

**Report of the Forty-third meeting
of the Commission**
(Hobart, Australia, 14 to 25 October 2024)

This is a preliminary¹ version of the CCAMLR-43 Report
as adopted on Friday 25 October 2024.

¹ Preliminary in this case means that further proofreading and verification is still to be done by the Secretariat.

Contents

	Page
Opening of the meeting	1
Organisation of the meeting	5
Adoption of agenda	5
Status of the Convention	6
Chair’s Report	6
Proposals for new measures	7
Meeting the obligations under the Headquarters Agreement between the Commission and the Government of Australia	7
Implementation of Convention objectives	9
Objectives of the Convention	9
Second Performance Review	10
Management of marine resources	11
Advice from the Scientific Committee	11
Krill resources	12
Fish resources	19
Statistical Area 48	20
Statistical Area 58	24
Statistical Area 88	25
Fisheries classifications	25
Non-target species	26
Fish and invertebrates	26
Seabirds and marine mammals	26
Gear specifications and diagrams	27
Bottom fishing and vulnerable marine ecosystems	27
Ecosystem monitoring	27
Spatial management	27
Review of existing Marine Protected Areas	29
Proposals for new Marine Protected Areas	30
Other spatial management issues	34
Impacts of climate change on the conservation of Antarctic marine living resources	35
Implementation and compliance	38
Advice from SCIC	38
Implementation of the CDS	38
CDS Fund Expenditure	39
Vessel inspections	40
Vessel monitoring system (VMS)	40
Promotion of compliance in CCAMLR	41
Transshipment	42

Implementation of the Scheme of International Scientific Observation (SISO)	42
NCP Engagement Strategy	42
Proposals for new and revised compliance related conservation measures	43
Conservation Measure 10-03	43
Conservation Measure 10-04	44
Conservation Measures 21-01 and 21-02	44
Conservation Measure 23-01	45
Conservation Measure 31-02	45
Conservation Measures 41-01 and 41-10	45
Fish nest areas	45
Harmonisation Symposium	46
Resolution on Labour and Safety Standards	46
Text of the Scheme of International Scientific Observation (SISO)	46
CCAMLR Compliance Report	47
Illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing in the Convention Area	50
Fishery notifications	53
Advice from the Scientific Committee to SCIC	54
Other business	55
CCAMLR Scheme of International Scientific Observation	55
Conservation measures	56
Measures on compliance	56
Measures on general fishery matters	56
Measures on fishery regulation	56
Measures on protected area	57
Resolutions	57
Review of existing measures	57
Measures on compliance	57
Revised measures on general fishery matters	57
Revised measures on fishery regulation	57
Protected Areas	57
Implementation and Compliance	57
General fishery matters	58
Fishery regulations	59
Exploratory fisheries	59
Toothfish catch limits	59
Icefish catch limits	60
Krill fisheries	60
Protected Areas	60
Other fishery matters	60
Administration and Finance	63
Review of the 2024 budget, the 2025 budget and forecast budget for 2026	63
Administration Matters	65

Cooperation with the Antarctic Treaty System and international organisations	69
Cooperation with the Antarctic Treaty System	69
Cooperation with international organisations	69
Reports of observers from international organisations	69
Reports from CCAMLR representatives at meetings of international organisations in the previous intersessional period and nominations of representatives to forthcoming meetings of relevant international organisations	71
Administrative matters	71
Election of officers	71
Invitation of observers	71
Next meeting	72
Other business	73
Report of the forty-third meeting of the Commission	75
Close of the meeting	75
Tables	76
Annex 1: List of Registered Participants	77
Annex 2: List of Documents	107
Annex 3: Opening Address by the Governor of Tasmania, Her Excellency the Honourable Barbara Baker AC	119
Annex 4: Agenda	123
Annex 5: Budget for 2025 and Forecast Budget for 2026	127
* Annex 6: Report of the Standing Committee on Implementation and Compliance 2024 (SCIC-2024)	
* Annex 7: Report of the Standing Committee on Administration and Finance 2024 (SCAF-2024)	

* Annexes 6 and 7 are available on the CCAMLR website.

**Report of the Forty-third
Meeting of the Commission**
(Hobart, Australia, 14 to 25 October 2024)

Opening of the meeting

1.1 The Forty-third Annual Meeting of the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR-43) met at its Headquarters in Hobart from 14 to 25 October 2024. It was chaired by Mr V. Tsymbaliuk (Ukraine).

1.2 The following Members of the Commission were represented: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, People's Republic of China (China), Ecuador, European Union (EU), France, Germany, India, Italy, Japan, Republic of Korea (Korea), Namibia, the Kingdom of the Netherlands (Netherlands), New Zealand, Norway, Russian Federation (Russia), Poland, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (UK), United States of America (USA) and Uruguay.

1.3 The following Contracting Parties were represented as Observers: Peru, Canada, Finland, Mauritius and Panama connected to the online streaming.

1.4 The following non-Contracting Parties were represented as Observers: Colombia, the Republic of Singapore. The Dominican Republic and Luxembourg connected to the online streaming.

1.5 The following Observers were represented in person or online: the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP), the Association of Responsible Krill harvesting companies (ARK), the Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition (ASOC), the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat, the Coalition of Legal Toothfish Operators (COLTO), the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources – the World Conservation Union (IUCN), Oceanites Inc., the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR), the Scientific Committee on Oceanic Research (SCOR), the UN Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea (UNDOALOS) and the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC). The International Association of Antarctica Tour Operators (IAATO), the International Whaling Commission (IWC), and the Southern Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement (SIOFA) connected to the online streaming.

1.6 The List of Participants is given in Annex 1. The List of Documents presented to the meeting is given in Annex 2.

1.7 The Chair welcomed all participants to the meeting and introduced Her Excellency, the Honourable Barbara Baker AC, the Governor of Tasmania, who delivered the opening address (Annex 3).

1.8 On behalf of the meeting, Ms S. Langerock (Vice-Chair, Belgium), thanked the Governor for her address. She noted the visionary approach of the founders of the Convention at its inception, and the imperative of even greater vision and commitment now to address the myriad challenges to the complex and rapidly changing Antarctic environment. She highlighted the need for increased diversity of the Commission, recognising, in particular, the growing role of women as Heads of Delegation and in Antarctic issues more broadly. She urged delegates to

be guided by the spirit of international cooperation and to uphold the Antarctic Treaty System, of which the Commission is a key pillar.

1.9 The meeting offered its condolences on the passing of Professor Marino Vacchi, former Scientific Committee Representative for Italy, and noted, with sadness, the tragic loss of life of 13 crew members in the sinking of the FV *Argos Georgia* in severe weather in the South Atlantic and of others at sea this year. A minute of silence was observed by the meeting as an expression of respect and remembrance.

1.10 A number of statements were made by Members.

1.11 Ukraine made the following statement:

‘Distinguished delegates!

The Ukrainian side draws the CCAMLR's attention to the fact that an aggressive war, illegally launched by the Russian Federation against Ukraine, still continues. The aim of this aggression is to seize and annex Ukrainian territories. Some 27% of Ukrainian territory is now under Russian occupation. Those territories that Russia has not yet been able to seize, it turns into a desert, not leaving a single surviving building in dozens of cities and villages where Russia is trying to advance.

Broadscale mined areas have appeared in Ukraine, and its demining will take decades. These are thousands of square kilometres of fertile Ukrainian lands, which have been a source of food for many decades not only for Ukraine, but also for many other countries.

In past year since our last meeting, thousands of new war crimes have been committed by the Russian Federation. These include the murders of civilians, the destruction of schools and hospitals, including the Okhmadyt Children's Hospital in the centre of Kyiv on July 8, 2024, which was seen by the whole world. The terrorist state also continues its deliberate attacks on Ukrainian energy facilities with the evident aim to cause a humanitarian disaster in Ukraine during wintertime.

Russia's aggression has already caused environmental damage to Ukraine in the amount of more than 57 billion US dollars. In total, about 300 cases of environmental war crimes by the Russian Federation have been recorded, including deliberate poisoning of river systems. In the first two years of the full-scale Russian invasion, the impact on the climate exceeded the annual greenhouse gas emissions of 175 countries.

Ukraine is collecting evidence of ecocide. Our goal is to bring the aggressor state to justice for environmental crimes.

Undoubtedly, Russian aggression continues to have an extremely negative impact on Ukraine's activities in Antarctica and, in particular, in the CCAMLR area, due to direct damage to Ukraine, which causes critical problems in the logistical support of Ukrainian Antarctic research, as well as due to a number of restrictions caused by martial law.

The biggest war in the 21st century is not Ukraine's choice. Our state has become the object of aggression, and it is forced to defend itself. The long-awaited peace in Europe depends only on Russia. Those who call for peace negotiations should remember this.

It is the withdrawal of Russian troops from Ukraine and the restoration of our territorial integrity is the only reliable foundation for the lasting peace.

We are calling on the CCAMLR parties to support our aspiration to restore peace in Ukraine and to force the aggressor state to stop its criminal actions.’

1.12 The United States made the following statement:

‘As we gather here today, it is imperative that we not only focus on our shared commitment to Antarctic conservation, but also address pressing global issues that threaten peace and stability.

To that end, we reaffirm our enduring support for Ukraine. Two and half years ago, Russian President Putin launched a full-scale invasion of Ukraine, shredding the core principles of the United Nations Charter – sovereignty, territorial integrity, and independence – and instead choosing a premeditated war that has brought catastrophic loss of life and human suffering.

Today, I stand before you to express unwavering support for Ukraine in the face of this unprovoked and unjust war.

We condemn, in the strongest possible terms, Russia's continued war against Ukraine and its relentless attacks against Ukraine’s ports and cities, with devastating effects on its people. We reiterate our call on Russia to withdraw all its troops from Ukraine’s sovereign territory.

At the same time, we also stand in solidarity with the people of Ukraine and reaffirm our commitment to supporting their sovereignty and democratic aspirations, and we all must support their call for a just and lasting peace to end Russia’s war of aggression.

Let us continue to work together, not only in our Antarctic conservation efforts, but also in upholding the values of peace, justice, and international cooperation that are essential for a sustainable and prosperous future.

Thank you.’

1.13 The European Union and its Member States made the following statement:

‘Let me express the full solidarity of the European Union and its Member States with Ukraine and the Ukrainian people, after more than two years of Russia’s illegal, unprovoked and unjustified full-scale invasion of Ukraine. We condemn in the strongest possible terms Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine, which grossly violates international law and the UN Charter, and undermines international security and stability. We demand that Russia immediately cease its military actions, withdraw all its troops from the entire territory of Ukraine and fully respect Ukraine’s territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence within its internationally recognised borders. We reiterate the call of the UN General Assembly Resolutions on this matter.’

1.14 Australia made the following statement:

‘Thank you, Chair. Australia condemns Russia's illegal and immoral invasion of Ukraine. Russia's invasion renders stark Australia's commitment to a world in which no country dominates, and no country is dominated. Australia strongly supports Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity and is working closely with our partners to support Ukraine. Aside from terrible damage and loss of life in Ukraine, the war is also compounding human suffering and propelling the global crisis in food and energy security.

The invasion is a gross violation of international law, including the Charter of the United Nations, and it is unacceptable that one CCAMLR Member has invaded another. Russia's actions are out of keeping with the goodwill and peaceful international cooperation that is fundamental to the Antarctic Treaty System. It has had direct negative consequences for Ukraine's Antarctic program.

We call on Russia to immediately withdraw its forces from Ukrainian territory, required by the legally binding decision of the International Court of Justice on 16 March 2022.’

1.15 New Zealand thanked the Governor of Tasmania for her warm welcome and the words of inspiration that ‘through our cooperation, dedication and innovation, great things can be achieved’, and thanked the Chair, the Secretariat, and the Australian Government for their work to prepare for a productive meeting. New Zealand added its voice to those speaking in solidarity with Ukraine and in condemnation of Russia's aggression against Ukraine.

1.16 Norway added its voice to interventions made by Ukraine, US, EU and its Member States, Australia and New Zealand in support of Ukraine, and underscored the point made by Ukraine that Russia's unlawful war in Ukraine does have consequences for Ukraine's participation in CCAMLR. Norway nevertheless expressed hope that the CCAMLR meeting would work in the spirit of the core values of the Antarctic Treaty System.

1.17 The United Kingdom expressed its wish to associate itself with statements put forward by Ukraine, the United States, the EU and its Member States, Australia, New Zealand and Norway and called for Russia to immediately cease this illegal war and respect Ukraine's independence and sovereignty.

1.18 With respect to the Commission meeting taking place in Hobart, Russia expressed its respect for indigenous peoples that have ever lived in Australia. It pointed out that the conservation and rational use of Antarctic marine living resources were the objective of the Convention and highlighted the role of the Commission to that end. It stressed that the statements of delegations had been made outside the mandate of the Commission. In particular, an assumption about negative impacts of actions of the Russian Federation on the Ukrainian Antarctic program was discussed at the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties Meeting (ATCM) and no evidence was provided in support of the said assumption.

1.19 China made the following statement:

‘On behalf of the Chinese delegation, I would like to express our gratitude to the Government of Australia for hosting this session, and to the Chair and Secretariat for their hard work for the Commission and their considerate arrangement for the meeting.

Mr. Chair,

The Commission is the main platform for the conservation of Antarctic marine living resources and assumes great responsibilities of protection and rational use according to the CAMLR Convention. As a State party to the Antarctic Treaty and the CAMLR Convention, China is committed to understanding, protecting and utilising Antarctica, firmly upholds its obligations under the CAMLR Convention and supports the Antarctic Treaty System. We are willing to work with other Members and partners to promote the development of Antarctic governance towards a more just and rational direction.

The establishment of Marine Protected Areas is one of the conservation tools to achieve the objective and principles of the CAMLR Convention. China believes that an appropriate approach is crucial to the establishment and operation of effective Marine Protected Areas. It is necessary for all parties to continue the discussion on this issue in a constructive and responsible manner to reach a consensus at an early date.

Mr. Chair,

In accordance with the purpose and mandate of the CAMLR Convention, it is expected that our discussion focus on the conservation and rational use of Antarctic marine living resources, not the others. The Commission should adhere to this mandate and prevent any unrelated issue from interfering with the course of the CAMLR meeting.

Mr. Chair,

China expects all parties to enhance mutual trust and build consensus through discussions and to make decisions on the basis of consensus. We wish this meeting a great success.'

1.20 Members of the Commission expressed different views regarding how to include paragraphs 1.11 to 1.18 in the report.

Organisation of the meeting

Adoption of agenda

2.1 The agenda, as drafted, was adopted.

2.2 The Chair invited nominations for the currently vacant roles of Chair of the Standing Committee on Administration and Finance (SCAF) and Chair of the *ad hoc* Conservation Measures (CM) Drafting Group (CMDG). Argentina proposed his Excellency Mr M. Gowland, Ambassador of Argentina to Australia, as Chair of SCAF. The USA proposed Dr C. Jones (USA) as Chair of the *ad hoc* Conservation Measures Drafting Group. The Commission welcomed these proposals and appointed Ambassador Gowland as Chair of SCAF and Dr Jones as Chair of the *ad hoc* CMDG.

2.3 The Chair invited nominations for the currently vacant roles of Vice-Chair of SCAF and SCIC. The USA proposed Ms Suzanne McGuire as Vice-Chair of SCAF. The Commission welcomed this proposal and appointed Ms McGuire as Vice-Chair of SCAF.

Status of the Convention

2.4 Australia as Depositary of the Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources 1980 (the Convention) reported that no additional countries had acceded to the Convention since the 42nd Meetings of the Commission. It noted that the number of Contracting Parties to the Convention accordingly remains thirty-seven.

2.5 Australia made the following statement:

‘We take this opportunity as the Australian Government, to reaffirm our continuing commitment as the host of the CCAMLR Secretariat since the Convention’s entry into force in 1982, and to thank you for your efforts over the past year.

It is vital to the continued success of CCAMLR and the ATS itself that the Commission can meet annually, and we are proud that the Commission is able to meet here in Hobart each year to discuss and adopt conservation measures and undertake its important work.

In response to concerns raised by the Commission at CCAMLR 42, the Australian Government has worked closely with the CCAMLR Chair and Secretariat to provide additional guidance on visa requirements and streamline the application process.

We have discussed this process with Members over the past year and the details were confirmed with Members via CCAMLR circular (including on 5 July and 12 August 2024).

I am pleased to report that all visa applications from delegates CCAMLR declared to the Department of Home Affairs, and following the guidance, have been decided this year in good time.

The Australian Government thanks CCAMLR Members for your cooperative engagement on this issue in the intersessional period.

We wish all Members the best for a productive meeting at CCAMLR-43.’

2.6 The United States made the following statement:

‘We want to thank the Executive Secretary for his efforts over the last year to address the concerns CCAMLR Members expressed at CCAMLR-42.

We also thank Australia for its significant efforts to enhance its processes and guidance to the Commission for our representatives’ entry into Australia.

We believe that Australia has made great strides in establishing a clear and transparent system with deadlines to ensure timely consideration of visa requests.

We are satisfied this issue is resolved.’

Chair’s Report

2.7 The Chair introduced his report (CCAMLR-43/BG/05) as read.

Proposals for new measures

2.8 To facilitate the review of proposals for new measures, the Chair provided the delegations an opportunity to introduce the following papers:

- (i) A revised proposal for a Conservation Measure establishing a Marine Protected Area in Domain 1 (Western Antarctic Peninsula and South Scotia Arc) by Argentina and Chile (CCAMLR-43/37)
- (ii) A proposal for a third CCAMLR Performance Review by the European Union and its Member States (CCAMLR-43/31)
- (iii) The Conveners' Report of the Symposium on Harmonisation of Conservation and Krill Fishery Management Initiatives in the Antarctic Peninsula Region (CCAMLR-43/29). Korea noted that the Harmonisation Symposium, held in Incheon in July 2024, was a joint meeting between the Commission and Scientific Committee.

