary depending on progress made.