

NEW AND EXPLORATORY FISHERIES

New Fishery in Divisions 58.4.3 and 58.5.2

8.1 Australia submitted a proposal for a new fishery in Divisions 58.4.3 and 58.5.2 for the 1995/96 seasons (CCAMLR-XIV/8). The proposal was for a single trawler to undertake an exploratory cruise in Division 58.5.2 (Heard Island) to explore deeper water than has hitherto been investigated by Australian research cruises, and in Division 58.4.3 (Elan and Banzare Banks), for which there are very few records of fishing or research. WG-FSA considered this proposal in depth (Annex 5, paragraphs 5.1 to 5.7).

8.2 The Scientific Committee congratulated Australia on the thoroughness of its proposal.

Advice to the Commission

8.3 The Scientific Committee endorsed WG-FSA’s advice on this proposal (Annex 5, paragraphs 5.4 to 5.7) and recommended the following TACs for these fisheries (Table 4).

Table 4: Recommended TACs for the new fisheries proposed by Australia in Divisions 58.5.2 and 58.4.3.

Area	Species	TAC
Division 58.5.2 (new exploratory deep-water fishery)	<i>D. eleginoides</i>	No additional TAC: catches to be part of the 297 tonnes currently set by Conservation Measure 78/XIII
	<i>C. gunnari</i>	No additional TAC: catches to be part of the 311 tonnes currently set by Conservation Measure 78/XIII
	<i>L. squamifrons</i> , <i>N. rossii</i> , <i>C. rhinoceratus</i> and <i>Bathyraja</i> spp.	By-catch limitation of 5% of the catch in any haul
	Other species	50 tonnes each species
Division 58.4.3 Elan and Banzare Banks	<i>D. eleginoides</i> and <i>D. mawsoni</i>	200 tonnes combined catch
	Other species	50 tonnes each species

8.4 Bearing in mind that previous research surveys in Division 58.5.2 found a low biomass of *L. squamifrons*, *N. rossii*, *Channichthys rhinoceratus* and *Bathyraja* spp., and that there is no TAC or prohibition on directed fishing for these species in this division, the Scientific Committee recommended that a by-catch limitation should be considered along the lines of Conservation Measure 84/XIII, paragraph 7. The relevant part of Conservation Measure 84/XIII, paragraph 7, with recommended insertions, reads:

‘If, in the course of the directed fishery [for *D. eleginoides* or *D. mawsoni*], the by-catch of any one haul of any of the species [*Lepidonotothen squamifrons*, *Notothenia rossii*, *Channichthys rhinoceratus* and *Bathyraja* spp] exceeds 5%, the fishing vessel shall move to another fishing ground ...’

8.5 The Scientific Committee also recommended that in order to maximise the use to which information from the exploratory cruises could be put, fishing should take place over as large a geographical and bathymetric range as possible. In particular, areas where concentrations of fish are found should not be the only areas that are fished.

8.6 The Scientific Committee endorsed Australia’s proposal to place a scientific observer on board and ensure that the vessel operated a vessel monitoring system (VMS).

New Fishery in Subarea 58.7

8.7 Dr Miller informed the Scientific Committee of South Africa’s intention to initiate a new longline fishery for *D. eleginoides* within South Africa’s EEZ, on the high seas adjacent to this EEZ and within the CCAMLR Convention Area in the EEZ around the Prince Edward Islands (part of Subarea 58.7).

8.8 At present, full details on the proposed fishery are unclear. In the spirit of Conservation Measure 31/X, however, South Africa will aim to limit fishing effort and will submit haul-by-haul data to the Commission from the fishery from both outside and inside the Convention Area in the recognised CCAMLR formats. Permit conditions will also require that the provisions of Conservation Measure 29/XIII (minimisation of seabird incidental mortality during longline fishing) be adhered to, namely that scientific observers should be carried on the vessels concerned and that all vessels should be fitted with satellite-linked vessel monitoring systems.

8.9 The Scientific Committee noted South Africa’s notification and looked forward to further information in due course, especially with respect to anticipated catch levels and limitation of actual levels of fishing effort. It also noted that no information on potential stock of *D. eleginoides* exists for the proposed fishing areas and therefore strongly supported South Africa’s future submission of relevant data to the CCAMLR database.