

**REPORT OF THE WORKSHOP ON
VULNERABLE MARINE ECOSYSTEMS**
(La Jolla, CA, USA, 3 to 7 August 2009)

CONTENTS

	Page
OPENING OF THE MEETING	539
Adoption of the agenda and organisation of the meeting	539
INTRODUCTION	540
HABITATS AND HABITAT-FORMING TAXONOMIC GROUPS THAT CONSTITUTE A VME	540
Life-history attributes, resistance, and resilience of VME taxa in the Southern Ocean	540
Benthic invertebrate taxa consistent with VMEs	543
VME habitat-forming organisms and features specified in Annex 22-06/B	543
Review of Benthic Invertebrate Classification Guide	544
EXTENT OF IMPACT BY DIFFERENT BOTTOM FISHING GEAR.....	545
METHODS FOR IDENTIFYING LOCATIONS OF VMEs	547
Available and potential data sources	547
Fishing vessels	547
Fishery-independent research	549
Use of fish diversity as an indicator of VME	550
Spatial extent of VMEs	551
Predicting the locations of VMEs in the absence of direct observations	551
Scales of Risk Areas	553
ENCOUNTERS AND INDICATORS OF VMEs IN THE SOUTHERN OCEAN	556
Taxonomic resolution required to describe VMEs	556
Indicators used by fishing vessels or during research surveys that signal when a VME is encountered.....	557
ADVICE TO THE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE	558
ADOPTION OF THE REPORT AND CLOSE OF THE WORKSHOP.....	559
REFERENCES	559
TABLE	562
FIGURES.....	563
APPENDIX A: List of Participants	565
APPENDIX B: Agenda	569
APPENDIX C: List of Documents	570

**REPORT OF THE WORKSHOP ON
VULNERABLE MARINE ECOSYSTEMS**
(La Jolla, CA, USA, 3 to 7 August 2009)

OPENING OF THE MEETING

1.1 The Workshop on Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems (VMEs) was held in La Jolla, CA, USA, from 3 to 7 August 2009. The Workshop was convened by Dr C. Jones (USA) and local arrangements were coordinated by Ms A. Van Cise, Southwest Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service (USA). With the Workshop's agreement, Dr K. Martin-Smith (Australia) withdrew from his role as Workshop Co-convenor.

1.2 Dr Jones opened the meeting and welcomed the participants, including three invited experts Drs D. Bowden (New Zealand), J. Gutt (Germany) and S. Schiaparelli (Italy) (Appendix A).

Adoption of the agenda and organisation of the meeting

1.3 The Workshop reviewed the provisional agenda and agreed to consider resistance and resilience, as well as endemism and rarity, in the discussion of life-history attributes (Item 3.1), consider the spatial extent of VMEs under Item 5 (previously Item 3.3), and consider the extent of the impact by different bottom fishing gear under Item 4. The adopted agenda is given in Appendix B.

1.4 The Workshop also considered discussions from two meetings held during the 2008/09 intersessional period:

- meeting of WG-SAM (Annex 6, paragraphs 4.12 to 4.15)
- meeting of WG-EMM (Annex 4, paragraphs 5.4 to 5.14).

1.5 The Workshop noted the Secretariat's high translation workload (COMM CIRC 09/82) and discussions at CCAMLR-XXVII (CCAMLR-XXVII, paragraph 3.13), and agreed to make every effort to limit the overall size of its report.

1.6 The Workshop agreed to follow WG-SAM's initiative and highlight sections of the report dealing with advice to the Scientific Committee and its working groups, and list the relevant references to paragraphs under Item 7 (Advice to the Scientific Committee).

1.7 While the report has few references to the contributions of individuals and co-authors, the Workshop thanked all the authors of submitted papers for their valuable contributions to the work presented to the meeting. Documents submitted to the Workshop are listed in Appendix C. Dr A. Constable (Australia) gave a teleconference presentation of WG-SAM-09/21.

1.8 The report was prepared by Drs D. Agnew (UK), Jones, S. Lockhart (USA), Martin-Smith, P. O'Brien (Australia), S. Parker (New Zealand), D. Ramm (Data Manager), K. Reid (Science Officer), A. Rogers (UK), B. Sharp (New Zealand) and G. Watters (USA).

INTRODUCTION

2.1 The Workshop reviewed the history of measures to conserve VMEs in CCAMLR, noting that benthic habitat protection measures, such as those contained in Conservation Measure 41-05, introduced in 2002, were used prior to the introduction of the term ‘Vulnerable Marine Ecosystem’.

2.2 The Workshop noted efforts to conserve VMEs in the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA), particularly noting the Sustainable Fisheries Resolution 61/105 adopted by UNGA in 2006 and the provisions contained in OP83 of this resolution, and that this and Article II of the CAMLR Convention provided the basis for Conservation Measure 22-06.

2.3 The Workshop further noted the work of CCAMLR to manage bottom fishing practices to prevent significant adverse impacts on VMEs through the work of the Scientific Committee in 2007 and 2008 (SC-CAMLR-XXVI, paragraphs 4.159 to 4.171 and Annex 5, paragraphs 14.1 to 14.50; SC-CAMLR-XXVII, paragraphs 4.207 to 4.284, Annex 4, paragraphs 3.21 to 3.44 and Annex 5, paragraphs 10.3 to 10.109).

2.4 The Workshop noted that some terms, such as destructive fishing practices, the vulnerability of an ecosystem to fishing and what constitutes significant adverse impacts, were proposed in SC-CAMLR-XXVI/10.

2.5 The Workshop recognised that guidelines for the management of deep-sea fisheries, including provisions for the conservation of VMEs, were developed by FAO and presented in *FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Report*, No. 881 (2009). The Workshop noted that these guidelines provide examples of some VMEs, including deep-sea corals and seamounts, but that this list is not exhaustive and does not encompass all potential VMEs in the Southern Ocean.

2.6 The Workshop noted that cumulative impacts, including those caused by multiple gear types, would be important when considering the effects of bottom fishing.

HABITATS AND HABITAT-FORMING TAXONOMIC GROUPS THAT CONSTITUTE A VME

Life-history attributes, resistance, and resilience of VME taxa in the Southern Ocean

3.1 The Workshop considered which life-history characteristics of benthic invertebrates of the Southern Ocean would be indicative of vulnerability to bottom fishing gear. The Workshop developed several criteria based on the characteristics of VMEs set out in the *FAO International Guidelines for Management of Deep Sea Fisheries on the High Seas* (2009) to classify intrinsic factors that contribute to vulnerability to physical disturbance due to bottom fishing. These criteria were then evaluated relative to the life-history attributes of organisms in each taxonomic group based on published literature and expert opinion, including through analogy with related taxa.

3.2 The Workshop agreed that functional roles of VME taxa include, *inter alia*, that they:

- (i) significantly contribute to the creation of a complex three-dimensional structure;
- (ii) create a complex surface by clustering in high densities;
- (iii) change the structure of the substratum (e.g. sponge spicule mats; Bett and Rice, 1992); or
- (iv) provide substrata for other organisms (Gutt and Schickan, 1998).

3.3 The Workshop agreed that these functional roles are not limited to creating 'large' structures, noting that encrusting organisms or organisms that create patches of structurally complex sea-floor substrata can also support the existence of additional fauna (Jones et al., 1997).

3.4 An additional intrinsic factor contributing to vulnerability to disturbance is rarity or uniqueness (the term endemism is not used here because it is scale-dependent). For example, rare dense populations of single species or communities (e.g. aggregations of stalked crinoids or chemosynthetic assemblages) could be significantly impacted by a single fishing event, and the effect exacerbated by limited potential for recovery because of isolation from recruitment sources. All of the taxa included in Table 1 were considered to be vulnerable to disturbance by bottom fishing gear.

3.5 The seven criteria included in the evaluation of benthic taxa are defined below:

1. **Habitat-forming** – One of the main characteristics of the structural species within VMEs is the degree to which they create habitat that could be used by other organisms. Organisms that are large, with a strong three-dimensional shape, or which create a complex surface by clustering in high densities, or changing the character of the substratum (e.g. sponge spicule mats), create habitats for other organisms. The relative degree to which organisms contribute to generating this habitat was classified as Low, Medium or High.
2. **Longevity** – Mortality of long-lived organisms can result in long recovery periods to regenerate unfished age structure (possibly more than centuries). CCAMLR's objectives under Article II cannot be achieved if recovery does not occur over a time scale of 20–30 years. Therefore, where estimates of maximum longevity for the members of the taxon were available, they were scaled as Low (<10 years), Medium (10–30 years) and High (>30 years). Thus, longevity was categorised into the three levels with respect to the length of time an ecosystem takes to recover from fishing impacts and how this recovery time relates to the objectives of the Convention.
3. **Slow growth** – Organisms which grow slowly will take a longer time to attain a large size or reproductive maturity. Slow growth rates of organisms are correlated with high longevity, but independent of age, slow growth requires longer times to generate maximum size. Vulnerability related to growth rate was classified as Low for fast growth rates, Medium, and High for slow growth rates.