Meeting the obligations under the Headquarters Agreement between the Commission and the Government of Australia

2.9 The Chair updated the Commission on the actions that had been undertaken regarding the Headquarters Agreement since CCAMLR-42. Recalling the difficulty one Member had with obtaining visas for attendance in that year, and the Commission's request that the Executive Secretary engage with the Government of Australia in the intersessional period to ensure equal right to representation of all Members, he advised that he had written as Chair to the Australian authorities on 3 November 2023. The Executive Secretary then met with the relevant authorities in December 2023 and over subsequent months.

2.10 The Chair noted that the Australian authorities distributed two documents describing additional measures they had put in place to avoid such a situation in the future, and that these documents were shared and discussed at a Heads of Delegation meeting on 29 February 2024. Given not all issues were resolved at that session, a second Heads of Delegation meeting then took place on 3 April 2024, at which the Heads agreed the meeting dates for CCAMLR-43 and a number of additional steps, including early notification of the meeting to allow for sufficient time for all delegates to apply for and receive a response to their application for a visa.

2.11 The Chair advised the Commission that, with the cooperation of the Australian authorities, the Secretariat had developed detailed guidance on visa applications, including advice that applications should be made 8 to 10 weeks prior to travel, which was placed on the meeting website. The Secretariat announced the meeting on 10 June 2024, and sent out reminder circulars in July and August, following up directly with delegates and liaising very closely with the Australian authorities throughout the period leading up to the meetings to ensure that all delegates were assisted in their registration and visa application process. Visas were issued in a timely manner, within the 8 weeks informed by the Australian authorities.

2.12 Russia introduced its paper CCAMLR-43/23, which was titled 'On the importance to fulfil obligations under the Headquarters Agreement'. Russia noted that meetings with all Members represented are the main instrument for the Commission to carry out its functions.

Interrelated provisions of the Convention define the participation in, frequency and locations of meetings. Each Member of the Commission shall be represented by one representative that may be accompanied by alternate representatives and advisers. Strict adherence to the provisions of the Agreement is essential for the Commission to carry out its function in Australia. Therefore, any case of non-compliance with obligations of the host country hinders the Commission's work — in particular, no member of the Russian delegation had received a visa on time in 2023. Russia emphasised that issues assigned for the Heads of Delegations meetings by CCAMLR-42 were not resolved.

2.13 Many Members thanked the Government of Australia and the Executive Secretary for their efforts to address this matter, noting that all delegates who applied in time and met visa requirements had received their visas for CCAMLR-43. They thanked Australia for its commitment to the Headquarters Agreement and expressed full confidence in it as host of the Commission, noting also that the issues raised in the paper had been discussed at length during CCAMLR-42, and satisfactorily addressed, and that they consider this issue to be resolved.

2.14 The European Union and its Member States noted that Australia's visa requirements are not inconsistent with its obligations, but that nevertheless, to address concerns, an agreed process had been established and implemented with regular reporting to Members on progress.

2.15 China thanked the Russian delegation for bringing this matter to the attention of the Commission and emphasised the importance of equal participation as a basic right of all Members. China noted that the situation had improved this year thanks to the efforts of the Secretariat and the host country. At the same time, China raised the question of whether a mechanism to effectively protect this right has been established and believed that there should be such a mechanism. It noted that it would be important not to repeat the situation in future.

2.16 Russia expressed its thanks to the many Members who had taken the floor on this issue and emphasised that further efforts were needed to ensure equal representation of all Members. It noted, in particular, that some issues were raised by the Australian border authorities on Russian visas upon the delegation's arrival for CCAMLR-43, and requested the Commission to call on the Government of Australia to take all necessary measures to ensure full implementation of its obligations under the Headquarters Agreement. It reiterated that when a Member is unable to participate in the Commission meeting due to visa difficulties, there is no basis for holding the meeting. It suggested to keep agenda item 2.5 on the agenda and further discuss relevant issues.

2.17 Noting Russia's position, the Chair suggested that the Executive Secretary send an official letter to the relevant Australian authorities before the commencement of each future meeting, emphasising the importance of the application of the Headquarters Agreement. He affirmed that the Commission would take Russia's concerns into account and keep this issue under review.

2.18 Australia confirmed that if it is the will of all of the Members that the Commission continue to discuss these issues with Australia then the Australian Government stands ready to assist.

2.19 The United States noted that the language agreed by the Commission at CCAMLR-42 referred to Members' equal right to representation, and the Chair confirmed that this would be reflected in the final report.

Implementation of Convention objectives

Objectives of the Convention

3.1 The Commission considered the proposal from the EU and its Member States (CCAMLR-43/31) to conduct a third CCAMLR Performance Review (PR3) during the 2024–25 intersessional period with the results and recommendations to be reported to CCAMLR-44. The Commission noted that PR2 was initiated in 2016 and prior to that PR1 was initiated in 2007, and further noted that the terms of reference for this proposal are similar to those of PR2 and build upon the outcomes of PR1 and PR2.

3.2 Many Members acknowledged the benefits of PR2 and supported the proposal for PR3.

3.3 Some Members noted that any performance review shall be carried out taking into account the Convention objective and pointed out that the budget and legal aspects must be resolved before proceeding with the proposal.

3.4 These Members also noted that outcomes of PR2 have to be analysed in view of the next performance review.

3.5 China recognised the value of the proposed PR3 and proposed the following amendments to the proposal: first, PR3 shall conduct a comprehensive review of the implementation of the Convention. Such work shall not be conducted on the basis of or restricted by PR2. Second, the priorities of PR3 shall be decided by Commission Members by consensus. Third, the nomination of reviewers shall be a state-driven process, with four experts nominated by Commission Members and two other nominations, including at least one expert from the fishery industry. Fourth, the qualifications of the nominated experts shall include, *inter alia*, expertise and long-time experience of fishery management in the framework of CCAMLR. Fifth, the nature of the PR3 report is to provide advice to the Commission for consideration.

3.6 Several Members recalled the conservation objective of the Convention and noted that the inclusion of industry representatives on the review panel would not be in line with the conservation objective of the Convention. These Members noted that an individual with industry experience could apply for the panel, but an exclusive industry role should not be included.

3.7 The Chair of SCIC reported that the PR3 proposal was discussed during SCIC-2024 but no consensus was reached and the discussion is outlined in the SCIC-2024 report (paragraphs 380–383).

3.8 The Chair of SCAF reported that the PR3 proposal was discussed during SCAF-2024 but that no consensus was reached, and it was recommended that further discussion should occur in Commission. The SCAF discussion is reported in paragraphs 49–52 of the SCAF-2023 report.

3.9 The Commission noted there was no consensus to proceed with the PR3 proposal. In recognising the general support from a number of Members, the European Union and its Member States were invited to review the suggestions from Members and consider revising the proposal for future consideration.

Second Performance Review

3.10 The Commission noted the report by the Executive Secretary on the progress against the recommendation of the Second Performance Review (PR2) as provided in CCAMLR-43/06.

3.11 Many Members thanked the Secretariat for its work in tracking the PR2 progress and considered that good progress has been made on the implementation of recommendations from the PR2, and that efforts need to continue. The Commission agreed that the Secretariat should continue to track this progress and keep Members informed of the progress.

3.12 Some Members noted that Recommendation 28 on capacity building had been marked as completed and suggested that it should also be recognised as ongoing. They further noted that while the work was considered complete in the context of the Strategic Plan considering the current capacity building activities, particularly around Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS) implementation, it would be helpful to mark Recommendation 28 as ongoing for future reference.

3.13 The Russian Federation stressed informal nature of intersessional workshops and symposiums. As such their outcomes should not be considered as findings or decisions of the Commission but may provide useful basis for formal considerations during the meeting.

3.14 Many Members noted that the intersessional work, including workshops and symposiums, is crucial to the Commission's work and they underlined that it is not informal work. It is inherently linked to the business of CCAMLR and is an integral part of building consensus on many projects which often produces helpful recommendations for the Commission to consider and take decisions on. These Members also noted that these intersessional activities, such as the Harmonisation Symposium, were explicitly endorsed by the Commission. Many Members also highlighted that constructive cooperation and a shared commitment to actively building consensus is a cornerstone of CCAMLR, and of the Antarctic Treaty System as a whole.

3.15 Australia urged Members to engage in discussions in good faith to obtain consensus, including through intersessional engagement as an active means to achieve consensus, and noted in particular that the Commission at CCAMLR-42 agreed to the appointments to the Steering Committee for the Harmonisation Symposium, as well as its Terms of Reference which were specifically linked to the establishment of krill fishery management arrangements and the establishment of a DIMPA, which formed part of the functions of the Commission.

3.16 The Commission noted that future reports will record and report upon these meetings but will differentiate these reports from those of the Meetings of the Commission, Scientific Committee and their associated Working Groups.

Management of marine resources

Advice from the Scientific Committee

4.1 The Chair of the Scientific Committee, Dr C. Cárdenas (Chile), presented the report of the Scientific Committee (SC-CAMLR-43) and thanked the Scientific Committee for the significant progress made.

4.2 The Chair of the Scientific Committee informed the Commission that the current krill catch in Statistical Area 48 was more than 498 000 tonnes, which was the highest on record and may exceed 500 000 tonnes by the end of the 2024 season, and that this historic high catch underscored the urgency of progressing the revised Krill Fishery Management Approach (KFMA). This equates to about 80% of the trigger level (or 8.87% of the precautionary catch limit, 0.83% of the estimated stock biomass in 2019) in Subareas 48.1 to 48.4 (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraph 2.2). The Commission noted the total catches in the Convention Area in SC-CAMLR-43/BG/01..

4.3 Most Members thanked the Scientific Committee for highlighting this and noted that the high level of total catch, unprecedented changes in the extent of sea ice and other environmental effects, and the concentration of fishing effort within localised areas of Subareas 48.1 and 48.2 underscore the importance of urgently progressing the harmonisation of the revised KFMA and the DIMPA. Most Members noted that overruns in catch in Subarea 48.1 were not a significant cause of the high level of catch to date.

4.4 Most Members noted the progress made since 2019 on the revised KFMA (fisheryreports.ccamlr.org), including a plan for updating biomass estimates, a mechanism for updating catch limits, and a mechanism to temporally and spatially distribute catch limits to avoid impacts on predators.

4.5 Most Members further recalled the significant progress made at the Harmonisation Symposium (HS-2024) and thanked the Co-conveners, Korea for hosting the meeting, ARK and ASOC for their financial support as well as those who participated in the Steering Committee. Most Members noted that further progress was needed to develop conservation measures to implement the DIMPA proposal and the KFMA, including to coordinate fishing vessel acoustic surveys, implement dynamic catch limits, improve the Spatial Overlap Analysis, develop fishery and land-based monitoring and establish administrative mechanisms and a sustainable budget for the Secretariat to support the harmonised approach.

4.6 Most Members supported implementation of a harmonised approach to spatial conservation and krill fishery management in the Antarctic Peninsula region, including: management units used by the HS-2024 which was based on the recommendation from WG-EMM-2024 (SC-CAMLR-43, Figure 1), implementation of the DIMPA proposal, spatial distribution of catch limits, development of improved monitoring of krill biomass and ecosystem status, improved measures for monitoring and control, and an initial implementation for a period of three years.

4.7 Russia stated its disagreement with the modalities of the harmonised approach as presented. It noted that DIMPA was submitted as a proposal under the relevant agenda item and Russia considered it premature to discuss implementation of a proposal. It pointed out that any MPA proposal should be considered separately and not within KFMA.

4.8 The Commission noted Scientific Committee discussions on the opportunity to report CCAMLR stock status to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) in 2024 for the biennial State of Stocks Index report (SC-CAMLR-43 paragraphs 2.13 to 2.16).

4.9 The Commission noted that this was the first time that CCAMLR had discussed a stock status classification method which, once the terminology, criteria and reference points are established, could serve as a transparent mechanism for tracking management progress through time. The Commission endorsed the proposal that the Secretariat develop explanatory text describing how CCAMLR manages fisheries and seek comment via a SC CIRC prior to reporting of stock status to the FAO. The Commission also noted that the Scientific Committee will further refine the CCAMLR stock status classification process.

4.10 The Commission recalled that the fishery for *D. eleginoides* in Subarea 48.3 was carried out in 2022, 2023 and 2024 in the absence of a Conservation Measure, since Conservation Measure 41-02 was not adopted for the 2021/22, 2022/23, 2023/24 fishing seasons, and that this is reflected in the table on stock status (SC-CAMLR-43, Table 1).

4.11 The Commission noted the fishery notifications for 2024/25 contained in CCAMLR-43/BG/09 Rev. 1. The Commission recalled discussions in SCIC (paragraphs 351–361) and considered the Commission decision last year to delete the first paragraph of CMs 41-09 and 41-10 (CCAMLR-42, paragraph 7.49).

4.12 The Commission noted that there was no consensus to re-instate the access paragraph in CMs 41-09 and 41-10.

Krill resources

4.13 The Commission considered the Scientific Committee's advice on updated Management Units in Subarea 48.1 (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraph 2.63), practical elements of the implementation of the revised KFMA (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraph 2.67), and consideration of the harmonised approach and its implementation (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraph 2.113).

4.14 The Commission noted the Scientific Committee's endorsement of the revised Management Units in Subarea 48.1 (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraph 2.63 and Figure 1) and that these could be adjusted in the future if required.

4.15 The Commission noted that a revised KFMA will require increased capacity at the Secretariat (CCAMLR-43/BG/07) to enable fisheries monitoring if catch limits were spread across many management units and between summer and winter. Many Members noted that a 3-year trial period was a possible way to evaluate a practical implementation and that an initial implementation of revised catch limits could be derived from work conducted during WG-EMM-2024 and HS-2024.

4.16 Russia presented paper CCAMLR-43/22, which provided comments on the harmonisation of the implementation of the revised KFMA and the establishment of the Domain 1 MPA in Subarea 48.1. Russia maintained its position on the lack of substantiation for the scientific and legal aspects of the revision of the KFMA, the establishment of the Domain 1 MPA, and the KFMA and D1MPA harmonisation scenario.

4.17 Russia presented paper CCAMLR-43/24, which provided comments on the revision of Conservation Measure 51-07. Russia noted a lack of scientific justification to revise CM 51-07 within the harmonisation process in connection to the D1MPA proposal.

4.18 The Commission considered CCAMLR-43/37, submitted by Argentina and Chile, which presented a revised proposal for a Conservation Measure establishing a Marine Protected Area in Domain 1. Noting that this proposal had first been submitted in 2018, the proponents highlighted the changes they had made following feedback from Members, the Scientific Committee and the Harmonisation Symposium (HS-2024), demonstrating their flexibility and willingness to compromise. Recalling the progress made by the Scientific Committee and the support of many Members (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraph 2.104), the proponents highlighted that there is an opportunity to reach consensus this year.

4.19 The Commission noted CCAMLR-43/29, submitted by the Co-conveners (Ms J. R. Kim (Korea) and Dr G. Watters (USA)) of the Symposium on Harmonisation of Conservation and Krill Fishery Management Initiatives in the Antarctic Peninsula Region, held in Incheon, Republic of Korea from 16 to 20 July 2024. The document presented a report of the Symposium (HS-2024) and included recommendations for further consideration by the Commission, noting that the recommendations did not represent the consensus of all participants. Dr Watters drew the Commission's attention to Recommendation 9 of the paper (Attachment I in CCAMLR-43/29) which outlined practical elements for the implementation of the harmonisation.

4.20 The Commission thanked the D1MPA proponents for their constructive engagement and their willingness to adapt their proposal to harmonise with the KFMA, Korea and the HS-2024 Co-conveners for their meeting support, and the Scientific Committee for their collaborative efforts and large amount of work. The Commission noted that the Scientific Committee had considered a range of options regarding harmonisation (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraphs 2.103 to 2.112).

4.21 Many Members expressed strong support for and willingness to move forward with the harmonisation approach as the Commission had sufficient elements at hand to endorse an initial trial.

4.22 Russia reiterated its position regarding the harmonisation approach, that the scientific and legal aspects for the harmonisation approach are unjustified, stating the need for (i) conducting comprehensive standardised surveys in Area 48 to develop a hypothesis on krill stock structure and to obtain data on both spatial and temporal patterns of krill distribution, taking into account the influence of oceanographic and environmental conditions and data on the distribution and population status parameters of dependent predators; and (ii) the development of evidence-based criteria and diagnostics for assessing the possible ecosystem impact of fishing, taking into account the mixed effects of fishing, environmental variability (or climate change) and competitive relationships between predator species. Russia argued that the best available data on comprehensive standardised surveys in Subarea 48.1 that was collected during the RV *Atlantida* 2020 cruise, provided evidence that an impact of the fishery on krill and its dependent predators in traditional fishing grounds in Subarea 48.1 was unlikely even during the summer season (February-March) (SC-CAMLR-42/07).

4.23 The Commission agreed that monitoring and data collection protocols were of great importance to the management of the krill fishery and noted the significant progress made by

WG-ASAM (WG-ASAM-2024, Appendices D–F) and by WG-EMM (WG-EMM-2024, Tables 7–8 and Figures 12–13) this year.

4.24 China noted that a 3-year implementation trial was a pragmatic approach and recalled that flexibility during this initial phase (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraph 2.18) would be beneficial. China noted that the harmonisation effort was useful, and that while the D1MPA and the KFMA shared objectives, these management tools did not need to be tied initially. Regarding the D1MPA proposal, China noted that the change of a SPZ in the Antarctic Peninsula tip area as suggested by WG-EMM-2024 to a GPZ after the HS-2024, and the change in toothfish fishing effort in Subarea 88.3 (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraph 3.108) need further deliberation.