4. **Fragility** – The potential for damage or mortality resulting from physical disturbance from bottom fishing gear was classified as Low (organisms that are resistant due to their structure or behaviour), Medium, or High (tall, brittle, or otherwise easily damaged).
5. **Larval dispersal potential** – The range of dispersal by larvae and propagules influences the ability of a species to recolonise impacted areas. Species which brood larvae, or otherwise have limited dispersal abilities, are less resilient to fishing disturbance because new recruits may not be available from a nearby source, and recruitment, recolonisation and recovery could be delayed. Organisms with high dispersal potential have a higher probability of supplying larvae to a disturbed area and are therefore more resilient. The reproductive strategies of brooding versus broadcast spawning were summarised for each group. Taxa consisting of brooding species were scored High, broadcast spawners Low, and taxa with a mix of both strategies were scored Medium.
6. **Lack of adult motility** – Motility in itself should not exclude taxa from being vulnerable or less resilient to bottom fishing gear, as organisms which can move to some degree may still meet all the other criteria of vulnerability. However, the lack of motility does add some degree of vulnerability and decreases resilience because as adults those organisms cannot redistribute themselves in response to a direct disturbance, adjust their position if altered in some way, or move into a disturbed area to recolonise. Organisms that are completely sessile were classified as High; those with some limited potential for movement as Medium, and typically motile as Low.
7. **Rare or unique populations** – Vulnerable taxa containing species that create dense, isolated populations are intrinsically vulnerable because they have a more limited potential for recovery. This criterion was classified as High if populations are isolated, and Medium or Low as population patch size or frequency of occurrence increases. Further, this criterion indicates vulnerability to physical disturbance and is independent of the habitat-forming characteristics of the taxon.

3.6 The Workshop recognised that, where coarse taxonomic groups were chosen, these may contain many species with a range of life-history characteristics. In this situation, the most precautionary values were used to characterise the potential vulnerability for the taxonomic group relative to the specific criterion. Coarse taxonomic levels were used to minimise the number of groups involved and to allow the inclusion of information derived from studies from the Southern Ocean or comparable ocean environments if necessary. The Workshop agreed that general relationships derived from meta-analyses of available information, such as those presented in WS-VME-09/12 and WG-EMM-09/35, could be useful where detailed information on particular taxa were lacking.

3.7 The Workshop agreed that Table 1 is a living document that should be periodically reassessed and updated to incorporate the best available science. In cases where the appropriate information was not available for a taxon, no score was given and the Workshop agreed that this was useful in identifying important information gaps.

3.8 The Workshop agreed that the parameters listed in Table 1 relate to the intrinsic vulnerability of VME taxa and that the actual impacts on VMEs depend on fishing intensity and the gear type that is deployed. All bottom fishing gears have the potential to impact seabed communities but have different levels of impact depending on the physical shape and weight of the gear and the way it is deployed (Rogers et al., 2008). However, fishing intensity is also extremely important as impacts of fishing gear on seabed communities are cumulative. Therefore, while some fishing gears may have a moderate or low impact per deployment, the cumulative impact of multiple deployments in a single area will increase damage to seabed communities over time and also negatively influence their recovery.

3.9 The observations from a benthos disturbance experiment in the Weddell Sea in which intensive trawling of a small area did not kill or remove all macrofauna (WS-VME-09/P5) support the view that bottom fishing impacts may not result in total mortality within the area impacted and that recolonisation does not need to occur from sources outside the impacted area. Dr Gutt noted that recent modelling work suggested that the rate of recovery may be strongly influenced by the proportion of surviving organisms remaining in the disturbed area (Potthoff, 2006). However, the Workshop recognised that the population growth potential is crucial to recovery time, and that recruitment dynamics are not well known for these taxa in the Southern Ocean. Also, there is evidence from outside the Convention Area that in some situations (e.g. intensive trawling on the summits of seamounts) VMEs may be totally or near-totally removed and subsequent recovery has not been observed 20 or 30 years post impact (Clark et al., in press).

3.10 The Workshop agreed that vulnerability is a continuum, not a binary characteristic of a species or assemblage. Therefore, designating a list of coarse taxonomic groups as being vulnerable will inevitably exclude some species that are potentially vulnerable to the use of bottom fishing gear, and may include some species that are less vulnerable. Evaluating the intrinsic factors contributing to vulnerability from physical disturbance indicates a number of taxonomic groups could be significantly impacted by bottom fishing activities.

Benthic invertebrate taxa consistent with VMEs

VME habitat-forming organisms and features specified in Annex 22-06/B

3.11 The Workshop recommended that Conservation Measure 22-06, Annex 22-06/B, be restructured to collect information related more directly to research vessel encounters with VME taxa. These changes could be addressed by WG-FSA. Specifically, the Workshop recommended that:

- (i) the habitat-forming organisms should be replaced with the VME taxa listed in Table 1, and with the addition of a category for other taxa;
- (ii) more details about the type of sampling gear used, and a list of other types of information collected from the site, should be requested;
- (iii) because these encounters would likely be by research vessels, there is some potential that additional data could be collected while the vessel is at the site. A

list of the high-priority types of data, such as multibeam bathymetry, oceanographic variables, sediment types or video recordings, could be provided to encourage the collection of these additional data;

(iv) sections 4 and 5 of the annex be combined and made less prescriptive;

(v) the annex include a section to provide a rationale and supporting evidence for the notification (see paragraph 6.13).

Review of Benthic Invertebrate Classification Guide

3.12 The Workshop noted the guide to Heard Island and McDonald Islands (HIMI) benthic invertebrates (WS-VME-09/13). The guide has now been finalised and will be made available to interested members. A benthic invertebrate identification guide is also being developed for the Ross Sea (see paragraph 6.6) and will be made available when complete.

3.13 The Benthic Invertebrate Classification Guide for Potentially Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems (WG-EMM-09/8; see also WG-FSA-08/19) was reviewed by the Workshop relative to the list of vulnerable taxa listed in Table 1. The Workshop agreed that this guide was applicable to all regions of the area defined in Conservation Measure 22-06, noting that additional VME taxa may be included in the guide in future revisions as information becomes available. The Workshop also encouraged work to continue to identify and characterise chemosynthetic communities within the CAMLR Convention Area.

3.14 Recognising the utility of the guide described in the preceding paragraph (also see TASO-09/8), the Workshop requested a number of minor improvements, including additional VME taxa columns, additional characteristics through photographs and text to aid in identification, and better contrasting information to distinguish currently confusing taxa. The Workshop noted that additional species codes will need to be developed to aid in recording additional VME taxa. The Workshop also agreed that for the purposes of the guide and of identification of VMEs, all corals (live or dead) should be reported to the taxonomic resolution in the guide. The Workshop agreed that the revised guide be titled the 'CCAMLR VME Taxa Classification Guide' and should be submitted for review by WG-EMM and WG-FSA.

3.15 The Workshop recommended that distributions of VME taxa weights and sizes recorded in both research and observer data be investigated with an aim to provide an additional characteristic to use in the CCAMLR VME Taxa Classification Guide. This would eventually aid vessels in determining when move-on rules that depend on the by-catch of various-sized VME taxa might be triggered.

3.16 The Workshop summarised its advice from discussions under this agenda item as follows:

(i) Scientific evaluation of the presence of vulnerable taxa or of fishery impacts to vulnerable taxa can be made using both fishery-dependent and fishery-independent data, and the vulnerable taxa encountered may be different for different sampling devices (e.g. bottom longline gear, bottom trawl or underwater video).

- (ii) Different taxonomic groups have qualitatively different degrees of intrinsic vulnerability to physical disturbance. The degree of impact and potential recovery time is influenced by the spatial overlap of the fishery footprint with the distribution of each vulnerable taxon, the intensity (cumulative effects) of fishing effort in overlapping areas, and those intrinsic factors.
- (iii) In addition to intrinsic vulnerability factors, the assessment of bottom fishing impacts should incorporate fishery specific factors, such as spatial overlap between fishing effort and VME distribution, and any correlations between VME taxa and fishery species.
- (iv) A single VME Taxa Classification Guide can be developed for use in all CCAMLR areas specified in Conservation Measure 22-06.

EXTENT OF IMPACT BY DIFFERENT BOTTOM FISHING GEAR

4.1 The Workshop acknowledged that currently all of the bottom fishing in the CAMLR Convention Area covered by Conservation Measure 22-06 was by longline. Given the limited overlap in the use of different longline gear (i.e. autoline, Spanish or trotline), there was insufficient data to compare the different impacts on VMEs of these different gear types. However, the Workshop did acknowledge that simply on the basis of the characteristics of the gear, especially the potential for movement of the mainline and hooks during the soak period, there was considerable potential for differences in the interaction of the gear with benthic organisms.