4.25 Many Members stated their willingness to collaborate on the harmonisation approach, noting the importance of adopting a precautionary and holistic approach in the management of the krill fishery, benefiting both the conservation of the ecosystem and the sustainability of the fishery. They noted that the elements discussed in paragraph 2.104 of SC-CAMLR-43 represented a useful starting point for further deliberations.

4.26 ASOC noted that the Harmonisation Symposium benefitted from solid work by the Scientific Committee and from the robust scientific basis of the D1MPA, which includes more than 140 data layers. ASOC further noted that the Scientific Committee had outlined a reasonable way forward for further Commission discussions on precautionary catch limits and monitoring.

4.27 Oceanites welcomed the opportunity to work with CCAMLR Members and discuss how Oceanites monitors top krill predators in the region, which could help support the development of any research and monitoring plan. Oceanites have demonstrated that it is clearly possible to perform wide-ranging, successful and stratified top predator monitoring throughout the region and hope their work can help support CCAMLR's conservation mission.

4.28 ARK highlighted its continued support of krill acoustic surveys in Subareas 48.1 and 48.2, and of the revised KFMA by participating in the discussions leading to the scenarios elaborated at HS-2024 (CCAMLR-43/BG/27). ARK further highlighted CCAMLR-43/BG/26, which provided a pragmatic analysis of the effect of implementing the main HS scenario on fishing operations. ARK noted that the first result would be that fishing patterns would change drastically. The second would be that only about 50% of the catch limit for Subarea 48.1 would be caught, mainly due to the implementation of the Spatial Overlap Analysis (SOA) model and, to a lesser extent, to the D1MPA. ARK noted the discussions at the Scientific Committee which highlighted that the Spatial Overlap Analysis model requires further development. ARK argued that until such a review of the SOA is conducted, flexibility in management units (MU) catch limits was needed to account for interannual variation in krill distribution. Noting that the HS-2024 outcome represents a compromised result reached after lengthy discussions, ARK expressed hope that the Commission could consider its results as a bundled agreement. ARK noted this year marked the 6th year of the implementation of the ARK VRZs, which the Commission has recognised (CCAMLR-41, paragraph 4.19) as a valuable, precautionary industry effort, and as such, remain committed to their implementation until the harmonisation results are implemented. ARK acknowledged that the ultimate goal is implementing a fully-fledged, revised KFMA and D1MPA for Subarea 48.1 in the first stage and the whole of Area 48 in the medium term.

4.29 SCOR highlighted that the SCAR/SCOR initiative, the Southern Ocean Observing System (SOOS), stood ready to support the development of data collection plan and monitoring efforts.

4.30 Members of the Commission participated in several informal discussions, margin consultations and plenary deliberations on harmonisation of the D1MPA proposal and the krill fishery management in the Antarctic Peninsula region. The Co-conveners of informal discussions during the meeting (Ms J. R. Kim and Dr G. Watters) indicated that the following topics were considered, noting that these were agreeable to most Members:

- (i) Harmonisation consisted of three elements: KFMA, MPA, and Monitoring and control of the fishery.
- (ii) Implementation would be delayed by one year to provide time for preparation by Members, fishing companies and the Secretariat.
- (iii) During that delay, CM 51-07 would be rolled over.
- (iv) After that delay, a trial 3-year implementation would occur.
- (v) During that 3-year trial, catch limits would increase.
- (vi) Catch limits would increase only under the condition of an agreement on an MPA.
- (vii) Monitoring and control of the fishery remained to be discussed.
- (viii) If agreement was reached, the GPZ in Subarea 48.2 could be considered at a later stage.
- (ix) Harmonisation could be enacted by a single 71-xx Conservation Measure (CM), although a draft 91-xx conservation measure was prepared.
- (x) Willingness to compromise was essential.

4.31 The Commission noted the effort made by its Members in trying to find consensus within the Commission.

4.32 Some Members noted that the consideration of a ‘packaged’ CM (i.e. 71-xx) was difficult as it moved away from the concept of an MPA and highlighted that this path would result in a short timeframe for protection. They voiced concern that such CM would relate more to other fisheries management CMs than MPA CMs, and that the precautionary approach should be upheld.

4.33 China considered that the revision of the KFMA did not need to be tied directly to the adoption of an MPA and that there was no precedent for such linking. China recalled that prior to the emergence of MPA proposals, CCAMLR CMs had been effective in ensuring conservation. China recalled all the scientific efforts put in the development of the KFMA by the engagement of many Members. China noted that ARK’s VRZs will be maintained if CM 51-07 expires.

4.34 The Chair of the Commission proposed to roll over CM 51-07 for the 2024/25 season and indicated that in accordance with CM 51-07 this conservation measure will expire if no agreement is reached.

4.35 Most Members expressed concern that letting CM 51-07 lapse would not be precautionary as the trigger level could be taken in any location within Subareas 48.1 to 48.4. They recalled that the CMs concerning the krill fishery were created due to the Commission's concerns over the potential impact of the fishery on the ecosystem, and this was a foundational element of CCAMLR. These Members recalled that the Harmonisation Symposium and its terms of reference, which included inter alia to 'provide recommendations to CCAMLR for steps to harmonise the implementation of the revised krill management approach and the establishment of a D1MPA in the Antarctic peninsula region', had been endorsed by the Commission (CCAMLR-42, paragraphs 4.35 to 4.37) and that if some elements of harmonisation were to not be adopted, a rollover of CM 51-07 is required.

4.36 Russia noted that CM 51-07, in itself, does not stipulate a catch limit and that as such the precautionary elements are contained in CM 51-01.

4.37 China noted that in accordance with the CAMLR Convention, the management of marine living resources shall be science-based using ecosystem and precautionary approach. China further noted that an MPA is a relatively new tool to be used together with conventional measures to achieve the objective of the Convention, and there is no scientific basis to argue that any MPA must be established before the adoption of a fishery related Conservation Measure.

4.38 ARK voiced its disappointment at the lack of agreement on the harmonisation proposal, considering the many deliberations and significant progress made. ARK noted that letting CM 51-07 lapse was an undesirable outcome and in the wrong direction and called on all Members to continue working towards a solution.

4.39 China noted three basic points regarding conservation. First, China recognised the value of the harmonisation approach and reiterated that this approach did not require all elements of harmonisation be adopted simultaneously. China noted its investments and efforts throughout the years to progress the revision of the KFMA, and its participation in the harmonisation discussions, showing flexibility and willingness to compromise. China called upon all CCAMLR Members continue to work together in order to make progress in the future. Second, regarding the precautionary principle, China recalled that CM 51-01 stipulated a trigger level catch limit of 620 000 tonnes for Subareas 48.1 to 48.4 and considered that CM 51-01 by itself provided precautionary management of krill fishery in Area 48. Further, on the use of best available science, China recalled that the Scientific Committee had provided such advice in 2022 (SC-CAMLR-41, paragraph 3.46), including a total catch limit in Subarea 48.1 of 668 101 tonnes, and that krill fishing should be conducted on the basis of this advice. China stressed that the concept of best available science should be applied in good faith by all CCAMLR Members without taking a double-standard approach. Lastly, China noted that the expiration of CM 51-07 was not a request, but rather was a natural outcome of its text. China highlighted that the expiration of 51-07 may not drastically impact fishing operations as these are constrained by sea ice and ARK's VRZs. China stated its dissatisfaction but indicated its willingness to continue working with others to move forward in the future, recalling its contribution to MPA discussions, and hoped an agreement will be reached by consensus in the future.

4.40 The Chair noted that there was no consensus to extend CM 51-07 for one year and it will therefore expire.

4.41 Most Members expressed a willingness to roll over CM 51-07 for another year and expressed deep concern with the expiration of CM 51-07. They reiterated that the three elements of harmonisation were synergistic and interdependent, and that moving forward on a single element independently would not be precautionary. They highlighted that this was a critical moment in CCAMLR's history, where the expiration of CM 51-07 was a step backwards in conservation efforts. They further highlighted that while the current scientific understanding was that the catch limit could increase in Subarea 48.1, it was predicated on the spatial and temporal spread of the catch and on the implementation of the MPA. There was no indication that an increase in catch would be precautionary for Subareas 48.2 to 48.4, and that without CM 51-07, all the trigger level could be caught in any of these Subareas. They noted this was a serious concern. They recalled CCAMLR was a conservation organisation and that letting CM 51-07 lapse would be contrary to efforts deployed over years through international collaboration.

4.42 Russia noted its scientific contributions to the management of the krill fishery and highlighted stagnation of the revision process of CM 51-07 in spite of consideration of new scientific data.

4.43 Many Members expressed concern over the expiration of CM 51-07 which could lead to a concentration of fishing, particularly in the Bransfield and Gerlache straits. Noting the recent historic high krill catch and the ongoing climate change impacts, these Members stressed that an expiration of CM 51-07 could lead to fishing concentration and come at a cost to the ecosystem. They recalled that CM 51-07 was considered precautionary (SC-CAMLR-41, paragraph 3.52), which was not the case for CM 51-01 alone.

4.44 ASOC made the following statement

‘ASOC would like to thank all Members who have worked very hard on the harmonisation discussions over the last couple of weeks, not to mention all the work that has been done over the years prior to that. We support Members who have referred to the three key elements of this process, the KFMA, the D1MPA and CMs for monitoring and control. All of these elements are critical management components that would ensure CCAMLR is meeting its mandate in line with Article II.

We were encouraged by the constructive discussions at the Harmonisation Symposium and in recent days. Finally, we saw that progress was being made. However, as we have all seen, this progress has fallen apart. Now is a time when national governments are making bold commitments in ocean protection including at the conference of the parties of the UN Convention on Biological Diversity that is happening now. As others have noted, CCAMLR is at serious risk of taking a step backward.

It is vital that CCAMLR roll over CM 51-07 this year. Without it, the fishery is not sufficiently precautionary and Antarctic ecosystems are at risk. Thank you very much to Australia and others for their very compelling interventions that have explained the situation and what is at stake very well.

The Commission must reflect on what happened here this week. Is this the kind of outcome that Members want after all their efforts? We cannot imagine that it is. And as representatives of civil society, we do not think that this is the outcome that people around the world want either.

We encourage Members to work together in good faith to resolve this situation before the meeting ends, and to commit to meaningful dialogue in the intersessional period so that when CCAMLR meets next year, everyone's hard work will have a meaningful result.'

4.45 The Commission noted that there was no consensus to rollover of CM 51-07 for one year for the fourth consecutive year and it will therefore expire at the end of the 2023/24 season.

4.46 The Commission noted the discussions by the Scientific Committee on krill in Area 58 (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraphs 2.114 to 2.116).

4.47 Many Members recalled that this research had successfully passed all steps involved in the scientific review process by CCAMLR, including review of the research proposal, discussion of analytical results and endorsement by the Scientific Committee. They therefore noted a revision of CMs 51-02 and 51-03 could be endorsed by the Commission.

4.48 Some Members noted the need for additional surveys in the area, and that because sea ice cover restricted the area surveyed, biomass was underestimated and the proposed catch limits were likely very conservative.

4.49 The Commission did not reach consensus on updating CM 51-02 and CM 51-03.

4.50 Australia and Japan expressed their disappointment that the Commission was unable to agree on updated catch limits for krill in Divisions 58.4.1 and 58.4.2 despite the Scientific Committee recommending their adoption. Significant resources have been devoted over a number of years to preparing for and conducting the krill surveys, as well as subsequent analyses. Krill biomass estimates for Division 58.4.1, and since 2021 for Division 58.4.2-East, based on these surveys have been presented to a series of WG-ASAM and Scientific Committee meetings since 2019, which agreed that these estimates should be considered the best available estimates of krill biomass in these areas. They recalled that Article IX outlines that the Commission shall formulate, adopt and revise conservation measures on the basis of the best scientific evidence available. The Scientific Committee has provided a clear recommendation that these catch limits are based on the best available science (SC-CAMLR-42, paragraph 2.98) and that the Commission should update CM 51-02 and CM 51-03 accordingly.

4.51 Many Members expressed concern that recommendations from the Scientific Committee in line with Article IX(1)(f) of the Convention, were being blocked. These Members concluded that while consensus was not reached, there was no scientific justification for blocking these proposals, and they highlighted the importance of the predictability of decision-making based on best available science.

Fish resources

4.52 The Commission noted the Scientific Committee's discussions on the potential application of management strategy evaluation (MSE) and harvest control rules (HCRs) in CCAMLR's toothfish fisheries (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraphs 3.10 to 3.16).

4.53 The Commission noted that many Members supported the integration of HCRs into current CCAMLR Decision Rules on an interim basis until comprehensive MSEs are completed, as this approach would strengthen the toothfish decision rules when fish stocks drop below target levels.

4.54 Australia did not support an interim change to the decision rule without appropriate testing and noted that a thorough and scientifically rigorous MSE of a range of candidate HCRs is needed. Australia noted that this work should ensure the CCAMLR Decision Rules are robust to the effect of climate change and changed productivity in fish stocks, to give the Commission confidence that their approaches to fisheries management are precautionary in the long term.

4.55 The Commission expressed its support for the Scientific Committee MSE development workplan (WG-FSA-IMAF-2024, paragraph 4.48) noting that this will require the investment of considerable resources over a 2-year time frame by Members and the Scientific Committee and its Working Groups (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraph 3.15).

4.56 The Commission urged Members to ensure that the MSE development workplan is completed within the two-year timeframe as it noted that some toothfish fisheries are currently assessed as below target.

4.57 ASOC noted that the discussions on catch limits and an MSE were important to ensure that CCAMLR continue to set precautionary catch limits in line with Article II of the Convention.

4.58 COLTO made the following statement:

‘COLTO is encouraged by discussions on this issue. As operators it is in our own self-interest that these fisheries are managed sustainably, now and into the future. We urge the Commission to ensure that any changes agreed upon are tested sufficiently and in the best interests of all Members.’

4.59 The Commission noted the discussions by the Scientific Committee on convening a third Age Determination Workshop for Toothfish during the 2024/25 intersessional period (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraphs 3.19 to 3.21) and welcomed the proposed third Workshop on Age Determination Methods, noting that these are essential to the Scientific Committee workplan and for understanding toothfish population dynamics.

4.60 The Commission considered the discussions by the Scientific Committee on toothfish tagging (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraphs 3.25 to 3.28) and endorsed a revision to CM 41-01 to correctly reference the updated toothfish tagging protocol.

Statistical Area 48

4.61 The Commission considered the Scientific Committee discussion on fish stocks in Area 48 (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraphs 3.29 to 3.57).

4.62 The Commission noted the lack of consensus on a proposed research survey for *C. gunnari* in Subarea 48.2.

4.63 Ukraine made the following statement:

‘Ukraine expresses its regret that the Scientific Committee did not achieve consensus to support the Ukrainian research proposal to conduct an icefish survey in Subarea 48.2. It promised to be very interesting study with the support of the Ukrainian fishing industry. Valuable, unique data to improve our knowledge on Antarctic marine living resources could be collected, and the maximum research performance would be achievable using the great potential of international research cooperation. We express our gratitude to the CCAMLR Working Groups and many Members of the Scientific Committee for their interest and support for this research. The discussions by the Scientific Committee and its Working Group were very important and useful for research plan improvement, and we hope to present it again next year and to achieve Scientific Committee and Commission unity, allowing this study to be conducted.’

4.64 Russia expressed its gratitude for the proponents’ willingness to engage in constructive discussions to improve the design of the research proposal and noted the willingness of several Members to assist with the provision of equipment and analytical support for the survey.

4.65 The Commission endorsed the advice of the Scientific Committee that the catch limit for *C. gunnari* in Subarea 48.3 be set at 3 579 tonnes for the 2024/25 season (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraph 3.37).

4.66 The Commission noted the discussions by the Scientific Committee regarding the *D. eleginoides* fishery in Subarea 48.3 (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraphs 3.38 and 3.51).

4.67 Most Members supported the reestablishment of a conservation measure for Subarea 48.3 and considered that the proposed catch limit of 2 062 tonnes for 2024/25 and 2025/26 was based on the best available science and was consistent with the CCAMLR Decision Rules. These Members noted that there was no scientific justification for Russia to refuse consensus on the catch limits at the time of the adoption of the SC report. These Members further noted the conclusion of the independent review panels in 2018 and 2023 that the assessments of *D. eleginoides* in Subarea 48.3 were consistent with global best practice and constituted the best available science for CCAMLR to estimate status and catch limits in this fishery (SC-CAMLR-42, paragraph 2.105).

4.68 Russia noted that during the last ten years of fishing in Subarea 48.3, the basis of catches at all depths is formed by immature fish, and fish with a length of 5–7 years are already involved in the fishery. Russia noted the need for fishery-independent data on the distribution and abundance of Patagonian toothfish throughout all habitats of the toothfish in Subarea 48.3 and stressed that the need for such data was recommended in the 2018 and 2023 independent reviews and that these recommendations are not being implemented. Russia recalled its position that an international survey be carried out in Subarea 48.3 to determine a fishery-independent

assessment of the *D. eleginoides* stock in Subarea 48.3, supplementing the data on juvenile toothfish obtained from a trawl survey of demersal fish, where toothfish are only by-catch recalling that there are no other survey data on Patagonian toothfish in Subarea 48.3.

4.69 The UK made the following statement:

‘Once again we find ourselves at a frustrating impasse. Russia have previously stated that there is no science that could be done to unblock their political position and this appears to remain the case today.

As paragraph 3.39 of the Scientific Committee report states:

“The Scientific Committee concluded that the results summarised in SC-CAMLR-43/BG/13 demonstrate that there is no scientific basis to block operation of the *D. eleginoides* fishery in Subarea 48.3. Previous assertions by representatives from the Russian Federation that there have been decreases in the length of first maturity of male and female toothfish and in the average length of toothfish caught by the fishery have been disproven”.

Over the course of the last four years, we have thoroughly and scientifically addressed the concerns raised by the Russian Federation. In particular we would highlight the independent review of toothfish stock assessments, undertaken by the Centre for Independent Experts in 2023, which was partly to address the issues raised by Russia. Russia chose not to participate. That review confirmed the assessment was consistent with global best practice for establishing the status and catch limits of Patagonian toothfish in Subarea 48.3 (CCAMLR-42, paragraph 4.48).

This year an assessment and projection using the CCAMLR Decision Rules was presented to WG-FSA-IMAF-2024 (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraph 3.51). Russian scientists, although present at the meeting, did not participate in the subgroup reviewing the assessments (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraph 3.45) and blocked consensus at report adoption. The basis for blocking this was once again nothing to do with science (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraphs 3.39–3.49).

This year we have also published two papers in prestigious peer-reviewed journals that specifically address the concerns of the Russian Federation. A summary of the results was presented to the Scientific Committee as SC-CCAMLR-43/BG/13 and demonstrated that there has been no systematic change in the size of fish caught in the fishery or in the size at maturity over a 25-year period.

The statement from the Russian Scientific Committee representative that “during the last ten years of fishing in Subarea 48.3, the basis of catches at all depths is formed by immature fish, and fish with an age (sic) of 5–7 years” is factually incorrect and not supported by any evidence.

At Scientific Committee the Russian Scientific Committee representative stated that “the use of illegal fishing data in developing fishery management recommendations is not acceptable in any case and is contrary to the CAMLR Convention”. It is not for the Scientific Committee to determine the legitimacy of catches in the Convention Area, that is a matter for SCIC and the Commission, and there has been no agreement in SCIC

that this fishing is in any way illegal. Notwithstanding the provenance of the data, the catch and biological data from the fishery has been collected in a manner consistent with CMs, including with the lapsed 41-02. The data was checked by WG-FSA as part of its review of the assessment.

Finally, it is worth noting that this is one of the longest-standing toothfish fisheries in the Convention Area and is demonstrably sustainable. Scientific work undertaken in this fishery has provided the basis for management of toothfish stocks in other Subareas and Divisions and there is no difference between the management of toothfish in 48.3 with any other stock in the Convention Area.’

4.70 Argentina made the following statement:

‘Argentina believes that it would not be a good idea to reopen a long discussion, in which each party expressed its position. Argentina's position was expressed very clearly in the SCIC report, and we refer to it. Hopefully, we can adopt a Conservation Measure such as 41-02 in Subarea 48.3, since all the scientific evidence is available to allow us to adopt this Conservation Measure again. The adoption of this measure would enable the fishing of Patagonian toothfish in this Subarea and, consequently, would allow us to avoid repeating the problem related to compliance.’

4.71 Russia recalled their statements from CCAMLR-42 (paragraphs 4.49 and 4.50):

‘The Russian Federation considers it of utmost importance that the management of Antarctic marine living resources to be in accordance with Article II of the Convention based on a balance between conservation and rational use. The Russian Federation has presented a number of documents at CCAMLR meetings reflecting its position on the management of toothfish resources in Subarea 48.3.

Russia questions whether the application of the decision rules to the toothfish stock in Subarea 48.3 was consistent with rational use of the resource, emphasising that the independent review panel had not provided an answer to this issue. Russia agreed that the *D. eleginoides* assessment in Subarea 48.3 represented the best available science but maintained its position that the data used in the assessment are neither the best nor sufficient science for CCAMLR to make decisions regarding the status and catch limits for this stock. Russia stated that there are still unresolved issues regarding the recruitment status and the lack of biological data based on the entire stock distribution in that Subarea, recalling that this uncertainty of the data in Subarea 48.3 was also indicated in the 2018 independent review. Russia maintained its position on the need to conduct a joint international survey of toothfish in Subarea 48.3 and this survey would cover the entire population habitats of *D. eleginoides* in Subarea 48.3 to provide data for the toothfish assessment.

The Russian Federation has repeatedly indicated that since 2002–2004, the longline fishery for toothfish in Subarea 48.3 is based on recruiting fish, and the population of Patagonian toothfish in Subarea 48.3 needs to be protected through the imposition of catch limits and changes to conservation measures. The precautionary approach to the use of stocks in the CCAMLR area, as it is currently applied, does not ensure the rational use of toothfish resources, as demonstrated by the scientific and fishery evidence.

Specific proposals from the Russian Federation regarding the regulation of toothfish fishery in Subarea 48.3 (limiting the size of Patagonian toothfish in catches, fishing only at depths of 1000 m, reducing the Total Allowable Catch (TAC) to 500 tonnes, according to the fishing grounds with depths from 1000 to 2250 m; conducting an international survey to assess toothfish stock) (SC-XXXVII/14 Rev. 2) were ignored. The Russian Federation deeply regrets that these proposals aimed at preserving toothfish stocks in Subarea 48.3 did not find support from a number of CCAMLR Members.

The Russian Federation also regretted that the 2023 Independent Review Panel did not consider the extent to which available data and decision-making rules support the ration use of the toothfish stock in Subarea 48.3, despite the existing disagreements regarding this issue. The Russian Federation recalled that it was not the initiator of the 2023 Independent Review Panel but proposed an international survey of toothfish in Subarea 48.3.

The Russian Federation, as a forced but necessary measure, does not support the proposal to establish a catch limit for toothfish in Subarea 48.3 for 2024/25. The Russian Federation maintains its position on the need to review the use of the Patagonian toothfish stock in the CCAMLR area (Subarea 48.3), as the existing approach does not ensure the rational use of this living resource.’

4.72 Many Members agreed that there was no scientific basis not to agree a catch limit for Subarea 48.3 and recalled paragraph 3.39 of the report of the Scientific Committee confirming its conclusion that there was no scientific basis to block the catch limit.

4.73 The Commission did not reach consensus on the establishment of catch limits for this fishery.

4.74 COLTO made the following statement:

‘We would like to align ourselves with most of the previous speakers and we would like to especially thank the UK Delegation for their continued attempts in trying to find solutions to unblock this unscientific impasse we have found ourselves in in recent years. We lament that Russia has continued to block the sustainably managed fishery in Subarea 48.3 on unscientific grounds and we urge the Commission to adopt catch advice for Subarea 48.3 and reestablish Conservation Measure 41-02.’

4.75 The Commission endorsed the advice of the Scientific Committee that the catch limit for *D. mawsoni* in Subarea 48.4 be set at 37 tonnes for the 2024/25 season based on an updated estimate of local biomass and precautionary harvest rate (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraph 3.53).

4.76 The Commission endorsed the advice of the Scientific Committee that the catch limit for *D. eleginoides* in Subarea 48.4 remain at 19 tonnes for the 2024/25 season (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraph 3.54).

4.77 The Commission endorsed the advice of the Scientific Committee on continuing the research fishing in Subarea 48.6, and that the catch limits be set at 152 tonnes in Research Block 486_2, 50 tonnes in Research Block 486_3, 151 tonnes in Research Block 486_4, and 242 tonnes in Research Block 486_5 in the 2024/25 season (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraph 3.57).

Statistical Area 58

4.78 The Commission endorsed the advice of the Scientific Committee that the catch limit for *C. gunnari* in Division 58.5.2 be set at 1 824 tonnes for 2024/25 and 1 723 tonnes for 2025/26 seasons (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraph 3.60).

4.79 The Commission considered the advice of the Scientific Committee on the exploratory fishery for *D. mawsoni* in Divisions 58.4.1 and 58.4.2 (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraphs 3.63 to 3.73).

4.80 The Commission endorsed the advice of the Scientific Committee that the catch limits for *D. mawsoni* in Division 58.4.2 be based on the trend analysis as shown in Table 4 of SC-CAMLR-43 (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraph 3.73).

4.81 Russia noted that the *D. mawsoni* fishery in Division 58.4.1 requires the use of standardised gear as outlined in Conservation Measure 24-01, Annex A, as fishing in this area operates under Conservation Measure 21-02, paragraph 6(iii). Russia further noted that this fishery should be considered as a new fishery given fishing activity had not taken place in this area for more than the last two seasons under Conservation Measure 21-01, paragraph 1.

4.82 Most Members expressed disappointment regarding the repeated blocking of this fishery by Russia, and further noted that they disagreed with the assertion that the *D. mawsoni* fishery in Division 58.4.1 should be considered a new fishery, as Conservation Measure 41-11 clearly identifies Division 58.4.1 as an exploratory fishery, recalling the view of the SC Chair to SCIC-2024 (paragraph 372) on this question. These Members further noted that the fishery in Division 58.4.1 does not meet the definitions provided in Conservation Measure 21-01. These Members noted that data collection from that fishery was needed to develop a stock assessment and provide support to ecosystem monitoring in this area. They further noted that the disagreement was not supported by scientific rationale, and that CCAMLR often required the use of fishing vessels to collect data and achieve its objectives.

4.83 The UK made the following statement:

‘Once again, Russia is trying to undermine established processes and procedures within the CCAMLR framework. The Scientific Committee has agreed catch limits in accordance with the best available science, yet Russia continues to block the fishery, on this occasion using the excuse of needing gear standardisation. On their proposal to redefine the classification of fisheries, it would be good to move from the current classification of fisheries that Russia blocks, and fisheries it does not.’

4.84 The Commission endorsed the advice of the Scientific Committee on the fishery for *D. eleginoides* in Division 58.5.2 (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraph 3.92), that the catch limit be set at 2 120 tonnes for the 2024/25 and 2025/26 seasons and that the prohibition of directed fishing outside areas of national jurisdiction for *D. eleginoides*, described in CM 32-02, remain in force in 2024/25.

4.85 The Commission endorsed the advice of the Scientific Committee that no new information was available on the state of fish stocks in Division 58.5.1 and Subareas 58.6 outside areas of national jurisdiction and that the prohibition of directed fishing for

D. eleginoides, described in CM 32-02, remain in force in 2024/25 (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraph 3.93).

Statistical Area 88

4.86 The Commission noted the Scientific Committee discussions on the Ross Sea Region data collection plan and endorsed a modification to Conservation Measure 41-09 to facilitate the delivery of the Ross Sea Data Collection Plan by vessels and scientific observers (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraph 3.98).

4.87 The Commission endorsed the 2024 Ross Sea shelf survey (RSSS) catch limit of 99 tonnes (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraph 3.100), and its allocation as per method 3 of Table 5.

4.88 The Commission endorsed the advice of the Scientific Committee that the catch limit for the Ross Sea Region (Subarea 88.1 and SSRUs 882A–B) be set at 3 278 tonnes for the 2024/25 and 2025/26 seasons (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraph 3.106) based on the outcome of the assessment (SC-CAMLR-41, Annex 9, paragraph 5.66).

4.89 The Commission endorsed the advice of the Scientific Committee that the catch limits for Subarea 88.2 SSRUs 882C–H for the 2024/25 season be based on the trend analysis as shown in Table 4 of SC-CAMLR-43 (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraph 3.107).

4.90 The Commission endorsed the advice of the Scientific Committee on the continuation of the research in Subarea 88.3 and that the catch limits for Subarea 88.3 be based on the trend analysis as shown in Table 4 of SC-CAMLR-43 (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraphs 3.108 and 3.109). The Commission noted that the dynamics of the removal and addition of Research Blocks in Subarea 88.3 should be considered as a component in the harmonisation process of DIMPA proposal and Krill Fishery Management (paragraphs 4.18 to 4.51).

Fisheries classifications

4.91 The Commission considered CCAMLR-43/33, submitted by Russia, proposing the Commission review the procedural and implementational aspects of *D. mawsoni* fisheries classifications in the regulatory framework and establish the status of existing fisheries (to clarify fishery nomenclature). Russia argued the outcome of the first stage should be a CCAMLR regulatory framework approved by the Commission in its entirety, including the procedural and implementational aspects of fisheries classification. The outcome of stage two should be a status allocated to each existing fishery in the Convention Area as approved by the Commission.

4.92 Many Members noted that the reclassification of fisheries is not without merit, however the proposal by Russia was not consistent with the status of existing fisheries and they did not support the proposal.

4.93 The Commission considered CCAMLR-43/33, submitted by Australia, Japan and the Republic of Korea, which proposed a new Annex to Conservation Measure 21-02, specifying the requirements for research plans submitted under Conservation Measures 21-02, paragraph

6(iii), rather than using the format currently required, which is specified in Conservation Measure 24-01, Annex 24-01/A Format 2.

4.94 Many Members expressed their support for the proposal noting that it would clarify requirements for vessels operating under Conservation Measure 21-02 and simplify the review process by the Scientific Committee and its Working Groups.

4.95 Russia did not support the proposal, noting that in its view it was necessary to begin by revising the general principles of fishery classifications, before considering more detailed requirements for individual fishery types.

Non-target species

Fish and invertebrates

4.96 The Commission noted the discussions of the Scientific Committee on by-catch management in krill fisheries (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraphs 4.1–4.4).

4.97 Many Members agreed that it is important to understand the by-catch of all species that are not targeted, including small fish, particularly for species and areas that have been historically overfished.

Seabirds and marine mammals

4.98 The Commission noted the incidental mortality associated with fishing (IMAF) reported in the CAMLR Convention Area (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraph 4.5) and expressed concern regarding the mortality of three whales, including two humpback whales and the first ever recorded mortality of a minke whale, in addition to six southern elephant seals and a third humpback whale that was released alive with injuries likely to compromise its long-term survival. The Commission noted that this highlights the importance and the need for the implementation of a robust scheme of scientific observation across all fisheries.

4.99 The Commission noted the discussions of the Scientific Committee on the derogation of the prohibition on net monitoring cables (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraphs 4.8 to 4.13), including the proposal to revise CM 25-03 as presented in CCAMLR-43/46.

4.100 The Commission endorsed the recommendations of the Scientific Committee to maintain the derogation of the prohibition of use of net monitoring cables in CM 25-03 (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraph 4.13) and to differentiate the requirements for the vessels *Antarctic Endurance* and *Antarctic Sea* from the other vessels participating in the trials designed to mitigate seabird strikes caused by net monitoring cables (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraph 4.9). The Commission encouraged Norway to improve the mitigation on the *Saga Sea* to reduce the level of seabird strikes. The Commission noted that a new annex could be developed for CM 25-03 which lists the vessels for which the derogation of the prohibition of using a net monitoring cable applies, provided these vessels use mitigation measures with demonstrated effectiveness.

4.101 Russia expressed concern about compliance status of the Norwegian vessels mentioned in the draft Provisional Compliance Report with regard to CM 25-03.

4.102 Norway reserved its right to respond to Russia's comment under the relevant agenda item.

4.103 The Commission requested the Scientific Committee to review the classification of warp strikes and to develop metrics and mitigation specifications that can be used to determine whether the mitigation device trials by individual vessels have been successful.

4.104 The Commission endorsed the recommendation by the Scientific Committee to clarify the requirements for the use of marine mammal exclusion devices in CMs 51-01, 51-02, 51-03 and 51-04 (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraph 4.20).

Gear specifications and diagrams

4.105 The Commission noted the inconsistency in CM 25-02 between the gear specifications and the diagrams provided for Spanish and trotline longline gear configurations and endorsed the recommendation by the Scientific Committee to update CM 25-02 with revised diagrams (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraph 4.27).

Bottom fishing and vulnerable marine ecosystems

4.106 The Commission endorsed the recommendation by the Scientific Committee to add the Lambda Island location as set out in WG-EMM-2024/48 Rev. 1, Annex 1 to the CCAMLR vulnerable marine ecosystems (VME) registry (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraph 4.32).

Ecosystem monitoring

4.107 The Commission noted CCAMLR-43/BG/28 Rev.1, submitted by ARK, which proposed an economically sustainable strategy for the long-term monitoring of krill populations as required by the revised KFMA. Noting the commitment required to regularly survey all Subarea 48.1 MUs (about 50 ship-days-year), ARK suggested a compensation scheme for vessels conducting surveys. This compensation, in tonnes of krill, calculated as the product of their historical Catch Per Unit Effort (CPUE) and the number of days spent surveying, would be deducted from the catch limit assigned to MUs and allocated to the vessels participating in the survey.

Spatial management

5.1 The EU and its Member States presented CCAMLR-43/BG/35 describing the benefits of large-scale (using a working definition of areas greater than 100 000 km²) Marine Protected Areas. These included:

- (i) better effectiveness in achieving ecological benefits and conserving biodiversity conservation by protecting entire large-scale system processes;
- (ii) increasing climate resilience, mitigation and adaptation by providing refugia where impacts are delayed allowing more time for adaptation;
- (iii) socio-economic benefits as larger areas are less expensive per unit area to manage and increased fish abundance can yield more cost-effective fisheries; and
- (iv) research and science benefits from establishing more encompassing natural laboratories to improve understanding of ecosystems function.

5.2 Considering these benefits, the EU and its Member States renewed their call for Members to reach agreement on designating the Marine Protected Areas proposed in East Antarctica, the Weddell Sea and the Western Antarctic Peninsula. They noted that these proposals would make a key contribution to achieving CCAMLR's objective of establishing a representative system of MPAs in the Convention Area.

5.3 The Commission noted that the Scientific Committee had reviewed the paper to discuss its scientific content (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraphs 6.1 to 6.4).

5.4 Many Members noted that the benefits described in the paper are all relevant to the objective of the Convention. These Members noted that there is an increasing body of evidence that MPAs have a critical role in mitigating the impacts of climate change and enhancing the resilience of ecosystems and species. These Members also noted that large MPAs better protect wide-ranging and highly mobile species, ecological processes at large-scales, provide socio-economic benefits including by ensuring the sustainability of fish stocks. They are also essential to achieving global conservation and biodiversity goals such as 30 by 30 (UN Convention on Biodiversity) as well as to the objectives of the Agreement under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea on the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Marine Biological Diversity of Areas beyond National Jurisdiction (BBNJ Agreement).