4.2 The Workshop considered WG-SAM-09/P1 which described the use of a flexible framework for estimating the impacts of bottom fishing gear on vulnerable taxa given the uncertainties that exist. The use of this framework to assess the cumulative impacts of fishing in the Ross Sea by New Zealand flagged vessels indicated that a primary factor influencing the potential impact of different longline gear types was the extent of lateral movement of the mainline in contact with the sea floor during line retrieval.

4.3 The Workshop recognised that the use of this framework to derive absolute measures of impact is subject to great uncertainty, but that the framework is valuable for making explicit the consequences of different assumptions, and for estimating the plausible upper and lower bounds of cumulative impact to date or of proposed future fishing activities, given particular assumptions about the spatial distributions of VME taxa. The Workshop noted that in response to Annex 6, paragraph 4.9, the authors of WG-SAM-09/P1 had applied the impact assessment in very small areas within which fishing effort distributions appeared uniform or random in space, in order to more closely approximate a condition in which the assumption of no systematic association between fishing distributions and VME taxa is valid. Actual distributions of VMEs remain unknown. The Workshop noted that the approach would be enhanced by efforts to validate this assumption, either by mathematically establishing the random distribution of effort at that scale or by examining actual effort distributions with reference to a range of simulated VME distributions, e.g. using the approach described in WG-SAM-09/21. The Workshop also recognised that the framework was potentially very useful to compare the relative impacts of fishing operations using different gear or operating in different locations.

4.4 Furthermore, the Workshop agreed that the combined use of this framework with that described in WG-SAM-09/21 (see paragraph 4.9) would allow the use of available data indicative of fishing effort and likely impact, and the simulation of other aspects of the risk assessment process for which data does not currently exist, i.e. the spatial distributions of VME taxa.

4.5 The Workshop suggested that the method be investigated as a tool that could be used in the routine impact assessment undertaken by Members in fulfilment of the requirements of the pro-forma notification in Conservation Measure 22-06, Annex 22-06/A. Such an investigation should consider the requirements of assessments of different gear types (Spanish longlines, autolines, droplines, trotline, pots singly, pots on strings) and the tool should operate using data requested from the Secretariat databases.

4.6 Although much of the information relating to fishing impacts to VMEs in the area included in Conservation Measure 22-06 will derive from fishery observations, a comprehensive evaluation of vulnerability might also utilise information from other sources (such as video or photographic data and geomorphologic information).

4.7 The Workshop recognised that there is currently little information available to monitor or evaluate impacts to taxa that may be vulnerable to bottom fishing but have unknown spatial distributions and are not observed in fishery by-catch. An expanded list of taxa could be considered when conducting scientific surveys and experiments using various sampling methods that efficiently collect data on a wider range of species (e.g. vent and seep taxa, or tube-building serpulid worms may not be catchable by bottom longline gear). Vulnerable taxa able to be monitored in the fishery would necessarily be a subset of the list of taxa that might be impacted by the fishery simply due to catchability constraints.

4.8 The Workshop considered additional fishery-specific factors that will modify the threat to VMEs from fishing:

- (i) Spatial distribution relative to fishery. The greater the degree of spatial concordance in three dimensions (latitude, longitude and depth) between the occurrence of benthic communities and fishing effort, the greater the impact on those communities from bottom fishing.
- (ii) Aggregation relative to fishery. If VMEs are highly aggregated, the likelihood of an encounter with bottom fishing gear may be decreased but the impact may be increased.
- (iii) Association with fishery species. A positive relationship between VMEs and fishery target species will increase the threat from bottom fishing while a negative relationship will decrease the threat.
- (iv) Gear-specific vulnerability. The proportion of individuals of different VME taxa that are dislodged, damaged or killed will vary depending on gear type, thus affecting potential rates of recovery.
- (v) VME area impacted per unit effort. Uncertainties exist concerning the area impacted by many gear types – for example lateral movement of longlines will increase the impact footprint.

4.9 WG-SAM-09/21 presented a simulation model (coded in R) for evaluating management strategies to conserve the ecological structure and function of benthic habitats that had already been considered by both WG-EMM and WG-SAM (Annex 4, paragraphs 5.12 to 5.14; Annex 6, paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15). The Workshop recognised that several of the suggestions for improvements made by the working groups had been incorporated into the model, as well as the provision of a draft manual, and congratulated the author for these developments.

4.10 The Workshop agreed that the outputs of discussions on resistance and resilience, such as Table 1, could be used as a basis to parameterise the model. Unfortunately the Workshop was unable to provide further commentary due to time constraints but urged further development of this model and its application.

METHODS FOR IDENTIFYING LOCATIONS OF VMEs

Available and potential data sources

Fishing vessels

5.1 The Workshop agreed that longline sets by fishing vessels are the most easily accessible and widely distributed method for sampling VME indicator organisms in areas where the toothfish fishery takes place. Nevertheless, it was recognised that longlines are unlikely to be good samplers of benthic organisms, and there are significant uncertainties about the relative catchability of different taxa by different types of gear and at different depths (SC-CAMLR-XXVII, Annex 5, paragraphs 10.22 and 10.38). Thus, longlines might not be equally good at identifying different types of VME if they are indicated by taxa of varying catchability.

5.2 WS-VME-09/5 analysed vessel-reported VME data and scientific observer data to compare two different metrics for monitoring VME indicator organism catch rates. Although there was a relationship between the number of VME indicator units and the number of VME indicator organisms per thousand hooks by line section, there was a high degree of scatter partially caused by the mix of ‘heavy’ and ‘light’ VME taxa captured on longline segments. Nevertheless, there appeared to be some consistency between taxa associations, for instance triggers with high numbers per thousand hooks generally comprised stylasterids and basket stars.

5.3 The Workshop agreed that it might be important to distinguish between catch rates of different VME taxa in order to interpret what type of community might be indicated by the composition of VME indicator units (paragraphs 6.8 to 6.10).

5.4 WS-VME-09/8 examined the distribution of different VME indicator taxa in the Ross Sea using data from the NIWA Invertebrate Collection, SCAR MarBIN and CCAMLR 2009 observer data. Scientific sampling is concentrated on the shelf, whereas fishing is concentrated on the slope, meaning that data from fishing vessels is important, and often the only source of data, for understanding the overall distribution of VME indicator taxa.

5.5 TASO-09/8 examined the issue of ease of identification of VME taxa by observers and found that observers were able to easily distinguish VME from non-VME taxa using the Benthic Invertebrate Classification Guide (WG-EMM-09/8) without specific training in identification of VME taxa (Annex 9, paragraphs 3.9 and 3.10).

5.6 Vessels themselves are required under Conservation Measure 22-07 to report encounters with VME indicator organisms where the volume or weight of the organisms caught in one line segment was greater than five VME indicator units, and additionally were urged to report the VME data from all line segments to the extent possible. WG-EMM-09/8 reported that 30 VME indicator notifications were made in exploratory bottom fisheries in 2008/09 and that 13 of the 18 vessels fishing had reported the additional fine-scale VME data.

5.7 The VME notifications under Conservation Measure 22-07 for the 2008/09 season were:

- Subarea 48.6: 1 notification of >5 units
- Subarea 88.1: 18 notifications of >5 units, including 5 notifications of >10 units
- Subarea 88.2: 11 notifications of >5 units, including 2 notifications of >10 units.

In addition, one VME fine-scale rectangle (an area of 0.5° latitude by 1° longitude) was identified in Subarea 88.2, where eight notifications of >5 units had been made.

5.8 Considering that the requirement for recording and reporting VME data only came into effect this season, and that the reporting of non-trigger VME data was not mandatory, the Workshop congratulated fishing vessels and observers on the quantity of the data that they had been able to report during the season. Data provided by vessels and observers have proven useful in investigating the relationship between fishing, fish catch and VME indicator units undertaken this year (WS-VME-09/5 and 09/7).

5.9 The Workshop agreed that high-resolution data from fishing vessels and observers were necessary to fully understand key issues concerning the impact of fishing on VMEs. Different data can provide key information such as the spatial scale of VME indicator organism occurrence and interaction with gear or associations of different taxa and between VME indicator organisms and fish. Although not all vessels had reported VME data for each line segment, enough data had been reported to demonstrate its utility. Some vessels had reported these data for entire lines, which although still useful, was not directly comparable with the line-segment data.

5.10 The Workshop further agreed that the relationship between data obtained from fishing vessels and observers and actual impacts on VMEs in relation to the effects of bottom fishing remains uncertain. Uncertainty could be reduced through the use of camera gear for example (SC-CAMLR-XXVI/BG/30; WG-FSA-08/58).

5.11 The Workshop noted the importance of distinguishing between nulls (where no observations were made) and zeroes (where observations were made but no VME taxa were found) as this is particularly critical to identify the patch size of VMEs and in habitat suitability modelling (see paragraphs 5.27 to 5.37).