5.5 Some Members noted that the concept of MPAs was not mentioned in the Convention and the concept of large-scale MPAs was not included in CM 91-04 and stated absence of value of large-scale MPAs for the achievement of the objective of the Convention. They also noted that the scale is not a fundamental element of MPAs. As all except one of the large-scale MPA examples cited in the paper were within national jurisdictions, they cannot be used to justify the situation of large-scale MPAs in high seas, and the information presented in this paper lacks scientific grounds. They further noted that MPAs are not necessary to address the impacts of climate change within the Convention Area and that those impacts can be addressed through existing conservation measures as set out in the Convention.

5.6 Most Members recalled that MPAs including large-scale MPAs are an established part of CCAMLR's work as evidenced by the existing MPAs, the existing MPA framework, and with the Commission's work to designate a representative system of MPAs, consistent with the Convention. At the time of adoption Argentina recalled that the reference was to Convention Article IX(2)(g).

5.7 ASOC noted that CCAMLR-43/BG/35 provided an excellent summary of the extensive body of peer-reviewed science that demonstrates the effectiveness and benefits of large-scale

MPAs. It was also clear in the paper that such MPAs were necessary to effectively protect ecosystems and species in an era of rapid climate change. ASOC urged CCAMLR to recommit to establishing a representative network of MPAs and thereby contribute to global targets such as 30 by 30.

Review of existing Marine Protected Areas

5.8 CCAMLR-SM-III/09, presented by Russia, provided suggestions on the format and content of the RSRMPA RMP. These included the need for clarification and analysis of data hosted on the CCAMLR MPA Information Repository (CMIR) in the context of the feasibility of implementing the key research categories in the MPA, the need for quantitative characteristics including justification, description and quantification of key or test indicators to be monitored, rationale and description of indicators and criteria for achieving the objectives and effectiveness of the MPA at the start of establishing the MPA, the establishment of guidelines in CM 91-05 that outline the steps and resources required to establish catch limits for conducting resource surveys that align with the MPA's objectives, and suggestions regarding the structure of the research and monitoring plan (RMP). The authors noted that, in their opinion, the absence of the RSRMPA Research and Monitoring Plan approved by the Scientific Committee and the Commission, in principle, makes it impossible to assess the effectiveness of the MPA's performance and to adopt the Report for the first review period in 2027.

5.9 Many Members noted that the Research and Monitoring Plan for the Ross Sea Region MPA (RSRMPA RMP) is based on the best available science and was adopted by the Scientific Committee in 2017 and is currently in use, supporting significant ongoing research with more than 20 Members involved. They noted that the RMP is a living document and can be contributed to by any Member and urged adoption of the RMP by the Commission.

5.10 Some Members noted that the RSRMPA RMP has not yet been adopted by the Commission, and without an RMP Members may be unable to undertake coordinated research and monitoring activities in accordance with the plan. They also noted the indicators and criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of the Ross Sea Region MPA still need to be improved, the principle of cost-effectiveness should be kept in mind, and the data obtained from RMP should be adequate for the review purpose. They further noted that without an RMP, there was no mechanism to evaluate the effectiveness of the MPA.

5.11 The UK summarised papers SC-CAMLR-43/01 and SC-CAMLR-43-BG/03 regarding the 2024 review of the South Orkney Island Southern Shelf MPA (SOISSMPA), noting that implementation, research and review of CCAMLR MPAs is a collective responsibility. The authors concluded that the MPA had been effective and encouraged the Commission to endorse the RMP included in the paper. The authors further recommended that CM 91-03 is maintained in its current form until the next review in 2029 or until appropriate alternative measures are agreed as part of the D1MPA and harmonisation processes.

5.12 Russia summarised paper SC-CAMLR-43/09, noting that the SOISSMPA was adopted in 2009 under unique circumstances and prior to the agreement of CM 91-04, so the objectives and the RMP were not developed in line with CM 91-04 and therefore needed to be revised through a new conservation measure. Russia also noted that the absence of the SOISSMPA

Research and Monitoring Plan approved by the Scientific Committee and the Commission makes it impossible to assess the effectiveness of the MPA's performance and to adopt the Report for the third review period 2020–2024 repeating the same situation with the lack of reporting for previous periods (2009–2014, 2015–2019). The SOISS MPA operates under CM 91-03 without transitioning to CM 91-04 (2011). As long as the SOISS MPA is governed by CM 91-03, its existence does not depend on the presence and implementation of the Research and Monitoring Plan nor on the performance in achieving the objectives of the MPA for each reporting period.

5.13 The Commission noted the review of these papers by the Scientific Committee (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraphs 6.16–6.20).

5.14 Many Members considered that the SOISSMPA was the first step towards a representative system of MPAs and that there was no current need to revise CM 91-03. They noted that reviews have shown that the MPA is meeting its objectives, and that the RMP was already being implemented and should be adopted by the Commission.

5.15 Some Members considered that although the MPA had been reviewed in 2014, 2019 and 2024, the data analysis provided was insufficient for the conservation objectives and that data on more topics and consistent reporting was needed. These Members noted that the reviews of 2014, 2019 and 2024 were not endorsed.

Proposals for new Marine Protected Areas

5.16 CCAMLR-43/41, submitted by China, proposed a step-by-step approach to progress establishment of new MPAs in the CAMLR Convention Area. The first step of the approach entailed improving CM 91-04 inter alia a definition of CCAMLR MPAs, identifying required baseline data, requirements of a research and monitoring plan, and defining a period of designation for MPAs. The second step involved revising existing and new MPA proposals to meet the new criteria, the third step involved reviewing the revised MPA proposals.

5.17 Most Members noted that CCAMLR has an existing framework for the design, designation, and review of MPAs which is flexible to accommodate different MPA objectives in different regions, has high scientific standards utilising the best available science, and provides a holistic approach for the development and implementation of an appropriate research and monitoring plan. They considered that CM 91-04 was effective and fit for this purpose and did not need to be revised. Those Members agreed that the existing MPA proposals are based on the best available science, have been extensively modified in response to feedback, and should be adopted to advance the Commission's work to establish a representative system of MPAs.

5.18 Most Members noted that progress on the implementation of a representative system of MPAs in the Convention Area had been hampered by focusing on the designation process, despite the process being clearly set out in CM 91-04. Members remained open to additional discussion of concrete recommendations for progress towards a reasonable timeline for MPA adoption and suggested those Members who wanted further clarification on the process develop a worked example of a proposal that meets any potential additional requirements proposed in CCAMLR-43/41 which would demonstrate the intent of the proposed revised process.

5.19 Some Members noted CM 91-04 had been adopted in 2011 and that many issues related to its implementation and interpretation remain unresolved since then. They considered that CCAMLR-43/41 reflected progress from the special meeting in Chile and presented a fresh outlook to improve CM 91-04 and generate an alternative pathway towards consensus. As an example, they noted that the MPA duration should be specified and that when it is specified it should be consistent among proposals.

5.20 Russia presented its paper, CCAMLR-43/36, based on CCAMLR-SM-III/07, and presented draft amendments to CM 91-04 ‘General framework for the establishment of CCAMLR MPAs’. These included the need to adopt a definition of ‘Marine Protected Areas in the Convention Area’, to elaborate a framework on the establishment and revision of MPAs with clear criteria related inter alia to sufficient scientific evidence necessary to define conservation needs as required by the Convention and on the basis of detailed bio-regionalisation of the Convention Area. The document stressed the importance of sufficient procedural and implementation measures to implement a unified process for the science-based designation of MPAs and regulation of their operation by CCAMLR. The proposed amendments reflected in four additional annexes: (i) legal management aspects of MPAs in the Convention Area, (ii) benchmark checklist to regulate the unified process for the establishment and operation of MPAs in the CCAMLR area, (iii) MPA Management Plan and, (iv) MPA RMP.

5.21 China noted that CCAMLR-43/36 and CCAMLR-43/41 both recommended developing a definition for CCAMLR MPAs and could be a good way forward.

5.22 Many Members noted, as in previous years (CCAMLR-SM-III, paragraphs 3.2–3.9), that the concept of ‘sufficient science’ is not the standard in the Convention (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraph 6.7) and that CCAMLR had a good understanding of what comprises an MPA. They expressed concern that the bar for research needed to establish MPAs is impossibly high. These Members noted that the current CM 91-04 was an operational and effective framework and is appropriate to progress MPAs now. They suggested that a joint proposal for a conservation measure could be developed by China and Russia, taking into account the feedback other Members expressed on this topic.

5.23 Australia presented paper CCAMLR-43/44, on behalf of the co-proponents the EU and its Member States, India, New Zealand, Norway, Korea, Ukraine, the UK, the USA and Uruguay, as a draft conservation measure for an East Antarctic Marine Protected Area (EAMPA). The proposal was first submitted in 2012 and has been amended significantly over the past 12 years in response to comments and feedback of Members during previous Commission meetings.

5.24 Chile appreciated the work that has been done by the Members involved in this proposal and joined the proposal as co-sponsors. Many Members welcomed the support of Chile in progressing this MPA proposal.

5.25 Many Members noted that the EAMPA proposal has been refined over the past years, incorporating new scientific information and feedback from previous meetings. They noted significant environmental changes occurring in this region, and that the changes have consequences for the pelagic and benthic ecosystems of the continental shelf and underlined the urgent need for this MPA to conserve living resources in this region. They noted the MPA would create scientific reference areas, support the region’s resilience to the impacts of climate

change, and conserve the productive coastal and oceanic food webs and diverse seafloor habitats in the region. They noted that the proposed conservation measure creates a comprehensive and adaptive management framework, with clear timeframes for implementation and review. They further noted that the EAMPA is a mature proposal based on the best available science and is therefore ready for adoption by the Commission.

5.26 Some Members noted that their substantive comments had not yet been taken into account. They questioned the status of the best available science, in particular its relevance at the present time and for the whole area of the proposed MPA and suggested that threats from fisheries needed to be demonstrated and that a sunset clause had to be included in the proposal. They suggested that the proposal required separate CMs with an RMP for each area within the EAMPA. They also noted that establishing an MPA could not provide protection against the impacts of climate change.

5.27 Many Members noted that CCAMLR's precautionary and ecosystem-based approach to management does not require a threat to be identified for MPAs to be adopted, for example to protect representative habitats. They highlighted that the current proposal was improved significantly based on extensive collaboration and compromise among all Members involved and encouraged further constructive collaboration in order to protect this pristine environment. They also reaffirmed the important role MPAs can play in increasing resilience to climate change by reducing other stressors.

5.28 ASOC thanked France for a compelling summary of the urgent need for this MPA and noted that the proposal had been ready for adoption for a long time, and therefore should be designated without delay.

5.29 Germany presented the paper CCAMLR-43/02, on behalf of the EU and its Member States, Norway, Uruguay, Australia, the UK, New Zealand, the USA, Korea, India, Ukraine and Chile, a draft conservation measure for a Weddell Sea Marine Protected Area (WSMPA) – Phase 1. The proponents recalled that the proposal conforms to the requirements of CM 91-04 and based on the best available science, including the priority elements for the research and monitoring plan (RMP). Further information about the WSMPA Phase 1 proposal is available at <https://wsmpa.de/en> and baseline data are available on Pangea.

5.30 Some Members noted that MPAs cannot protect from the effects of climate change and that much of the area is already closed under other conservation measures. They further noted that no threats have been identified, their previous comments had not been taken into account (CCAMLR-42, paragraph 5.13), in particular a sunset clause for the MPA has not been identified, and a Research and Monitoring Plan was not submitted.

5.31 Most Members noted that the WSMPA Phase 1 area is an important largely pristine, area of the global ocean and requires immediate protection. They considered that climate change constitutes a strong ecosystem threat. Many Members and the proponents had been responsive in adapting the proposal to feedback from Members and considered the proposal is therefore ready for adoption by the Commission. Many Members noted that sunset clauses are clearly not required to establish an MPA CM 91-04.

5.32 Some Members pointed out a lack of information on potential or existing benefits of the MPA and highlighted that scientific activities actually may be carried out in the area.

5.33 ASOC noted the many comments from Members that clearly demonstrated why the Weddell Sea region was a critical part of the representative system of MPAs that CCAMLR has agreed to create, and that it was clear that it needs to be designated.

5.34 Norway presented the paper CCAMLR-43/47 Rev. 1, on behalf of the proponents, Norway and the UK, which presented a revised draft conservation measure for a Weddell Sea Marine Protected Area Phase 2 (WSMPA Phase 2). They noted it has been subject to continued improvement thanks to feedback provided by Members since CCAMLR-42.

5.35 The Commission noted the improvements included in this proposal reviewed by the Scientific Committee (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraphs 6.23–6.29).

5.36 Many Members noted that the proponents had been very responsive to Member concerns and feedback, including through an RMP workshop in April 2024, which was collaborative and transparent. They welcomed Australia as a co-sponsor of the proposal. These Members noted that the baseline data were available through their online atlas (<https://tryggve.npolar.no/web/maudatlas/Atlas.html>) and that many Members of the Scientific Committee considered that the proposal was based on the best available science and met the requirements specified in CM 91-04 and is therefore ready for adoption by the Commission. They considered that MPAs are useful tools for CCAMLR and that the goal of Commission discussions on MPAs should be on implementation and not on designation.

5.37 Some Members noted that further work was needed to specify the indicators used in the RMP and that the Scientific Committee had not reached consensus (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraphs 6.28–6.29). They considered that the comments made regarding the WSMPA Phase 1 proposal applied to this proposal as well in that the conservation needs were not identified and there was no timeframe specified for the MPA duration as CM 91-05 provided a good example of the sunset clause needed. They noted that more baseline data were needed to describe the current state as some data sources such as marine mammal abundance data were not updated.

5.38 ASOC noted its appreciation of the inclusive and transparent approach of the proponents and noted that the proposal has matured over time. ASOC further noted that the proposal met the requirements of CM 91-04 and was developed using an incredible amount of science. As the proposal was based on the best available science and had many positive elements to ensure marine protection, ASOC encouraged CCAMLR Members to join as co-proponents and to progress it.

5.39 The Commission noted CCAMLR-43/37, presented by Argentina and Chile, describing a revised D1MPA proposal following discussions at the HS-2024. The proponents had revised the proposal since the HS-2024 to take feedback into account and had provided new analysis in support of the conservation objectives based on the Harmonisation Symposium recommendations. Further discussion on a harmonised approach is reported under paragraphs 4.18 to 4.51.

5.40 The Commission considered CCAMLR-42/37, also submitted as CCAMLR-SM-III/06, which indicated that Russia could not support the D1MPA proposal as this proposal does not contain any evidence of threats from fishing or other anthropogenic impacts, as well as threats from climate change to marine living resources, which require the urgency of ensuring their protection through the establishment of MPA and moreover, MPAs cannot ensure protection

from climate change impacts. The authors noted that there are substantive issues in the rationale for the establishment of the D1MPA that remain unresolved including that most data used were from prior to 2012 and had not been evaluated by the Scientific Committee, the management plan does not contain sufficient procedural and implementation measures, the D1MPA proposal should be accompanied by a Research and Monitoring Plan, not expected to be submitted within the next few years..

5.41 Many Members noted that the paper Russia presented was responding to a version of the proposal from 2023 and that the D1MPA proposal had been significantly revised since then following discussions of WG-EMM and the Harmonisation Symposium. They noted that it was not necessary for a conservation organisation to prove threats prior to implementing an MPA. They further noted that CCAMLR should take a precautionary approach in its response to climate change and the effects of fisheries and that the D1MPA would make a significant contribution to a representative system of MPAs in the Convention Area.

5.42 Some Members considered that the conservation objectives of the proposal were not clearly identified and that there were a series of information gaps that needed to be addressed. They also noted that while they wished to move forward, more discussion was required, especially regarding the status of information in Subarea 88.3, and the sunset provision for the proposed MPA.

5.43 ASOC noted its appreciation of the positive discussions on this proposal. ASOC also noted that it was clear in the scientific literature that MPAs increase the resilience of ecosystems to climate change, which was very important for the rapidly warming Antarctic Peninsula region. ASOC looked forward to successful outcomes on this proposal at this meeting.

Other spatial management issues

5.44 The USA presented paper CCAMLR-43/08, which provided a workflow pathway for transmitting a draft ASPA or ASMA management plan between the ATCM and CCAMLR where the ASPA or ASMA contains an applicable marine area. The paper recommended that the CCAMLR Secretariat be the designated recipient for proposed ASPAs and ASMAs that contain an applicable marine area, as defined by ATCM Decision 9 (2005), and that when such a proposal is received, the Antarctic Treaty (AT) Secretariat forward it to the CCAMLR Secretariat for submission to SC-CAMLR and its relevant Working Groups for consideration. SC-CAMLR would then provide advice to the Commission. The paper recommended that the CCAMLR Secretariat transmit the results of the Commission's review to the AT Secretariat for CEP and ATCM consideration. Noting that several of the ASPA proposals endorsed by the Commission since the last time Annex CM 91-02/A was updated have now been approved by ATCM, the paper recommended that the Commission charge the Secretariat with updating the list of ASPAs and ASMAs on the CCAMLR website rather than in Annex 91-02/A, and with keeping it updated thereafter.

5.45 The Commission noted the review of this proposal by the Scientific Committee did not reach consensus (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraphs 6.33–6.36).

5.46 Many Members supported the proposal, noting that the current process is confusing and time consuming. Many Members considered that the proposed process is simple, practical,

could enhance coordination and would avoid unnecessary delays, noting that there are limited circumstances where proposed management plans would include applicable marine areas, requiring CCAMLR to review. Further, they noted that the proposed process would remain proponent driven and clarified that the proposed process would allow for the CCAMLR consideration of a draft ASPA or ASMA management plan if the CEP proponent was not a CCAMLR Member with access to CCAMLR meetings.