5.12 The Workshop made the following recommendations with respect to data collection on vessels:

- (i) vessels should only report total weight of VMEs, not volume;
- (ii) reporting of all VME data and fish catch data by line segment should be mandatory for a subset of whole lines for all vessels;
- (iii) whenever whole lines are monitored, all catches of VME taxa for every segment should be recorded, including entering a zero catch if no VME taxa were caught;
- (iv) observers should be required to identify taxa for VME catches on segments from the same segments as the vessel's subset (see (ii) above);
- (v) observers should record both weight and numbers of each VME taxon at the level of the line segment when monitoring VME data (paragraph 5.3);
- (vi) vessels and observers should be careful to record geodetic datum¹ information and avoid transcription errors in location data.

Fishery-independent research

5.13 The Workshop considered other methods of locating VMEs using research data.

5.14 WS-VME-09/4 indicated how VMEs might be located by considering physical mechanisms of trophic focusing which are determined by the interactions of oceanographic dynamics and geomorphology.

5.15 WS-VME-09/9 outlined an approach to locating chemosynthetic communities using a range of data acquired through a variety of different surveys such as seismic reflection surveys. The Workshop noted that the SCAR Action Group would also compile a field guide to chemosynthetic communities to allow observers to classify them in by-catch.

5.16 WS-VME-09/10 described the development of an Antarctic-wide geomorphic map of the sea floor for use in locating potential VME sites and for bioregionalisation. The geomorphic map is based on global bathymetric datasets to provide the most uniform coverage of the entire region. The value of the approach to VME detection is that it locates seamounts over 12 km in diameter even in areas lacking ship-based data.

5.17 The Workshop agreed that geomorphic mapping should be made available via the CCAMLR Secretariat so that individual VME locations could be overlaid on it to investigate possible relationships between VME distributions and geomorphology. It was recognised that polygon data like this are difficult to include in statistical modelling exercises that use gridded data. However, the geomorphology does provide seamount locations and insights into environmental characteristics in areas where there are no other data.

¹ A geodetic datum is the earth model used to locate latitudes and longitudes on the earth surface. The location of a latitude-longitude pair on the earth's surface can vary by hundreds of metres for different geodetic datums. The datum used for a navigation system is specified in the system set-up of GPS units and hydrographic charts specify what datum was used as part of the legend.

5.18 WG-EMM-09/32 presented results from two surveys on the Antarctic Peninsula margin and the South Orkney Islands. The surveys used benthic trawls and video transects to collect benthic samples. VME taxa were common at almost every station so the investigators defined a threshold weight of 10 kg per 1 200 m² trawled to be analogous to the trigger set out in Conservation Measure 22-07.

5.19 The Workshop discussed the applicability of a threshold for defining a potential VME identified during research. Conservation Measure 22-06, Annex 22-06/B, requires only presence of VME organisms, but it was recognised that this could apply to almost every station sampled in this study, and that this was not consistent with the spirit of the conservation measure.

5.20 The Workshop recommended that CCAMLR Members develop mechanisms for acquiring non-fisheries research information from national programs and to provide information that could be useful for identifying potential VME areas.

Use of fish diversity as an indicator of VME

5.21 The Workshop noted that results from studies investigating whether the abundance and biomass of fish are enhanced by the presence of epifaunal coral and sponge communities on seamounts or in other deep-sea ecosystems are equivocal. Observations have indicated that catches of commercially valuable species may be higher in and around cold-water coral reefs (Husebø et al., 2002). Research submersibles, ROVs or other scientific methods have recorded significantly higher abundances of fish and crustaceans in coral and sponge versus non-coral and sponge habitats in some cases (Lindberg and Lockhart, 1993; Brodeur, 2001; Koenig, 2001; Krieger and Wing, 2002; Costello et al., 2005; Pirtle, 2005; Stone, 2006; Tissot et al., 2006; Ross and Quattrini, 2007), and not in others (Auster, 2005). In Alaska, 97% of juvenile rockfish and 96% of juvenile golden king crab were associated with emergent epifaunal invertebrates such as corals and sponges (Stone, 2006). In the northeastern Atlantic, visual surveys of areas of the continental margin indicated that 80% of individual fish and 92% of fish species were observed on *Lophelia pertusa* reefs in comparison to non-reef habitat (Costello et al., 2005).

5.22 The Workshop noted that in the Antarctic there are few data relating the distribution of fish species to benthic habitat, particularly VMEs. Unpublished work has identified a specific association between *Patagonotothen guntheri* and sponges, where the eggs of the fish have been repeatedly found in sponge colonies (E. Fitzcharles, BAS, UK, unpublished data). There are also observations that *Trematomus* spp. are often observed in association with sponges (Gutt and Ekau, 1996) and *Lepidonotothen nudifrons* are associated with dense aggregations of bryozoans (C. Jones, pers. obs.).

5.23 Although there is some potential for association of specific fish species and perhaps even overall fish diversity with VMEs, unless these fish were also vulnerable to capture by longlines, examination of fish by-catch rates and diversity may not provide useful indicators of VME presence.

5.24 WS-VME-09/7 described an analysis of VME indicator data reported by vessels and toothfish CPUE in the Ross Sea. The paper found little evidence for a functional relationship

between toothfish catch and VME units, and vessel was the most significant factor influencing VME units and VME units declined with depth. Further, catch rates of VME units were higher in the west of Subarea 88.1 close to Cape Adare than in the east.

5.25 The Workshop examined preliminary investigations undertaken by the Data Manager which highlighted the limitations of the current dataset to detect relationships between the catch rates of other fish species – macrourids, rays or *Antimora* – with VME taxa observations.

5.26 The Workshop concluded that, given the evidence to date, it was unknown whether the examination of fish diversity from longline samples would generate useful indicators of VME location. The Workshop agreed that this approach could be further investigated and urged Members to submit analyses to WG-FSA. These studies should consider:

- (i) different fish parameters – size, species, density and diversity;
- (ii) the relationship between fish catches and the occurrence of each specific VME taxon listed in Table 1;
- (iii) issues of the potential saturation of hooks at high levels of VME taxa catch;
- (iv) scale issues – for instance, the possibility that toothfish are attracted to a longline from a wider area than the area from which VME data are being collected; and differences in size between VME patches and longline segments;
- (v) the variation in catchability of toothfish may be influenced by different aspects of the configuration of gear and habitat compared to the aspects that influence variations in catchability of VME taxa, and these aspects may vary independently;
- (vi) the catchability assumptions both in regard of fish and VMEs.

Spatial extent of VMEs

Predicting the locations of VMEs in the absence of direct observations

5.27 The Workshop reviewed WS-VME-09/4, 09/9, 09/10, 09/P1, 09/P2, 09/P3 and 09/P4, as well as Tittensor et al. (2009) that included analytical and statistical options that may be useful for predicting the distributions of VMEs.

5.28 Furthermore, the Workshop noted that data-driven spatial modelling approaches (as in WS-VME-09/P1 to 09/P4) were preferable to hand-drawn geomorphology classifications, as in WS-VME-09/10, for many applications, but that geomorphology data may be better at discerning particular features of interest (e.g. seamounts) and as such may be useful as a stand-alone tool, or to modify the outputs of other modelling efforts.

5.29 The Workshop noted that the data-driven spatial modelling approaches require two kinds of data:

- (i) spatially comprehensive environmental data layers (e.g. depth, water temperature);
- (ii) biological datasets for the taxa in question (either presence-only, presence–absence, or abundance).

5.30 It was further noted that sufficient environmental data exists at present to effectively run these models (although assembling spatial datasets in useful format is not a trivial task), but that biological data are likely to be limiting. The following spatial modelling methods were judged to be appropriate (as in WS-VME-09/P1), in order of increasing power to make highly resolved predictions, but also increasing demand for quality data:

- (i) bioregionalisation (SC-CAMLR-XXVI, Annex 9)
- (ii) Environmental Niche Factor Analysis (ENFA) (Tittensor et al., 2009)
- (iii) Generalised Dissimilarity Modelling (GDM) (WS-VME-09/P3)
- (iv) Maximum Entropy modelling (MAXENT) (Tittensor et al., 2009)
- (v) Multivariate Adaptive Regression Splines (MARS) (WS-VME-09/P2)
- (vi) Boosted Regression Trees (BRT) (WS-VME-09/P4).

5.31 The Workshop noted BRT has been reviewed by WG-SAM (SC-CAMLR-XXVII, paragraph 2.1(vi)); however, it is unlikely that currently available data are adequate to inform a BRT model for VME taxa at a circumpolar scale.