5.47 Some Members considered that the proposal presented substantive changes to the ATCM rules including Resolution 1 (2024), in particular by transferring the role of proponents to the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat. These Members noted that CCAMLR Rules of Procedure should be followed with respect to submission and consideration of papers and considered it inappropriate to task the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat as proposed.

5.48 Russia noted that the proposal was inconsistent with ATCM rules that set out ‘proponents should make arrangements to ensure that any feedback from CCAMLR is available before the proposal is considered by the CEP’. Russia emphasised the role of proponents in the procedure. Russia further noted that ASPA and ASMA as instruments of ATCM and not CCAMLR should be listed on the ATS website.

5.49 One Member suggested that the proposal should first be discussed in the ATCM.

5.50 Most Members recommended that the AT and CCAMLR Secretariats consult to develop alternative processes and report to the Commission in 2025. The Commission did not reach consensus on this issue.

5.51 The Commission noted CCAMLR-43/10, by the Secretariat, that noted Annex 91-02/A needs to be updated as several ASPAs and ASMAs have changed status or been modified. The Commission requested that Annex 91-02/A be updated.

5.52 The Commission also noted in CCAMLR-43/10 that the Arrangement with South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation (SPRFMO) should be renewed for another three years.

Impacts of climate change on the conservation of Antarctic marine living resources

6.1 The Commission noted the Scientific Committee’s discussions on climate change (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraphs 7.1–7.11).

6.2 Most Members welcomed the incorporation of tasks identified during WS-CC-2023 into the workplans of the Scientific Committee and its Working Groups, the future publication of tables summarising evidence for changes in stock assessment and population parameters or processes that could be due to the effects of environmental variability or climate change in the Fishery Reports, as well as the planned joint CEP/SC-CAMLR climate change and monitoring workshop.

6.3 The Commission noted CCAMLR-43/BG/12, submitted by Oceanites, which presented a summary of the organisation’s activities in the last year including updates to the Mapping Application for Penguin Populations and Projected Dynamics (MAPPPD; www.penguinmap.com), the development of 3-dimensional photogrammetry images

(oceanites.nira.app/gallery), the development of an R library (`mappdr`) to access their database and the latest State of Antarctic Penguins report (<https://www.oceanites.org/research-portal/state-of-antarctic-penguins-reports>).

6.4 The Commission thanked Oceanites for their continued engagement, noted the value of their long-term dataset as well as their invitation to collaborate on predator monitoring.

6.5 The Commission noted SC-CAMLR-43/BG/15, submitted by SCAR, which presented an update on recent research and SCAR activities relevant to CCAMLR including recent research and observational updates, the development of a climate model framework, the establishment of a new SCAR Action Group on Fish (SCARFISH), the development of a range of Antarctic Climate Indicators, and the establishment of a new SCAR Action Group on Climate to assess and report on emerging policy-relevant issues.

6.6 The Commission thanked SCAR for their frequent updates and valuable work and encouraged Members to join SCAR in their efforts. It welcomed the new SCAR Action Groups and noted the reported changes in krill habitat, behaviour and dynamics.

6.7 Most Members noted that climate within the Convention Area is rapidly changing. The previous season has seen the highest krill catches on record in Area 48, which also saw unusual conditions including extensive winter sea ice in that region while Antarctic sea ice overall reached its second lowest extent on record. Given such rapid changes in climate and increased climatic variability, consideration of climate change across the Commission, the Scientific Committee and its Working Groups is essential.

6.8 The UK noted that SC-CAMLR-43/BG/08, which summarised the state of the environment and Antarctic Marine Living Resources in Area 48, had not been presented to the Commission. Recalling CCAMLR-42, paragraph 6.12, the UK requested that a State of the Environment and Antarctic Marine Living Resources in the Convention Area be provided by the Scientific Committee to the Commission each year. This report should also take account of climate change implications, so that management decisions can be underpinned by an understanding of the changing Antarctic environment.

6.9 Some Members noted that climate change should be considered in the context of resources management, and that while climate change may negatively impact some species, others will benefit from it. These Members stressed the need to comprehensively assess the effects of the climate change on the basis of the scientific approach.

6.10 Japan drew the Commission's attention to the Seventeenth round of Informal Consultations of States Parties to the UN Fish Stock Agreement (ICSP17), that was held from 15–17 May 2024 at the UN Headquarters and focused its discussions on the topic 'Sustainable fisheries management in the face of climate change'. Japan noted that the ICSP17 report (available on the DOALOS website) includes in its Annex 1 a series of key points relating to sustainable fisheries management in the face of climate change, including many useful and relevant statements for CCAMLR climate change discussions. These included:

- (i) 'Sustainable fisheries management is an important vehicle for mitigating the impacts of climate change on fisheries, as well as promoting the long-term health and resilience of the marine ecosystems associated with such fisheries in the face of climate change'.

- (ii) ‘[I]t was noted that many modern fisheries management tools and approaches, if fully and effectively implemented, may already provide a framework for fisheries management in the face of climate change. Such frameworks should include an adaptive management approach which incorporates the precautionary approach and ecosystem approaches to fisheries management. Management strategy evaluation tools were highlighted in this regard’.
- (iii) ‘A well-functioning science-policy interface was considered key to timely and well-informed decision-making’, and
- (iv) ‘The point was made that it was important to move discussions beyond high-level principles to practical guidance on implementation’.

6.11 China reiterated that while climate change is one of the scientific factors that may need to be considered in formulating a CCAMLR Conservation Measure, climate change itself is not the objective of the CAMLR Convention. It was the Framework of United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) that served as the main channel for the discussion and decision-making on climate change. China noted that climate change is only one aspect of CCAMLR’s scientific work. In addition, it needed further consideration on whether the issue of climate change is among the most important work of science in CCAMLR. China expressed the hope that the joint CEP/SC-CAMLR workshop on climate change will collect the divergent views of participants and was of the view that there was no unified understanding in the scientific community of the impact of climate change on Antarctica.

6.12 Many Members noted that effective management of Antarctic marine living resources required ensuring the resilience of these resources and their ecosystems in the face of climate change and that doing so was possible through the adoption of Conservation Measures explicitly accounting for climate change, such as MPAs. They recalled that Article II(3)(c) of the Convention includes, as part of the principles of conservation, taking into account ‘the effect of environmental changes, with the aim of making possible the sustained conservation of Antarctic marine living resources’. These Members further recalled that there is an overwhelming body of scientific evidence on the serious implications of climate change for the Antarctic and its ecosystems.

6.13 The Commission considered the Scientific Committee’s discussions on the development of ‘State of the Environment’ reports (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraphs 5.22–5.27), and noted the contribution made by the United Kingdom in SC-CAMLR-43/BG/08 Rev. 1. Many Members noted the usefulness of such reports.

6.14 ASOC welcomed the progress made by the Scientific Committee in its inclusion of climate change in its work, that sea ice is a critical habitat of krill and that it was clear in the scientific literature that MPAs increase the resilience of ecosystems to climate change. ASOC also looked forward to the joint CEP/SC-CAMLR workshop on climate change.

Implementation and compliance

Advice from SCIC

7.1 The Chair of SCIC, Ms M. Engelke-Ros (USA), presented the SCIC-2024 report (Annex 6).

Implementation of the CDS

7.2 The Commission noted the implementation report of the Catch Documentation Scheme for *Dissostichus* spp. (CCAMLR-43/21) and noted that the CDS was implemented by 15 Members, 3 Acceding States, and 1 non-Contracting Party (NCP) cooperating with CCAMLR by participating in the CDS.

7.3 The Commission noted the explanations from Spain and the European Union (COMM CIRCs 24/07 and 24/106) and from Argentina (COMM CIRC 24/66) on the issuance of two Specially Validated *Dissostichus* Catch Documents (SVDCDs) in 2024 and based on these explanations, the Commission agreed that no further action was necessary.

7.4 As per CM 10-05, Annex 10-05/C, paragraph C9, SCIC considered the current cooperating status granted to Colombia, Mexico, Singapore and Thailand (SCIC-2024, paragraph 18). SCIC noted the success of the in-person CDS training undertaken in Thailand and Colombia in 2024. The Commission agreed that Colombia, Mexico, Singapore and Thailand would maintain their status as cooperating NCPs with limited access to the CDS for the purpose of verifying export/re-export documents accompanying imports of *Dissostichus* spp. and issuing re-export documents, and supported the Secretariat's continued efforts to engage with Mexico to facilitate the implementation of CM 10-05.

7.5 Colombia made the following statement:

‘Concerning Colombia's change of status before the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR), as a Cooperating Non-Contracting Party, limited access to the *Dissostichus* spp. Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS) was granted in October 2023 to the National Aquaculture and Fisheries Authority (AUNAP) of Colombia.

As is known by the participating States, the Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS) of Toothfish, *Dissostichus* spp. has been established under CCAMLR Conservation Measure 10-05 (2022). The CDS is a scheme for determining along the entire supply chain whether the fishery resource comes from catches consistent with applicable regional and global conservation and management measures, established in accordance with relevant regional and international obligations.

Consequently, with the limited access to the CDS granted to Colombia, and as part of its commitment to the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources, the Colombian State, in coordination with staff from the Fisheries, Monitoring and Compliance Group (FMC) of the CCAMLR Secretariat, successfully carried out the Training Workshop on the institutional implementation of Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS) for toothfish, species *Dissostichus* spp.

This Training Workshop was attended as well by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MRE), the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MADR), the Ministry of Commerce, Industry and Tourism (MCIT), the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MADS), the General Maritime Directorate (DIMAR), the National Aquaculture and Fisheries Authority (AUNAP), the Directorate of National Taxes and Customs (DIAN), the Colombian Ocean Commission (CCO), among some other Government Entities.

This fundamental Training Course was basically financed by CCAMLR, and also supported by the "*Fisheries for Development*" Project (FfD) that AUNAP is currently carrying out with the valuable Norwegian International Cooperation.

As an essential part of such implementation, and as recommended by the CCAMLR Commission based on the fact that access to the CCAMLR e- CDS is managed by assigning user roles to a CCAMLR account. Therefore, Colombia identified the roles according to the mission of the institutions and the responsibility over the CDS by designating these roles.

Additionally, it is also highlighted that after the Training Workshop on the Implementation of the Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS) of the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR), for the toothfish species *Dissostichus spp.* carried out at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MRE) last August, no imports have been registered, the most recent being in April of this year, for this reason these procedures have not yet been applied. However, they will be applied as soon as they are required.

Currently, AUNAP is working on the elaboration of an institutional Resolution to officially and properly adopt the Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS) for Toothfish, *Dissostichus spp.* in accordance with CCAMLR regulations and FAO Voluntary Guidelines for Catch Documentation Schemes (VG-CDS, 2017) that encourage States to apply CDSs as a trade-related measure to prevent, deter and eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing (IUU Fishing).’

CDS Fund Expenditure

7.6 The Commission noted that the CDS Fund Review Panel was convened to consider four proposals from the Secretariat (CCAMLR-43/20). The CDS Fund Review Panel, which consisted of representatives from Australia, Korea, New Zealand, Russia, the United Kingdom and the USA, recommended support for three of the four proposals and SCIC recommended that the Commission endorse the recommendation.

7.7 The Commission endorsed the recommendation of SCIC to adopt the proposals for expenditure from the CDS Fund for e-CDS development, in-person CDS training on request, NCP engagement, and CDS training in Singapore. The Commission thanked the Secretariat for its work to continue to enhance the e-CDS.

Vessel inspections

7.8 The Commission noted the report on the implementation of CM 10-03 and the System of Inspection in the 2023/24 fishing season (CCAMLR-43/15). The Commission endorsed the proposed project plan (CCAMLR-43/15, Annex 1) to improve the accessibility and content of inspector resources.

7.9 China noted that during SCIC-2024 they had suggested that electronic reporting systems contained in the proposed work plan (CCAMLR-43/15, Annex 1) should be available in languages of all Members as per paragraph 1 of the CCAMLR System of Inspection (SoI). China further suggested that industry representatives should be included in stakeholder engagement of the proposed work plan. The Commission agreed that industry representatives will be engaged when the proposed work plan is carried out and the electronic reporting system for the SoI will be accommodated where the budget allows.

7.10 The Commission considered the Secretariat's plans for future work on CCAMLR website operations (CCAMLR-43/BG/20) and endorsed the development of electronic inspection reporting.

7.11 The Commission noted that during the 2023/24 season, there were four cases of vessels required to enter port due to a crew member needing emergency medical treatment and there was no allowance given within CM 10-03 to accommodate for these situations. The Commission endorsed amendments to CM 10-03 to address situations of *force majeure*, distress or medical emergency.

7.12 The Commission recalled the Secretariat proposal at SCIC-2023 for a modified Port Inspection Form to be used in conjunction with the Agreement on Port State Measures (PSMA) (CCAMLR-42/16). The Commission endorsed the modified form and associated CM 10-03 revisions.

7.13 The Commission acknowledged and thanked Chile, New Zealand and the United Kingdom for their at-sea inspections and aerial surveillance activities as well as all Members who undertook port inspections in support of CCAMLR during the 2023/24 season.

Vessel monitoring system (VMS)

7.14 The Commission noted the report on the implementation of the vessel monitoring system (VMS) (CCAMLR-43/BG/14). The Commission endorsed the recommendations of SCIC for:

- (i) vessels and Members to ensure vessel movement reports are submitted to the Secretariat in the format outlined in Appendix 10-04/A (SCIC-2024, paragraph 38)
- (ii) the Secretariat to submit all future implementation reports containing recommendations as Working Papers (SCIC-2024, paragraph 39)

- (iii) the Secretariat to work with interested Members in the automated VMS movement notification trial and to provide a report on the outcomes of the trial, to be considered by SCIC-2025 (SCIC-2024, paragraph 45)

7.15 The Commission noted the renewal of the CCAMLR Search and Rescue (SAR) Arrangements undertaken in 2024 between each of the five maritime rescue coordination centres (MRCCs) and the CCAMLR Secretariat (CCAMLR-43/17) and that these Arrangements are available to authorised users on the CCAMLR website. The Commission further noted the improvements to the CCAMLR SAR request system and thanked the Secretariat and the five MRCCs for their work.

Promotion of compliance in CCAMLR

7.16 The Commission noted the report on vessel sighting reports received over the 2023/24 fishing season (CCAMLR-43/13). The Commission endorsed SCIC's recommendations to adopt a standardised form for reporting vessel sightings available on the CCAMLR website, and for the Secretariat to report annually on vessel sightings reports submitted to the Secretariat.

7.17 Korea noted, consistent with comments raised by Members in SCIC, that the reporting of vessel sightings should consider the administrative burden on vessels, while still maintaining benefits to monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) activities in the Convention Area and that they would be providing a proposal to improve this process in the future.

7.18 The Commission noted the progress made towards the Workplan on addressing Unidentified Fishing Gear in the Convention Area (CCAMLR-43/BG/17), and thanked New Zealand, Korea, Australia, and the Secretariat for their continued efforts on this topic. The Commission further encouraged the use of the voluntary form for reporting encounters of unidentified fishing gear by vessels and encouraged continued intersessional participation within the e-Group.

7.19 The Commission noted New Zealand's report on aerial surveillance patrols undertaken during the 2023/24 season (CCAMLR-43/BG/24) and thanked New Zealand and other Members conducting such activities in the Convention Area for their efforts, noting that such activities are an important tool in the fight against IUU fishing.

7.20 China commended SCIC for its willingness to give attention to the gap in regulating air surveillance patrol activities and for its acknowledgment of the need to further work to develop a protocol on carrying out such activities. In this respect, China highlighted two important elements in developing such a protocol, the need to keep a balance a right and obligations of both inspectors and inspected; and the need to increase the transparency of the air surveillance patrol (SCIC-2024, paragraphs 65 and 67).

7.21 Russia emphasised that the approaches and principles of CCAMLR SoI needed to be implemented for the purposes of setting forth regulation of air surveillance patrol activities.

7.22 The Commission noted that work could be done to further develop protocols on aerial surveillance and associated activities within the Convention Area. Many Members noted that New Zealand's air surveillance patrols were conducted within the requirements of CCAMLR and encouraged these activities to continue in the future.

7.23 The Commission considered Chile's report outlining the implementation of electronic monitoring systems (EMS) used in Chile to control discards and incidental by-catch and to implement fishing regulations (CCAMLR-43/BG/33 Rev. 1). The Commission endorsed SCIC's recommendation for Chile to lead an intersessional e-Group on the development of EMS guidelines and standards to be established on the CCAMLR Discussions platform to facilitate the participation of Members and Observers. Many Members recalled their shared experiences with the implementation of EMS as a tool in several of their domestic and high seas fisheries and welcomed the opportunity to participate in the discussion group.

7.24 The Commission noted SCIC's consideration of the report on the informal compliance workshop co-hosted by Korea and ASOC on improving CCAMLR's compliance regime hosted online on 6 and 7 February 2024 (CCAMLR-43/BG/39 Rev. 1). SCIC noted that the workshop identified areas for improving CCAMLR's compliance regime, focusing on aligning with global best practices, standardising data collection, and ensuring transparency. Key topics for further work included transshipment, krill traceability, port inspections, and vessel monitoring.

Transshipment

7.25 The Commission considered the transshipment implementation report (CCAMLR-43/BG/15) and noted SCIC's considerations of the transshipment activities associated with non-Contracting Party-flagged vessels.

7.26 Many Members thanked ASOC and Korea for their analysis of FAO Voluntary Guidelines for Transshipment and CCAMLR transshipment regulations (CCAMLR-43/BG/38), and noted the need for CCAMLR to keep step with the FAO Voluntary Guidelines. Russia noted that in their opinion there were no gaps in CCAMLR's regulation of transshipments, and the current issue relates to the involvement of NCP vessels in transshipments.

7.27 The United States expressed interest in developing a proposal to strengthen CCAMLR's monitoring of transshipment in the intersessional period and invited other interested Members to join the effort.