5.32 The Workshop agreed that there were unavoidable trade-offs involved in the selection of any spatial modelling approach. Approaches with lower data requirements, e.g. bioregionalisation, can be implemented now and will likely produce useable results at larger scales, i.e. large-scale habitat classes within which detectable associations with VME taxa are evident. If CCAMLR requires smaller-scale outputs, i.e. actual predictions of the location of VMEs at scales comparable to VME patch size or fishing effort distributions, then methods that require larger amounts of data will be necessary, possibly requiring the allocation of additional resources to compile and prepare relevant biological datasets.

5.33 The Workshop noted that in some locations and for some environments (e.g. the Ross Sea shelf, or the South Shetland and South Orkney Islands), biological data in datasets already assembled may be adequate to allow the use of some of the more powerful methods (GDM or MARS).

5.34 The Workshop noted that extending VME spatial modelling to other regions or to some important environments (e.g. seamounts, continental slopes) may require collaborative efforts to assemble, combine and/or groom existing biological datasets. Relevant data are currently widely dispersed and stored in formats that may not currently be amenable to a global analysis.

5.35 The Workshop noted possible sources of useful biological data to inform spatial modelling for VMEs included, *inter alia*, the SCAR-MarBIN database and IPY CAML voyages.

5.36 In those areas where currently available environmental and biological data are adequate to inform the use of sophisticated spatial modelling techniques (GDM, MAXENT, MARS or BRT), the Workshop urged Member countries to pursue spatial modelling of VME distributions on smaller scales using these or similar approaches.

5.37 In areas where currently available data are inadequate, Members are encouraged to collaborate to share available environmental datasets, and to combine and assemble relevant biological datasets, to allow this work to proceed. The Workshop advised that additional resources may be required to progress this work.

Scales of Risk Areas

5.38 The Workshop recalled that Conservation Measure 22-07 currently defines the scale of Risk Areas to be defined as circles with radii of 1 n mile (although Members may define larger Risk Areas if required by domestic law). This scale was developed by considering the length of longline segments.

5.39 WS-VME-09/6 summarised analyses that were conducted to evaluate scale-dependent genetic connectivity among populations of benthic invertebrates. Although the Workshop did not identify all of the taxa considered in the paper as VME taxa, animals having a range of larval stage durations were represented in the study. In general, the results in WS-VME-09/6 were consistent with other published work (e.g. Rogers, 2007) and demonstrated that benthic invertebrates rarely demonstrate genetic connectivity across regions (e.g. between the South Shetland Islands, South Orkney Islands and Bouvet Island). Deep water appears to be a significant barrier to gene flow, even for taxa that have long larval stages.

5.40 However, although the results of WS-VME-09/6 mostly demonstrated genetic homogeneity within regions, significant genetic structure can be found even at small spatial scales in species having a pelagic larval phase (Guidetti et al., 2006). Conversely, some species which lack a pelagic larval stage, and therefore are predicted to have localised populations, show genetic homogeneity at regional scales (Hunter and Halanych, 2008). Therefore, inferring realised dispersal range from the duration of the larval phase may not be a reliable way to predict connectivity of populations. It should be noted that present levels of connectivity in populations can be difficult to infer using genetic methods because of strong historical influences on molecular markers or lack of variability of available genetic markers (Rogers, 2007).

5.41 The Workshop agreed that although the results from WS-VME-09/6 and other studies on genetic connectivity are applicable to issues surrounding spatial management to conserve marine biodiversity (e.g. to the delineation of MPAs), at present these studies provide insufficient information to determine the spatial scale of VME Risk Areas. It was noted that, if population genetics data are used to advise on broader spatial management issues, high-resolution mitochondrial markers, such as the mitochondrial control region, and nuclear markers, such as microsatellites, together are most promising for making inferences about population structure.

5.42 The Workshop agreed that taxon- or community-specific information on scales of patchiness of VME would be most useful for delivering advice on the scales of Risk Areas.

Such information might be collected in a variety of ways, including research transects with video or camera equipment or detailed by-catch information from the length of an entire longline set (paragraph 6.11), and Members were encouraged to conduct such work in the future.

5.43 Results presented in WG-EMM-09/32 indicate that VMEs may be found in clusters. The authors of the paper noted that it would be both more precautionary and more easily manageable to consider the areas within and around such clusters as potentially harbouring additional VMEs and therefore suggested that relatively large (as compared to the scale specified in Conservation Measure 22-07) Risk Areas might be defined on the basis of such clusters.

5.44 With regard to scaling Risk Areas on the basis of VME clusters (or non-random distributions of VMEs), the Workshop advised that:

- (i) clusters may be shaped such that circular areas might not circumscribe appropriate Risk Areas. For example, stylasterids sometimes occur in long, narrow bands that are located on the shelf break;
- (ii) the scales and shapes of clusters will likely depend on the community structure of particular VMEs and whether such communities are dominated by ‘heavy’ or ‘light’ taxa. For example, the authors of WG-EMM-09/32 noted an isolated patch of light-bodied *Umbellula* spp. (Cnidaria: Pennatulacea) that was distinct from larger VME clusters dominated by sponge communities;
- (iii) inferences about the size and location of VME clusters will be influenced by operational thresholds that may be used to identify VMEs from cumulative catches or collections of VME indicator taxa within sets, hauls or samples. For example, the authors of WG-EMM-09/32 standardised research trawl catches to units of kg per 1 200 m² and identified VMEs at locations where catches of indicator taxa were ≥ 10 such standard units, but the sizes and locations of VME clusters identified by this approach would have been different if catches of, say, five standard units had been used to identify VMEs;
- (iv) clusters may indicate mesoscale patchiness of VMEs and thus warrant mesoscale-sized Risk Areas.

5.45 The Workshop agreed that a number of approaches could be taken to characterise the shape and scale of VME clusters after catches or collections of VME indicator taxa have crossed thresholds signifying the likely presence of one or more VMEs. These approaches include drawing simple polygons that enclose likely VMEs (e.g. drawing convex hulls around locations where catches of indicator taxa that are greater than agreed thresholds) and using statistical models (e.g. kernel smoothers and possibly GDMs or BRTs using a variety of predictor variables) to describe local variations in the likely abundance of VMEs by including information from hauls and samples that may have been relatively close in space but yielded catches that were less than agreed thresholds (and include possible zero values). Regardless of which approach is adopted, it was also agreed that as much information as possible should be used to characterise the shape and scale of VME clusters, including environmental information. In this respect, the Workshop acknowledged its previous conclusion that there is

an inverse relationship between the data requirements for modelling and the spatial scales on which advice can be provided (paragraph 5.32). Cumulating a network of Risk Areas defined on the basis of VME clusters would be akin to the process used to designate SSRUs for exploratory longline fisheries.

5.46 Following these points, the Workshop noted that the VMEs identified in WG-EMM-09/32 (and which have been notified under Conservation Measure 22-06) occur in distinct geomorphic regions identified by the work described in WS-VME-09/10. The authors of WS-VME-09/10 provided geomorphic maps to the Workshop and these maps showed that clusters of VMEs identified along the southern portion of the Bransfield Strait often occurred in a geomorphic province classified as ‘shelf bank’ while those identified on the western and eastern sides of the South Orkney Islands often occurred in a geomorphic province classified as ‘wave-affected bank’ (Figures 1 and 2).

5.47 The Workshop agreed that it may be possible to define Risk Areas for the VMEs identified in WG-EMM-09/32 on the basis of the geomorphic provinces described in WS-VME-09/10 and other information, and that doing so would result in relatively large Risk Areas occurring along the southern Bransfield Strait and around the periphery of the South Orkney Islands.

5.48 The Workshop noted that the scale of Risk Areas which might be defined around the South Orkney Islands can impact the conduct of the exploratory crab fishery which has been notified for Subarea 48.2. Conservation Measure 52-02 currently requires the exploratory crab fishery to be conducted following an experimental harvest regime (Conservation Measure 52-02, Annex 52-02/B) in which fishing effort must be distributed among twelve 0.5° latitude by 1.0° longitude blocks (Annex 52-02/C). Within this experimental harvest regime, Blocks C and E overlap the clusters of VMEs identified in WG-EMM-09/32 and notified under Conservation Measure 22-06.

5.49 Acknowledging that Conservation Measure 52-02 was agreed with an intent to collect data that would facilitate a future assessment of potential crab stocks in Subarea 48.2, the Workshop advised that a number of options should be considered for revising Conservation Measure 52-02 in light of the overlap between Blocks C and E of the experimental harvest regime and the VME clusters identified in WG-EMM-09/32:

- (i) eliminate Blocks C and E from the experimental harvest regime;
- (ii) redefine the 0.5° latitude by 1.0° longitude blocks used in the experimental harvest regime so that overlap with the VME clusters identified in WG-EMM-09/32 is appropriately minimised;
- (iii) define a more highly resolved grid of blocks (i.e. blocks that are smaller than 0.5° latitude by 1.0° longitude) and exclude blocks that overlap with the VME clusters from the experimental harvest regime.

5.50 In advising these options, the Workshop agreed that a precautionary approach to addressing overlap between blocks in the experimental harvest regime and VME clusters is warranted because:

- (i) there are multiple ways to construct, configure and fish pots; all of these factors will influence the impact that an individual haul may have on VMEs; and it is unclear how the exploratory fishery may actually be prosecuted;
- (ii) a recent report (Edinger et al., 2007) indicated that few VME taxa are retained when pots are hauled on board despite observations demonstrating that pots do damage benthic invertebrates (Stone, 2006). Thus, it will likely be difficult to determine the degree to which such a fishery is impacting VMEs using fishery-dependent data alone.

5.51 The Workshop further acknowledged SC CIRC 09/41, which indicated that Argentina intends (subject to agreement by the Commission) to use pots to fish for *Dissostichus* spp. in Subareas 88.1 and 88.2 during the forthcoming season. It was advised that the issues identified in the preceding paragraph would pertain to this notification, and WG-FSA may wish to consider these points when evaluating the notification.

ENCOUNTERS AND INDICATORS OF VMEs IN THE SOUTHERN OCEAN

Taxonomic resolution required to describe VMEs

6.1 The Workshop agreed that the taxonomic resolution used in the Benthic Invertebrate Classification Guide for Potentially Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems was adequate for the purposes of data collection and analysis for determining potential VME Risk Areas.

6.2 The Workshop recommended that Porifera be separated into Hexactinellida and Demospongiae, but that the option be given to record unknowns at the coarser scale of Porifera. This situation may also be relevant to other groups such as Cnidaria.

6.3 The Workshop recognised the need for additional FAO code assignments. In particular, the need for codes for some of the lower taxonomic ranks already illustrated in the Benthic Invertebrate Classification Guide for Potentially Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems (e.g. Hexactinellida, Demospongiae).

6.4 The Workshop recommended that a hierarchy of codes be made available to scientific observers, who will then be encouraged to use the finest resolution code they are comfortable with. The ability of many observers to record at a finer resolution than absolutely necessary is supported by the analysis in TASO-09/8. The Workshop further recommended that scientific observers be encouraged to record at the finest resolution possible, and instructions to observers should reflect this. The Workshop noted the constraints of the current workload put on scientific observers, and recognised the increase in workload any additional request would create.

6.5 The Workshop suggested that hands-on training for scientific observers would considerably improve the identification of VME taxa. It was recommended that scientific

observer technical coordinators liaise with their respective national Antarctic research programs to acquire example material of VME indicator taxa in order to advance this training.

6.6 In addition, the Workshop recommended the distribution of alternate field guides available, such as those produced by the UK, and by Australia for the HIMI region. The Workshop was informed about a benthic invertebrate identification guide for the Ross Sea which is under development, and which will form part of the SCAR-MarBIN field guide initiative, which, when completed over the next two years, will provide an extensive online field guide of Antarctic benthic invertebrates, available and updated through the SCAR-MarBIN website. Such a field guide could be used as an online resource for training purposes.

Indicators used by fishing vessels or during research surveys that signal when a VME is encountered

6.7 The Workshop considered the information on VME indicators from fishery-dependent and fishery-independent sources contained in WS-VME-09/5, 09/7, WG-EMM-09/8, 09/32 and TASO-09/8 (see sections 3 and 5).

6.8 The Workshop discussed the basis for determining trigger levels used to initiate management actions and noted that the VME indicator taxa reported in 2009 have different densities and therefore agreed that the trigger levels currently in use were likely to be too high for 'light' taxa; but there was insufficient information to suggest an appropriate new level. Examples using 'heavy' and 'light' categories to separate taxa were provided in WG-EMM-09/32 and WS-VME-09/5 (paragraph 5.44). The Workshop also noted that separate trigger levels may also need to be developed for encounters with rare and unique populations (paragraphs 3.4 and 3.5).

6.9 The Workshop agreed that further examination of observer and vessel data could be used to develop revised trigger levels but noted that there was no information currently available on which to make scientific recommendations on appropriate trigger levels for pot fisheries (paragraph 5.50).

6.10 The Workshop agreed that additional data on the number, weight and type of VME indicator taxa per line segment and fish catch on the same line segments (paragraph 5.12), could be used to develop advice on the occurrence and spatial scale of VMEs.

6.11 Although increased data collection adds additional burden to vessels and scientific observers, the Workshop agreed that such collection could be undertaken on a subset of all gear deployments during the course of a single season with a well designed, targeted sampling program.

6.12 The Workshop discussed VME notifications from fisheries-independent research and noted that there are many different forms of evidence that can be used to indicate the presence of a VME including, *inter alia*, photographic images, acoustics and catches from research sampling gear, and suggested that the rationale and as much supporting information as possible should be provided when a VME notification is submitted (paragraph 3.11).

6.13 The Workshop agreed that proposed notifications under Conservation Measure 22-06 should be provided to WG-EMM for assessment and the outcomes of this evaluation should be incorporated by the proposing Member before a VME notification under Conservation Measure 22-06 is submitted to the Secretariat.

6.14 The Workshop recognised that systematic, ecologically-based criteria need to be developed to assist the Scientific Committee in defining areas as VMEs under Conservation Measure 22-06 in an objective manner.

ADVICE TO THE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE

7.1 The Workshop identified the following advice to the Scientific Committee and WG-EMM and WG-FSA (as indicated):

- (i) Habitats and habitat-forming taxonomic groups that constitute a VME –
 - life-history attributes, resistance and resilience of VME taxa (advice to WG-EMM: paragraph 3.7 and Table 1; advice to WG-FSA: paragraph 4.8);
 - VME habitat-forming organisms and features specified in Conservation Measure 22-06, Annex 22-06/B (paragraph 3.11);
 - review of the benthic invertebrate classification guide (paragraphs 3.13 and 3.16; advice to WG-EMM and WG-FSA: paragraph 3.14).
- (ii) Extent of the impact by different bottom fishing gear (paragraphs 4.8 and 4.10).
- (iii) Methods for identifying locations of VMEs –
 - data from fishing vessels (paragraphs 5.9 and 5.12)
 - data from fishery-independent research (paragraphs 5.17 and 5.20)
 - fish diversity as indicator of VME (paragraph 5.26)
 - scales of Risk Areas (paragraphs 5.44, 5.45, 5.47 and 5.49 to 5.51).
- (iv) Encounters and indicators of VMEs in the Southern Ocean –
 - taxonomic resolution required to describe VMEs (paragraphs 6.1 to 6.6)
 - indicators used by fishing vessels or during research surveys that signal when a VME is encountered (paragraphs 6.8, 6.10, 6.13 and 6.14).
- (v) Conservation Measures –
 - 22-06 (paragraphs 3.11, 3.13 and 6.14)
 - 22-07 (paragraphs 3.13, 5.12, 5.44, 5.45 and 5.51)
 - 52.02 (paragraphs 5.49 and 5.50).

ADOPTION OF THE REPORT AND CLOSE OF THE WORKSHOP

8.1 The report of the Workshop was adopted.

8.2 In closing the meeting, Dr Jones thanked the participants and the invited experts for their scientific contributions and fruitful discussions, the rapporteurs for producing a succinct report, and the Secretariat for its support.

8.3 Dr Watters, on behalf of the participants, thanked Dr Jones for his leadership and for motivating focused discussions and resultant advice. The Workshop also thanked Ms Van Cise and the Southwest Fisheries Science Center for providing excellent facilities and Workshop arrangements.

REFERENCES

- Auster, P.J. 2005. Are deep-water corals important habitats for fishes? In: Freiwald, A. and J.M. Roberts (Eds). *Cold-Water Corals and Ecosystems*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg: 747–760.
- Bett, B.J. and A.L. Rice. 1992. The influence of the hexactinellid sponge (*Pheronema carpenleri*) spicules on the patchy distribution of macrobenthos in the Porcupine Seabight (bathyal NE Atlantic). *Ophelia*, 36: 217–226.
- Brodeur, R.D. 2001. Habitat-specific distribution of Pacific Ocean perch (*Sebastes alutus*) in Pribilof Canyon, Bering Sea. *Cont. Shelf Res.*, 21: 207–224.
- Clark, M.R., A.A. Rowden, T. Schlacher, A. Williams, M. Consalvey, K.I. Stocks, A.D. Rogers, T.D. O’Hara, M. White, T.M. Shank and J.H. Hall-Spencer. In press. The ecology of seamounts: structure, function and human impacts. *Annual Review of Marine Science*.
- Constable, A., D. Welsford, S. Doust S. and R. Kilpatrick. 2007. Demersal fishing interactions with marine benthos in the Southern Ocean: an assessment of the vulnerability of benthic habitats to impact by demersal gears. Document *SC-CAMLR-XXVI/BG/30*. CCAMLR, Hobart, Australia: 13 pp.
- Costello, M.J., M. McCrea, A. Freiwald, T. Lundalv, L. Jonsson, B.J. Bett, T.V. Weering, H. de Haas, J.M. Roberts and D. Allen. 2005. Functional role of deep-sea cold-water *Lophelia* coral reefs as fish habitat in the north-eastern Atlantic. In: Freiwald, A. and J.M. Roberts (Eds). *Cold-Water Corals and Ecosystems*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg: 771–805.
- Edinger, E., K. Baker, R. Devillers and V. Wareham. 2007. *Coldwater Corals off Newfoundland and Labrador: Distribution and Fisheries Impacts*. WWF-Canada, Toronto, Canada: 41 pp.

- FAO. 2009. International Guidelines for the Management of Deep-Sea Fisheries in the High Seas: Annex F of the Report of the Technical Consultation on International Guidelines for the Management of Deep-sea Fisheries in the High Seas, Rome, 4–8 February and 25–29 August 2008. *FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Report*, 881: 87 pp.
- Guidetti, M., S. Marcato, M. Chiantore, T. Patarnello, G. Albertelli and R. Cattaneo-Vietti. 2006. Exchange between populations of *Adamussium colbecki* (Mollusca: Bivalvia) in the Ross Sea. *Ant. Sci.*, 18: 645–653.
- Gutt, J. and W. Ekau. 1996. Habitat partitioning of dominant high Antarctic demersal fish in the Weddell Sea and Lazarev Sea. *J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol.*, 206: 25–37.
- Gutt, J. and T. Schickan. 1998. Epibiotic relationships in the Antarctic benthos. *Ant. Sci.*, 10: 398–405.
- Hunter, R.L. and K.M. Halanych. 2008. Evaluating connectivity in the brooding brittle star *Astrotothoa agassizii* across the Drake Passage in the Southern Ocean. *J. Hered.*, 99 (2): 137–148.
- Husebø, A., L. Nøttestad, J.H. Fosså, D. Furevik, S. Jørgensen. 2002. Distribution and abundance of fish in deep-sea coral habitats. *Hydrobiologia*, 471: 91–99.
- Jones, C.G., J.H. Lawton and M. Shachak. 1997. Positive and negative effects of organisms as physical ecosystem engineers. *Ecology*, 78 (7): 1946–957.
- Koenig, C.C. 2001. *Oculina* Banks: habitat, fish populations, restoration and enforcement. Report to the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council: www.safmc.net.
- Krieger, K.J. and B.L. Wing. 2002. Megafaunal associations with deepwater corals (*Primnoa* spp.) in the Gulf of Alaska. *Hydrobiologia*, 471: 83–90.
- Lindberg, W.D. and F.D. Lockhart. 1993. Depth stratified population structure of geryonid crabs in the eastern Gulf of Mexico. *J. Crustacean Res.*, 13: 713–722.
- Pirtle, J.L. 2005. Habitat-based assessment of structure-forming megafaunal invertebrates and fishes on Cordell Bank, California. M.Sc. Thesis, Washington State University, Vancouver, Washington, USA: 64 pp.
- Potthoff, M. 2006. The role of disturbances for the Antarctic benthos. PhD. Thesis, Oldenburg University, Germany: 177 pp.
- Rogers, A.D. 2007. Evolution and biodiversity of Antarctic organisms: a molecular perspective. *Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.*, 362: 2191–2214.
- Rogers, A.D., M.R. Clark, J.M. Hall-Spencer and K.M. Gjerde. 2008. *The Science behind the Guidelines: a Scientific Guide to the FAO Draft International Guidelines (December 2007) for the Management of Deep-Sea Fisheries in the High Seas and Examples of How the Guidelines may be Practically Implemented*. IUCN, Switzerland, 2008: 39 pp.
- Ross, S.W. and A.M. Quattrini. 2007. The fish fauna associated with deep coral banks off the southeastern United States. *Deep-Sea Res. I*, 54: 975–1007.

- Stone, R.P. 2006. Coral habitat in the Aleutian Islands of Alaska: depth distribution, fine-scale species associations, and fisheries interactions. *Coral Reefs*, 25: 229–238.
- Tissot, B.N., M.M. Yoklavich, M.S. Love, K. York and M. Amend. 2006. Benthic invertebrates that form habitat on deep banks off southern California, with special reference to deep sea coral. *Fish. Bull.*, 104: 167–181.
- Tittensor, D.P., A.R. Baco, P.E. Brewin, M.R. Clark, M. Consalvey, J. Hall-Spencer, A.A. Rowdern, T. Schlacher, K.I. Stocks and A.D. Rogers. 2009. Predicting global habitat suitability for stony corals on seamounts. *J. Biogeogr.*, 36: 1111–1128.

Table 1: Intrinsic factors contributing to the vulnerability from physical disturbance of invertebrates in the Southern Ocean.

Taxon	Habitat forming	Rare or unique populations	Longevity	Slow growth	Fragility	Larval dispersion potential	Lack of adult motility
Phylum Porifera							
Hexactinellida	H	L	H	H	H	M	H
Demospongiae	H	M	H	H	H	M	H
Phylum Cnidaria							
Actiniaria	L	L	H	L	L	M	M
Scleractinia ¹	H	M	H	H	H	M	H
Antipatharia	M	L	H	H	H	L	H
Alcyonacea	M	L	M	L	M	M	H
Gorgonacea	M	L	H	H	H	M	H
Pennatulacea	L	H	H	M	H	L	M
Zoanthida	L	L			M	L	H
Hydrozoa							
Hydroidolina	L	L			L		H
Family Stylanderidae	H	L	H	M	H	H	H
Phylum Bryozoa	H	L	H	M	H	H	H
Phylum Echinodermata							
Crinoidea: Stalked crinoid orders	L	H	H		H		H
Echinoidea: Order Cidaroida	M	L	H	H	M	H	L
Ophiuroidea: Basket and snake stars	L	L			H	L	M
Phylum Chordata: Class Ascidiacea	M	L		L	L	L	H
Phylum Brachiopoda	L	H	H	L	M	M	H
Phylum Annelida: Family Serpulidae	M	L			H	L	H
Phylum Arthropoda: Infraclass Cirripedia:	L	H	H		M	L	H
Bathylasmatidae							
Phylum Mollusca: Pectinidae: <i>Adamussium colbecki</i>	L	H	H	M	M	L	M
Phylum Hemichordata: Pterobranchia	M	M			M	H	H
Phylum Xenophyophora	L	H			H		H
Chemosynthetic communities	H	H	H	H	H	L	H

¹ As of 2009, almost all records of Scleractinia in the CAMLR Convention Area are of cup corals (*Desmophyllum* and *Flabellum* sp.). However, records of matrix forming scleractinians (*Madrepora oculata* and *Solenosmilia variabilis*) do exist in the northernmost areas, as far south as 60°S. Cup corals are typically not habitat-forming, but Scleractinia were classified as ‘high’ for the habitat-forming criterion to be consistent with the approach of using the precautionary attributes of the members of each taxon.




Figure 1*: Geomorphic provinces (irregular coloured polygons) around the Antarctic Peninsula and the locations of VMEs (black triangles identifying both start and end locations). The geomorphic provinces were characterised and mapped following methods described in WS-VME-09/10. The VMEs were identified in WG-EMM-09/32; start and end locations are from research trawls. VME clusters are considered loose groupings of VMEs (e.g. the grouping of VMEs on the shelf bank to the northeast of D’Urville and Joinville Islands that is annotated with a red oval).

* This figure is available in colour on the CCAMLR website.




Figure 2*: Geomorphic provinces (irregular coloured polygons) around the South Orkney Islands and the locations of VMEs (black triangles identifying both start and end locations). The geomorphic provinces were characterised and mapped following methods described in WS-VME-09/10. The VMEs were identified in WG-EMM-09/32; start and end locations are from research trawls. VME clusters are considered loose groupings of VMEs (e.g. the grouping of VMEs on the shelf bank to the west of Coronation and Signy Islands that is annotated with a red oval).

* This figure is available in colour on the CCAMLR website.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Workshop on Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems
(La Jolla, CA, USA, 3 to 7 August 2009)

AGNEW, David (Dr)	MRAG 18 Queen Street London W1J 5PN United Kingdom d.agnew@mrage.co.uk
BARRY, Jim (Dr)	Monterey Bay Aquarium Research Institute 7700 Sandholdt Road Moss Landing, CA 95039 USA barry@mbari.org
BOWDEN, David (Dr) (Invited expert)	National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research (NIWA) Private Bag 14-901 Kilbirnie Wellington New Zealand d.bowden@niwa.co.nz
GUTT, Julian (Dr) (Invited expert)	Alfred Wegener Institute for Polar and Marine Research Columbusstr. D-27568 Bremerhaven Germany julian.gutt@awi.de
HAYASHIBARA, Takeshi (Dr)	National Research Institute of Far Seas Fisheries Fisheries Research Agency 2-12-4, Fukuura, Kanazawa-ku Yokohama, Kanagawa 236-8648 Japan hayat@affrc.go.jp
JONES, Christopher (Dr) (Convener)	US AMLR Program Southwest Fisheries Science Center National Marine Fisheries Service 3333 Torrey Pines Court La Jolla, CA 92037 USA chris.d.jones@noaa.gov

LOCKHART, Susanne (Dr)
US AMLR Program
Southwest Fisheries Science Center
National Marine Fisheries Service
3333 Torrey Pines Court
La Jolla, CA 92037
USA
susanne.lockhart@noaa.gov

MARTIN-SMITH, Keith (Dr)
Australian Antarctic Division
Department of the Environment, Water,
Heritage and the Arts
Channel Highway
Kingston Tasmania 7050
Australia
keith.martin-smith@aad.gov.au

O'BRIEN, Philip (Dr)
Geoscience Australia
GPO Box 378
Canberra ACT 2601
Australia
phil.obrien@ga.gov.au

PARKER, Steve (Dr)
National Institute of Water and
Atmospheric Research (NIWA)
PO Box 893
Nelson
New Zealand
s.parker@niwa.co.nz

ROGERS, Alex (Dr)
Institute of Zoology
Zoological Society of London
Regent's Park
London
United Kingdom NW1 4RY
alex.rogers@ioz.ac.uk

SCHIAPARELLI, Stefano (Dr)
(Invited expert)
Dipartimento per lo Studio del Territorio
e delle sue Risorse
Università di Genova
Corso Europa 26
Genova, I-16132
Italy
steschia@dipteris.unige.it

SEOK, Kyu Jin (Dr)
Fiheries Resources Research Division
Fisheries Resources and Environment Department
National Fisheries Research
and Development Institute
Busan
Republic of Korea
pisces@nfrdi.go.kr

SHARP, Ben (Dr)
Ministry of Fisheries
PO Box 1020
Wellington
New Zealand
ben.sharp@vanuatu.com.vu
ben.sharp@fish.govt.nz
brs_sharp@yahoo.com

VAN CISE, Amy (Ms)
(Local organiser)
US AMLR Program
Southwest Fisheries Science Center
National Marine Fisheries Service
3333 Torrey Pines Court
La Jolla, CA 92037
USA
amy.vancise@noaa.gov

VERCOE, Amanda (Ms)
Antarctic Policy Unit
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade
Private Bag 18-906
Wellington
New Zealand
amanda.vercoe@mfat.govt.nz

WATTERS, George (Dr)
(WG-EMM Convener)
US AMLR Program
Southwest Fisheries Science Center
National Marine Fisheries Service
3333 Torrey Pines Court
La Jolla, CA 92037
USA
george.watters@noaa.gov

YAMAMOTO, Takahisa (Mr)
International Affairs Division
Fisheries Agency of Japan
1-2-1, Kasumigaseki
Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo 100-8907
Japan
takahisa_yamamoto@nm.maff.go.jp

Secretariat:

Denzil MILLER (Executive Secretary)
David RAMM (Data Manager)
Keith REID (Science Officer)
Genevieve TANNER (Communications Officer)

CCAMLR
PO Box 213
North Hobart 7002
Tasmania Australia
ccamlr@ccamlr.org

AGENDA**Workshop on Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems
(La Jolla, CA, USA, 3 to 7 August 2009)**

1. Opening of meeting
2. Introduction
 - 2.1 Review of VMEs and bottom fishing issues in CCAMLR
 - 2.2 Current and interim CCAMLR conservation measures (CM 22-05, 22-06 and 22-07)
3. Habitats and habitat-forming taxonomic groups that constitute a VME
 - 3.1 Life-history attributes, resistance and resilience of VME taxa in the Southern Ocean
 - 3.2 Benthic invertebrate taxa consistent with VMEs
 - 3.2.1 VME habitat-forming organisms and features specified in Annex 22-06/B
 - 3.2.2 Review of Benthic Invertebrate Classification Guide
 - 3.3 Endemism and rarity of taxa
4. Extent of the impact by different bottom fishing gear
5. Methods for identifying locations of VMEs
 - 5.1 Available and potential data sources
 - 5.1.1 Fishing vessels
 - 5.1.2 Fishery independent research
 - 5.2 Fish diversity as indicator of VME
 - 5.3 Spatial extent of VMEs
 - 5.3.1 Predicting locations of VMEs in the absence of direct observations
 - 5.3.2 Scale of Risk Area designation
6. Encounters and indicators of VMEs in the Southern Ocean
 - 6.1 Taxonomic resolution required to describe VMEs
 - 6.2 Indicators used by fishing vessels or during research surveys that signal when a VME is encountered
7. Advice to the Scientific Committee
8. Report adoption and close of Workshop.

LIST OF DOCUMENTS

Workshop on Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems
(La Jolla, CA, USA, 3 to 7 August 2009)

- | | |
|--------------|--|
| WS-VME-09/1 | Provisional and Provisional Annotated Agenda for the CCAMLR Workshop on Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems (VMEs) |
| WS-VME-09/2 | List of Participants |
| WS-VME-09/3 | List of Documents |
| WS-VME-09/4 | Physical controls on coral communities on the George V Land slope: some working hypotheses
A.L. Post, P.E. O'Brien, R.J. Beaman, M.J. Riddle (Australia) and L. De Santis (Italy) |
| WS-VME-09/5 | Analysis of VME data collected by UK vessels fishing in the Ross Sea during the 2008/09 CCAMLR Season
R.E. Mitchell, T. Peatman, J. Pearce and D. Agnew (United Kingdom) |
| WS-VME-09/6 | Using genetic connectivity to identify vulnerable marine ecosystems (VMEs) in Antarctica - the issue of scale
N.G. Wilson (USA) |
| WS-VME-09/7 | Is the bycatch of vulnerable invertebrate taxa associated with high catch rates of fish in the Ross Sea longline fisheries?
S.J. Parker and S. Mormede (New Zealand) |
| WS-VME-09/8 | Identifying taxonomic groups as vulnerable to bottom longline fishing gear in the Ross Sea region
S.J. Parker and D.A. Bowden (New Zealand)
(<i>CCAMLR Science</i> , submitted) |
| WS-VME-09/9 | Detection of cold seeps and hydrothermal vents
P.E. O'Brien, A. Jones, G. Logan, N. Rollet and J. Kennard (Australia) |
| WS-VME-09/10 | Antarctic-wide geomorphology as an aid to habitat mapping and locating Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems
P.E. O'Brien, A.L. Post and R. Romeyn (Australia) |
| WS-VME-09/11 | A database of life-history attributes for habitat-forming benthic taxa
K.M. Martin-Smith (Australia) |

- WS-VME-09/12 Predicting the vulnerability of bryozoans and sponges to disturbance using life-history characteristics
K. Martin-Smith (Australia)
- WS-VME-09/13 Field identification guide to Heard Island and McDonald Island (HIMI) benthic invertebrates: a guide for scientific observers aboard fishing vessels
T. Hibberd and K. Moore (Australia)
- Other Documents
- WS-VME-09/P1 Novel methods improve prediction of species' distributions from occurrence data
J. Elith, C.H. Graham, R.P. Anderson, M. Dudík, S. Ferrier, A. Guisan, R.J. Hijmans, F. Huettmann, J.R. Leathwick, A. Lehmann, J. Li, L.G. Lohmann, B.A. Loiselle, G. Manion, C. Moritz, M. Nakamura, Y. Nakazawa, J.McC. Overton, A.T. Peterson, S.J. Phillips, K.S. Richardson, R. Scachetti-Pereira, R.E. Schapire, J. Soberón, S. Williams, M.S. Wisz and N.E. Zimmermann
(*Ecography*, 29 (2006): 129–151)
- WS-VME-09/P2 Predicting species distributions from museum and herbarium records using multi-response models fitted with multivariate adaptive regression splines
J. Elith and J. Leathwick
(*Diversity Distrib.*, 13 (2007): 265–275)
- WS-VME-09/P3 Using generalized dissimilarity modelling to analyse and predict patterns of beta diversity in regional biodiversity assessment
S. Ferrier, G. Manion, J. Elith and K. Richardson
(*Diversity Distrib.*, 13 (2007): 252–264)
- WS-VME-09/P4 Variation in demersal fish species richness in the oceans surrounding New Zealand: an analysis using boosted regression trees
J.R. Leathwick, J. Elith, M.P. Francis, T. Hastie, P. Taylor
(*Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.*, 321 (2006): 267–281)
- WS-VME-09/P5 Response of Antarctic benthic communities to disturbance: first results from the artificial Benthic Disturbance Experiment on the eastern Weddell Sea Shelf, Antarctica
D. Gerdes, E. Isla, R. Knust, K. Mintenbeck, S. Rossi
(*Polar Biol.*, 31 (2008): 1469–1480 DOI 10.1007/s00300-008-0488-y)