Implementation of the Scheme of International Scientific Observation (SISO)

7.28 The Commission noted SCIC's consideration on the implementation of the Scheme of International Scientific Observation (SISO) (WG-FSA-IMAF-2024/11 Rev. 1) provided by the Secretariat.

7.29 The Commission requested the Secretariat revert to the previous practice of omitting observers' names in reports (see also paragraph 8.9).

NCP Engagement Strategy

7.30 The Commission noted the review of the implementation of the NCP Engagement Strategy for 2023–2024 and the proposal for the 2025–2026 NCP Engagement Strategy and

Action Plan (CCAMLR-43/16). The Commission endorsed SCIC's recommendation to adopt the 2025–2026 NCP Engagement Strategy and Action Plan (SCIC-2024, paragraph 90).

7.31 The Commission noted the collaboration by the Secretariat with the Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center (SEAFDEC) and The Regional Plan of Action to promote responsible fishing practices including combatting IUU fishing (RPOA-IUU) within the framework of the NCP Engagement Strategy and encouraged continued engagement.

7.32 The Commission endorsed SCIC's recommendation that both SEAFDEC and RPOA-IUU be invited to observe future CCAMLR meetings (SCIC-2024, paragraph 93).

Proposals for new and revised compliance related conservation measures

Conservation Measure 10-03

7.33 The Commission noted that SCIC endorsed the proposal by the Secretariat (CCAMLR-43/15) to modify CM 10-03 to allow for delayed inspections and the waiver of the requirement for advanced submission of the information in Appendix 10-03/A in cases of port entry involving medical emergency.

7.34 The Commission noted that SCIC endorsed the proposal agreed during SCIC-2023 (SCIC-2024 paragraph 96) to amend CM 10-03 and to add an alternative CCAMLR Port Inspection Form which can be utilised by inspectors in conjunction with the Agreement on Port State Measures (PSMA) inspection form.

7.35 The Commission noted that SCIC discussed the need to improve monitoring of krill fisheries, including regarding port inspection requirements, but was unable to endorse the proposal put forward by Australia, Korea, New Zealand, and the USA to amend CM 10-03 (CCAMLR-43/42) to require:

- (i) Contracting Parties to conduct port inspections of all fishing vessels carrying species and products other than *Dissostichus* spp. that were harvested in the Convention Area;
- (ii) the inclusion in Appendix 10-03/B of references to CMs 25-03, 51-01, 51-02, 51-03 and 51-04 to record inspection of marine mammal exclusion devices on trawl gear and other measures related to the mitigation of seabird mortality; and
- (iii) the inclusion of product codes for boiled, peeled, and oil-processed krill products.

7.36 Many Members expressed their views that the inspections of all vessels carrying krill are of particular importance given the potential increases in krill harvest and the recommendations of the Harmonisation Symposium (CCAMLR-43/29).

7.37 Russia recalled that the krill fishery is not subjected to IUU fishing and to conduct port inspections of all fishing vessels carrying krill could create an unnecessary burden for fishing vessels and Port States.

7.38 Some Members recalled that port inspections provide an opportunity to monitor compliance with a wide range of conservation measures and not just to detect IUU fishing, and noted that this is a key opportunity to ensure a high standard of compliance in CCAMLR fisheries.

7.39 ASOC recalled CCAMLR-42/BG/03 and noted that the proposals of CCAMLR-43/42 could be beneficial not only to combat IUU fishing, but also to improve the traceability of krill and krill products within the supply chain.

Conservation Measure 10-04

7.40 The Commission noted that SCIC considered, and did not reach consensus, on the proposal by the delegations of Australia, New Zealand, Korea, Norway, the United Kingdom and the USA to amend CM 10-04 (CCAMLR-43/43) to require that all Contracting Parties whose fishing vessels are operating in the Convention Area submit VMS data to the CCAMLR Secretariat no later than one hour after receipt, removing the allowance to report VMS data following exit from the Convention Area.

7.41 Many Members noted that if CCAMLR is to adopt a harmonised approach to krill fisheries management with smaller scale management units, it will be very important to have timely and accurate data reporting to manage those units.

Conservation Measures 21-01 and 21-02

7.42 The Commission noted that SCIC considered, and did not reach consensus, on the proposal by the EU to amend CMs 21-01 and 21-02 (CCAMLR43/45) to require the presence on board of a scientific observer appointed in accordance with SISO for new fisheries under CM 21-01, and to specify in CM 21-02 that the scientific observers should be appointed in accordance with SISO.

7.43 Russia noted the absence of any notification on new fisheries that prevented CCAMLR to come to an understanding of the benefits from appointing the SISO observers.

7.44 China emphasised the need for extensive data, particularly acoustic data, for krill fisheries, noting that many of these data require specialised scientists to be collected and further highlighted that they hold more than 10 years of research data on krill fisheries (SCIC-2024, paragraphs 82 to 88). China also commended the high quality of data gathered by their national scientific observers, noting that a Chinese observer was recently recognised with an award from the Association of Responsible Krill (ARK) for their contributions.

7.45 Many Members expressed their views regarding the importance of the independent scientific observation that is achieved through SISO observers. Members also highlighted that improved understanding and implementation of CCAMLR conservation measures can be facilitated through consistency among conservation measures.

Conservation Measure 23-01

7.46 The Commission noted that SCIC considered and endorsed the proposal by the Secretariat (CCAMLR-43/19, paragraph 10(a)) to amend CM 23-01, paragraph 2, to improve the reporting deadline for vessels where Contracting Parties are required to report catch and effort data to the Executive Secretary. The paper also proposed amendments to CM 23-01, paragraph 7 (CCAMLR-43/19 paragraph 10(a)), to require fishery closures to be communicated by the Secretariat to fishing vessels in addition to their Contracting Parties, but SCIC could not reach consensus on the amendments to CM 23-01, paragraph 7.

Conservation Measure 31-02

7.47 The Commission noted that SCIC considered and did not reach consensus on the proposals by the Russian Federation (CCAMLR-43/34 and CCAMLR-43/35), to amend CM 31-02 to clarify the management procedures regarding the delayed retrieval of longline gear after fisheries close in Subareas 88.1 and 88.2. Many Members expressed appreciation for the paper and noted it was presented last year during SCIC-2023, further noting that drafting suggestions previously provided on this matter should be incorporated into any future proposals.

Conservation Measures 41-01 and 41-10

7.48 The Commission noted that SCIC considered and endorsed two proposals to amend CM 41-01.

7.49 The first proposal was presented by the Secretariat (CCAMLR-43/18) to realign and clarify the respective requirements of CM 41-01 and CM 41-10 regarding the requirement of research hauls to be conducted when fishing in Subarea 88.2 SSRU H.

7.50 The second proposal for amendments to CM 41-01 was presented by Australia (CCAMLR-43/49), to permit a vessel to cease the setting of a research haul for the purpose of preventing gear loss or securing the safety of a vessel or those on board, noting various conditions, whereby such a ceased haul would not meet the requirements of a research haul.

Fish nest areas

7.51 The Commission considered the proposal from the European Union (CCAMLR 43/01) for a new CM 32-XX on the protection of notothenioid fish nest areas in the Convention Area, by closing such areas to fishing. The Commission noted that SCIC did not reach consensus on the proposal.

7.52 The European Union recalled that some Members had argued that the protection of notothenioid fish nest areas is not required because there is no identified threat at the moment, noting that this was the opposite of a precautionary approach.

7.53 Most Members expressed agreement with the European Union and underscored the importance of this proposal and the ample scientific evidence of fish nest areas in the Weddell Sea, recalling that such spawning areas are defined as necessary to the long-term maintenance of fish populations. Most Members also noted that this was a notable opportunity to protect rare and vulnerable areas, and that it was disappointing that the proposal could not be endorsed.

7.54 Russia noted that the proposal was drafted based on measures adopted for VMEs, but a different approach was required considering that spawning seasons are limited in time, and additional discussions are necessary.

7.55 China noted that the location of specific fish nests and the dynamics of such fish nest areas should be considered in future discussions.

Harmonisation Symposium

7.56 The Commission noted SCIC's consideration of the report on the Harmonisation Symposium held Korea from 16 to 20 July 2024 (CCAMLR-43/29). The Commission noted that the paper listed many recommendations to develop the KFMA, however no explicit CM changes were considered by SCIC.

Resolution on Labour and Safety Standards

7.57 The Commission noted that SCIC considered and did not reach consensus on the paper (CCAMLR-43/32) presented by the USA, on the proposal for a Resolution on Labour and Safety Standards in CCAMLR Fisheries, noting that labour abuses and safety issues on fishing vessels have rightfully received significant attention in recent years and that this is not a new topic of discussion for SCIC.

7.58 The United States reported that a revision of the proposal was submitted to the meeting server for Members' consideration, recognising that during SCIC, some Members reported that they were waiting for advice from the relevant governmental departments.

7.59 China and Russia expressed concerns about the proposal and noted that substantive discussions are required noting the issue is beyond the mandate of CCAMLR.

Text of the Scheme of International Scientific Observation (SISO)

7.60 The Commission noted that SCIC considered and did not reach consensus on the proposal by the delegations of Argentina, Australia, New Zealand, Norway, the United Kingdom, and the United States to amend CM 51-06 (CCAMLR-43/40) to require at least one observer on every vessel be appointed under the Scheme of International Scientific Observation (SISO).

CCAMLR Compliance Report

7.61 The Commission considered SCIC-2024, paragraphs 135 to 311, noting SCIC's consideration of the 68 potential compliance issues in CCEP Summary Report (CCAMLR-43/11) in accordance with CM 10-10, paragraph 3(i). The Commission noted that SCIC was able to reach a common understanding of the appropriate compliance status for 55 of the identified issues but that, despite protracted discussions, it could not reach consensus on the compliance status for the remaining 13 issues. For this reason, it was unable to adopt a Provisional Compliance Report as required by CM 10-10.

7.62 Many Members noted their disappointment that a Provisional Compliance Report could not be adopted by SCIC and noted the efforts by the SCIC Chair and the Secretariat to support the discussions, and to assist Members to reach agreement on how to report on SCIC's CCEP considerations. These Members noted the important role that compliance evaluation plays in the work of the Commission.

7.63 Many Members noted that the SCIC report reflected the discussions related to the CCEP in considerable detail and considered that they would refer to that section of the SCIC report (SCIC-2024, paragraphs 135 to 311), rather than restate their views at the Commission. Many Members further noted that there appeared to be sufficient information available to determine a compliance status for the items related to FV *Alpha Crux*. Many Members recalled their concerns about applying a compliance status of 'additional information required' without providing an agreed deadline for the submission of additional information and urged the relevant Members to make all possible efforts to provide additional information on these incidents during the meeting of CCAMLR-43, and no later than 1 February 2025.

7.64 New Zealand noted that whilst Russia had taken responsibility in respect of some of the compliance issues identified, they recalled that several Members have urged Russia to make all possible efforts to provide additional information during the meeting of CCAMLR-43 on the seven Russian compliance issues where consensus on a compliance status had not been reached and on its outstanding investigations.

7.65 Russia noted that there is currently discussion ongoing regarding the contents of the SISO Report and that Russia is currently engaged in the procedure of SISO Part A, paragraph h, with the SISO designating Member.

7.66 China recalled that its request at SCIC-2024 for the SISO report from the *Alpha Crux* to be accessible to interested Members was denied by the SISO designating Member due to confidentiality concerns. China indicated that as per paragraph 3 of CM 10-10, all relevant information should be accessible to support the work of SCIC and urged the Commission to take measures to safeguard the rights of Members and promote the transparency in the work of SCIC and the Commission.

7.67 China made the following statement in respect to the issues involving three Norwegian vessels (SCIC-2024, paragraphs 269 to 271):

'China understands that Norway as a responsible Flag State did not intend to see these issues happened. However, as the matter of fact, the three Norwegian vessels have failed to comply with Conservation Measure 31-02 and have harvested a substantial amount of krill after the fishery closed. Although Norway conceded that these issues should be

non-compliant during the SCIC discussion, they are apparently not minor non-compliant. China encourages that Norway consider the comments made by Members last week in SCIC and take effective, necessary measures to address these issues.'

7.68 China made the following statement in respect to the issues involving three UK vessels (SCIC-2024, paragraphs 259 to 260):

'China would like to draw the attention of the Commission to the fact that the issues relating to the three UK-flagged vessels have persistently happened over year. Unfortunately, the Commission has so far not been able to address these issues. China notes that some Members argued that the issue arises just because of the failure of the Commission to reach consensus on the catch limits for toothfish fisheries in Subarea 48.3. In this regard, China would like to reiterate that these three issues should be assessed pursuant to CM 31-01, and the failure to reach consensus by the Commission on the catch limit shall not be used as an excuse for conducting illegal fishing. It is quite clear that the illegal fishing by three UK vessels has not only undermined the objective of the Convention, but also has left other Members in a disadvantage position. Therefore, China urges the Commission to take effective actions to end this persistent and serious violation and to safeguard the integrity of the Commission.'

7.69 Russia stated that fishing by the three UK-flagged vessels *Argos Georgia*, *Argos Helena* and *Nordic Prince* in Subarea 48.3 was done in contravention of CM 31-01 and a compliance status of seriously, frequently or persistently non-compliant (level 3) should be assigned. Russia further noted that mentioned UK-flagged vessels had benefitted from illegal activity in Subarea 48.3 in the 2023/24 season.

7.70 The UK recalled the discussion on the issue in SCIC, including the position it had set out in that meeting (SCIC-2024 paragraph 260) and expressed concern that Russia has demonstrated a selective approach to the application of compliance status, noting seven matters regarding the *Alpha Crux* remained unresolved.

7.71 Argentina reiterated that its position on fishing activities of *Dissostichus eleginoides* in Subarea 48.3 has been clearly stated during the SCIC meeting and referred the Commission to the report from that meeting. Argentina also expressed its desire to see CM 41-02 adopted, noting that with its adoption fishing would be allowed and, therefore, there would not be an ongoing compliance issue.

7.72 Some Members expressed regret that a Provisional Compliance Report could not be adopted, noting that this suited the Russian Federation in view of its own non-compliance. They called on Russia to agree to the adoption of a conservation measure for Subarea 48.3 and to report back to the Commission on the investigations into the *Alpha Crux*.

7.73 Ukraine made the following statement:

'Ukraine confirms its position stated earlier concerning evaluation of the UK's fishing vessels activities in the Subarea 48.3.

We consider that the situation in CCAMLR conservation measures regarding toothfish fishery in the Subarea 48.3, as it is, is very far from real stock precautionary needs over

the last years. This situation has been caused by blocking relevant conservation measure prolongation by the Russian Federation, and it should be considered rather as a technical attack by one CCAMLR Member in relation to the other CCAMLR Member, and it has only political reasons.

We reject this attempt to use the CCAMLR as a tool in global politics, and we consider as a very wrong way to encourage such attempts, giving to the provoking party exactly what is their goal.

So, noting as a fact, that exactly this destructive action by Russia has pushed an issue of toothfish fishery in Subarea 48.3 from the CCAMLR responsibility area to the bilateral area, Ukraine does not support a decision to include the UK's fishing vessels, which took part in toothfish fishery in the Subarea 48.3 within the fishing season 2023/24, in the IUU vessel list, and this approach would be absolutely the same in case of Argentina vessels similar activities.'

7.74 Chile noted the lack of consensus in adopting the Provisional Compliance Report, expressing its concern on the slow pace of considerations. They recalled that the CCEP is a principal tool of CCAMLR and noted that dialogue is the key mechanism for States to overcome their differences and, as the engine of the Antarctic Treaty System, should be used in good faith. Chile further recalled its position that Members should abstain from fishing in areas where the Commission has not adopted a relevant conservation measure. Chile noted that the best available science demonstrates that Subarea 48.3 is a sustainable fishery and there is no reason to not agree upon a conservation measure for Subarea 48.3.

7.75 Russia recalled Norway's explanation with respect to the three issues of non-compliance with CM 31-02, that the Secretariat was to blame for the vessels not receiving the Subarea 48.1 closure notice. Russia noted that by CM 23-01, paragraph 7, the Secretariat is only required to notify Contracting Parties of the closure and expressed its concern that Norway did not exercise its Flag State responsibility to notify its vessels of the closure. Russia urged Norway to conduct further investigation into vessels activities by the *Antarctic Endurance*, *Antarctic Sea* and *Saga Sea* after the fishery closure and to report back to the Commission.

7.76 Ukraine recalled the explanation provided by Norway and noted the demonstration of flexibility in their willingness to accept a compliance status of minor non-compliance (level 1). China noted that Norway did not intentionally contravene CM 31-02, however, it noted that a large quantity of krill was harvested, and the issue was too serious for a compliance status of minor non-compliance (level 1) to be applied.

7.77 Some Members noted that despite the best efforts of SCIC, a Provisional CCEP report could not be adopted and noted that this will most likely occur again unless the Commission agrees to a different approach. They recalled the practice implemented in SCIC-2022 where a Provisional CCEP was adopted by consensus, although consensus was not reached for every compliance issue.

7.78 China and Russia noted that the practice adopted by SCIC in 2022 was not consistent with CM 10-10 and created a loophole which undermined the integrity of the Commission, reiterating that the CCEP report should be adopted as a whole.

7.79 The Commission recognised the difficulty in adopting a Provisional CCEP report, noting that it was not in a position to do so. The Commission strongly urged SCIC to follow CM 10-10 to adopt a Provisional CCEP report next year and consider possible changes to this conservation measure to prevent repeating this issue in the future.

7.80 The United States noted CM10-10, paragraph 3(iv), that states ‘At its next annual meeting, SCIC shall review any further information provided by the Contracting Party’ and that SCIC does not currently have an agenda item for such updates. The United States requested that an item dedicated to this issue is added to the SCIC agenda for future meetings.

Illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing in the Convention Area

7.81 The Commission considered the report on IUU fishing activity and trends in 2023/24 in the Convention Area (CCAMLR-43/14 Rev.1).

7.82 The Commission noted SCIC’s consideration of the information in CCAMLR-43/BG/18 Rev. 1, which provides an overview of methods and opportunities to improve awareness of activities occurring within the CAMLR Convention Area. The Commission noted support for such efforts, including the resources and information provided in Appendix I of BG/18 to support Member vessels on various missions in the Convention Area to contribute to efforts to detect and deter IUU fishing and monitor compliance of fishing activities.

7.83 The Commission noted the United States’ announcement during SCIC that it intended to pilot this approach and that the US Coast Guard icebreaker *Polar Star* would be undertaking a surveillance patrol and reporting vessel sighting information during its mission to and from McMurdo Station in the 2024/25 season.

7.84 The Commission noted the continued collaboration with INTERPOL as outlined in CCAMLR-43/BG/11 Rev. 1 and thanked the EU for the funding to support that collaboration noting the threat posed by transnational organised crime to the objective of CCAMLR.

7.85 The Commission noted SCIC’s consideration of the report on the implementation of Conservation Measure 10-08 (CCAMLR-43/BG/19) and that the Secretariat had not received any new reports relevant to CM 10-08 in 2024.

7.86 The Commission noted that Uruguay had expressed its willingness to further investigate the listing of a vessel master of Uruguayan nationality in relation to the South African flagged vessel *El Shaddai* and that the EU had provided SCIC with an update on action taken with respect to Spanish nationals linked to the *Cobija* and *El Shaddai* (SCIC-2024, paragraph 321).

7.87 The Commission recognised that the Secretariat is further seeking the support of INTERPOL and the Joint Analytical Cell (JAC) to expand the scope of available information, analyse available evidence and share relevant information useful to Contracting Parties to combat IUU fishing under CMs 10-06 and 10-07 and to support the implementation of CM 10-08.

7.88 The Commission considered the Provisional NCP-IUU Vessel List for 2024/25 (CCAMLR-43/15 Rev. 1 and COMM CIRC 24/98) along with a request from the Islamic Republic of Iran for the removal of the *Koosha 4* from the NCP-IUU Vessel List for 2024/25.

7.89 The Commission noted that the Islamic Republic of Iran had provided information containing images and a video of a vessel purported to be the *Koosha 4* in the process of being scrapped. Some Members expressed the view that the Commission should delay the removal of the *Koosha 4* from the NCP-IUU Vessel List for 2024/25 until a definitive confirmation of the scrapping of the *Koosha 4* was received.

7.90 Russia noted that the steps taken by the Islamic Republic of Iran reflected the intent of a Flag State to fulfilling its obligations.

7.91 The Commission noted that SCIC had not reached consensus on the removal of the *Koosha 4* from the NCP-IUU Vessel List for 2024/25. The Commission requested that the Secretariat continue to reach out to the Islamic Republic of Iran for further information on the purported scrapping of the *Koosha 4* or other information that could satisfy the requirements set out in Conservation Measure 10-07.

7.92 The Commission adopted the 2024/25 NCP-IUU Vessel List without the removal of the *Koosha 4*.

7.93 The Commission considered the Provisional List of Contracting Party IUU Vessels for 2024/25 in accompaniment with the existing 2023/24 CP-IUU Vessel List, noting the proposed inclusion of the *Argos Georgia*, *Argos Helena* and *Nordic Prince* and the request from South Africa to remove the *El Shaddai*.

7.94 The Commission expressed its condolences for the victims of the sinking of the *Argos Georgia*

7.95 The Commission noted that SCIC had not reached consensus on the removal of the *El Shaddai* from the CP-IUU Vessel List for 2024/25. Noting concerns raised in SCIC related to the request to remove the *El Shaddai* from the CP-IUU Vessel List, the EU thanked South Africa for its continuous cooperation on this matter. The EU noted that the request to remove the vessel was being made pursuant to CM 10-06, paragraph 14 (iv) rather than paragraph 14 (ii), but reiterated its position that financial losses resulting from the inclusion of the vessel on the CP-IUU Vessel List cannot be considered as a sanction, that it is a Flag State responsibility to impose sanctions, and that it would have been preferable if civil or administrative proceedings had been initiated once the criminal prosecution was unsuccessful. In relation to the request to remove the vessel pursuant to paragraph 14 (iv), the EU requested confirmation from South Africa that the improvements to the permit and licence conditions would be finalised rapidly, that it would effectively monitor and control the activities of its vessels operating in the Convention Area, and to provide an update on the process of reviewing its legal framework.

7.96 South Africa thanked the EU for its continued support and made the following statement:

‘The South African delegation would like to express its gratitude to the European Union delegation for having supported us throughout the bilateral engagement. We hope that

South Africa's efforts to address all concerns brought up by the Members have been satisfactory.

Question 1 - Finalisation of amending the permit and licence conditions (before the upcoming fishing session)

Response: As indicated in the bilateral meeting held between the parties last week, South Africa has committed to further amending its licence and permit conditions which has been notated in a document which recorded discussions during the technical meeting. These amendments will be made prior to the commencement of the new fishing season starting on 1 December 2024 and will be issued together with any new catch permit. The amended licence and permit conditions will be distributed to Members as an update to those circulated in September 2024 in COMM CIRC 24/96.

The conditions as amended are sufficient to demonstrate compliance with paragraph 14(iv) of CM 10-06 and are considered sufficient to ensure that any South African flagged vessel will be clear as to exactly what the requirements are and therefore not engage in IUU fishing and if IUU fishing is discovered, these amendments ensure that appropriate criminal and other sanctions can be taken.

We would like to once again thank the EU for its support in this regard.

Question 2 - A more detailed description (i.e. additional information to the ones provided in your 2024 delisting request) of how you are monitoring your vessels operating in the CCAMLR area and the improvements you have made to your MCS system since the IUU activities of the *El Shaddai* took place?

Response: VMS alarms in terms of the CCAMLR areas, specifically the closed areas, are set. The Department also recently established a working relationship with the Norwegian Government toward improved satellite-based vessel monitoring.

VMS and Departmental monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) staff are hands-on and trained and this training is ongoing. The VMS recently extended its contract with a United Kingdom based VMS service provider Ocean data, UK.

MCS officials are present and hands-on at port and have improved the MCS processes and protocols for vessels coming into port to offload fish at the three major ports namely, Cape Town, Port Elizabeth and Durban. It is already clear in the permit conditions that a vessel may not offload any fish without a fishery control officer being present to inspect the landing and these procedures will be further detailed in permit conditions with references made to specific and relevant conservation measures as agreed in the technical bilateral meeting last week with the EU.

Staff capacity issues have been addressed and additional Honorary Marine conservation Inspectors and Catch data Monitors have been appointed. The Department is also in the process of implementing an electronic landing reporting system.

Officials will also benefit from the in-person workshop with a focus on the CDS and port inspections which is to be hosted by the Secretariat in South Africa in 2025.

Question 3 - An update on the process of the amendment of their Marine Living Resources Act and if possible an idea of timeline.

Response: The Department in respect of all its laws routinely and as appropriate engages in a revision of its laws to update them to keep up to date with modern trends and technological advances. The MLRA is in the process of being reviewed and amended on a broader scale to address these kinds of advancements and normal routine implementation issues which occur when a law is being implemented. This project is in the initial stages and will take at least three years. Many of the timelines and processes are beyond the control of the Department as an Act must go through both executive and parliamentary processes and of course extensive consultation processes with relevant stakeholders. We are working closely with the FAO and have already had multiple workshops and engagements with them, with a further session scheduled for 22 October 2024. They are assisting the Department in reviewing some of our current legal frameworks and identifying those areas which could be considered for amendment, and this includes aspects relating to international agreements, Treaty and RFMOs.

We of course commit to update and clarify all aspects relating to international agreements as part of this process.’

7.97 The Commission thanked South Africa and the EU for their efforts to reach a common understanding and endorsed the removal of the *El Shaddai* from the CP-IUU Vessel List.

7.98 Russia noted with regret that consensus was not reached with regard to the inclusion of the *Argos Georgia*, *Argos Helena* and *Nordic Prince* on the CP-IUU Vessel List for 2024/25. Russia stressed that these vessels had partaken in IUU fishing and had benefitted from the sale of illegal catch. Russia further stressed that the ongoing inability of the Commission to reach consensus on this matter was not a result of a failure to adopt conservation measures for all Subareas and that it was no excuse for any Member to continuously ignore their obligations under CM 31-01. Russia requested that the Commission include the *Argos Georgia*, *Argos Helena* and *Nordic Prince* on the CP-IUU Vessel List for 2024/25.

7.99 The UK refuted the assertion that the operation of UK vessels in Subarea 48.3 can be characterised as IUU fishing under CM 10-06 and recalled the discussion on this issue in SCIC-2024, including the position it had set out (SCIC-2024, paragraph 335). Accordingly, the UK rejected the proposal that the *Argos Georgia*, *Argos Helena* and *Nordic Prince* be included on the CP-IUU Vessel List for 2024/25.

7.100 The Commission did not achieve consensus regarding the inclusion of the *Argos Georgia*, *Argos Helena* and *Nordic Prince* on the CP-IUU Vessel List. The Commission approved a CP-IUU Vessel List for 2024/25 which contains no vessels.

Fishery notifications

7.101 The Commission considered the summary of fishery notifications submitted for the 2024/25 season (CCAMLR-43/BG/09), noting SCIC’s discussion on the matter and concerns raised by some Members regarding vessels notified by UK, Norway and Russia for which compliance issues were considered by SCIC.

7.102 The Commission noted that all the fisheries notifications received met the requirements of CM 21-02 and CM 21-03 and that these conservation measures do not require a decision by the Commission on the fisheries notifications.

7.103 Russia recalled its previous statements regarding notifications of the UK-flagged vessels *Argos Georgia*, *Argos Helena* and *Nordic Prince* noting the vessels' inclusion on the Draft CP-IUU Vessel List for 2024/25. Russia further noted that in relation to the *Argos Georgia*, in accordance with paragraph 11 of CM 21-02, the United Kingdom was required to immediately inform the Commission regarding a replacement, but they did not fulfil this obligation.

7.104 The United Kingdom rejected the assertions made by Russia, recalling the discussion on this issue in SCIC-2024, including the position it had set out in that meeting (SCIC-2024, paragraph 354). Many Members recalled their interventions made during SCIC and contained in the SCIC-2024 report relating to the UK and Norwegian-flagged vessels and supported their notifications.

7.105 Some Members also recalled the discussions in SCIC relating to the Russian-flagged vessel *Alpha Crux* and again urged Russia to provide any additional available information on the outstanding compliance issues and investigations to reassure the Commission that they can exercise control over their vessels as a responsible Flag State and to ensure that their notified vessels comply with relevant conservation measures.

7.106 The Commission noted SCIC's consideration of the recommendations on gear details in fishery notifications (CCAMLR-43/12) and endorsed by SCIC's recommendations (SCIC-2024, paragraph 363) that:

- (i) the requirement for the inclusion of a technical line diagram for each gear description submitted by Members on the CCAMLR website is mandatory
- (ii) there should be only one official description of 'notified gear' for the purposes of CM 21-02, paragraphs 6(ii)(b), 11(iii) and 13, and that this will be the gear description submitted by Members on the CCAMLR website.

Advice from the Scientific Committee to SCIC

7.107 The Commission noted that SCIC received advice from the Chair of the Scientific Committee in respect to scientific observers, discards, late gear removals, the status of fishing in Division 58.4.1 and 58.4.2, and the outcomes of the Harmonisation Symposium (SCIC-2024, paragraphs 366–376).

7.108 The Commission noted the Chair of the Scientific Committee's clarification in respect to his advice on scientific observers, highlighting that international SISO observers have clear priorities whereas national scientific observers may have additional tasks that differ from those of an international SISO observer.

7.109 The Commission endorsed the recommendation from SCIC that the need for amendments to the C2 reporting form or instructions to clarify that all retained fish, including fish retained only for later discard north of 60°S, should be reported as 'retained' should be

referred to the Scientific Committee and its relevant Working Groups. SCIC noted that confusion on this matter had led to compliance issues considered in the CCEP.

Other business

7.110 The Commission endorsed SCIC's recommendation to add a standing item to its agenda for future meetings under any other business, which will consider the various tasks assigned to the Secretariat, both under conservation measures and through report text, and prioritise and possibly eliminate some tasking given projected budgetary constraints (SCIC-2024, paragraph 387).

7.111 The Commission expressed its appreciation to the Chair of SCIC, Ms. Engelke-Ros, for her constructive leadership throughout her tenure, and welcomed Mr. Berry to his incoming role as the new Chair of SCIC.

CCAMLR Scheme of International Scientific Observation

8.1 The Commission noted the discussions by the Scientific Committee on the Scheme of International Scientific Observation (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraphs 9.1–9.15) and noted that the potential development and implementation of EMS in CCAMLR fisheries offered a number of possibilities to reduce the current workload of scientific observers.

8.2 The Commission welcomed the introduction of the 'Krill Scientific Observer Prize' and thanked ARK for funding the initiative (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraphs 9.14 and 9.15).

8.3 The Commission noted that the significant contribution made by observers in collecting scientific data is recognised by the awarding of the 2024 'Krill Scientific Observer Prize' (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraph 9.14).

8.4 The Scientific Committee Representative of China highlighted paragraph 368 of the SCIC Report: 'The Chair of the Scientific Committee replied that international scientific observers carry out more work including marine mammal sightings and monitoring.'

8.5 The Commission noted a possible discrepancy between the discussion in the report of SCIC with regard to the work of data collection performed by scientific observers and the advice that had been provided by the Chair of the Scientific Committee to SCIC-2024, and that as a result the report may not reflect practice.

8.6 Upon request, the Chair of the Scientific Committee clarified his recollection of the discussion in SCIC on this topic was that national observers may undertake additional tasks beyond SISO requirements and as a result may prioritise tasks differently (SCIC-2024, paragraphs 366–368).

8.7 China stressed that both SISO observers and national scientific observers follow the same guidelines and protocols as specified in the text of CCAMLR Scheme of International Scientific Observation (SISO) and the manuals for scientific observers. China further noted that

the Chinese Government-appointed scientific observer also conducts acoustic surveys and other scientific tasks in addition to those specified above.

8.8 The Commission recalled discussion in SCIC regarding the WCPFC's adoption of minimum standards and guidelines under their regional observer program, including a requirement for the observer provider to formally debrief observers shortly after disembarking a vessel, and that this process maintains the integrity of the observer statement and ensures the safety of the observer after the completion of their post. The Commission noted that some Members suggested CCAMLR consider the development of such a procedure (SCIC-2024, paragraph 306), and that such work should progress through the development of working and background papers for consideration.

8.9 The UK recalled WG-IMAF-2024/11 Rev. 1 presented to SCIC (paragraph 82) regarding summary information on observers appointed under SISO during the past season. Given concerns around observer safety and personal information potentially being made publicly available, the Commission agreed that SISO observer names would be omitted from future reports.

Conservation measures

9.1 The Commission's consideration of revised and new conservation measures and resolutions, and related matters, is reported in this section. Conservation measures and resolutions adopted at CCAMLR-43 will be published in the Schedule of Conservation Measures in Force 2024/25.

9.2 The Commission noted that the following conservation measures and resolutions will remain in force for 2024/25:

Measures on compliance

10-01 (2014), 10-02 (2022), 10-04 (2022), 10-05 (2022), 10-06 (2016), 10-07 (2016), 10-08 (2017), 10-09 (2022), and 10-10 (2023).

Measures on general fishery matters

21-01 (2019), 21-02 (2019), 21-03 (2023), 22-01 (1986), 22-02 (1984), 22-03 (1990), 22-04 (2010), 22-05 (2008), 22-06 (2019), 22-07 (2013), 22-08 (2009), 22-09 (2012), 23-02 (2016), 23-03 (2016), 23-04 (2016), 23-06 (2022), 23-07 (2016), 24-01 (2023), 24-02 (2014), 24-04 (2017), and 26-01 (2022)

Measures on fishery regulation

31-01 (1986), 31-02 (2007), 32-01 (2001), 32-02 (2017), 32-18 (2006), 33-01 (1995), CM 42-01 (2023), and 51-06 (2019).

Measures on protected area

91-01 (2004), 91-03 (2009), 91-04 (2011) and 91-05 (2016).

Resolutions

7/IX, 10/XII, 14/XIX, 15/XXII, 16/XIX, 17/XX, 18/XXI, 19/XXI, 20/XXII, 22/XXV, 23/XXIII, 25/XXV, 27/XXVII, 28/XXVII, 29/XXVIII, 30/XXVIII, 31/XXVIII, 32/XXIX, 33/XXX, 34/XXXI, 35/XXXIV and 36/41.

Review of existing measures

9.3 The Commission adopted the following revised conservation measures:

Measures on compliance

10-03 (2024)

Revised measures on general fishery matters

23-01 (2024), 24-05 (2024), 25-02 (2024), and 25-03 (2024)

Revised measures on fishery regulation

32-09 (2024), 33-02 (2024), 33-03 (2024), 41-01 (2024), 41-03 (2024), 41-04 (2024), 41-05 (2024), 41-06 (2024), 41-07 (2024), 41-08 (2024), 41-09 (2024), 41-10 (2024), 41-11 (2024), 42-02 (2024), 51-01 (2024), 51-02 (2024), 51-03 (2024) and 51-04 (2024).

Protected Areas

91-02 (2024)

Implementation and Compliance

9.4 The Commission considered the proposed revisions to CM 10-03 by Australia, Korea, New Zealand, and the USA (CCAMLR-43/42) requiring Contracting Parties to:

- (i) conduct port inspections of all fishing vessels carrying species and products other than *Dissostichus* spp. that were harvested in the Convention Area;
- (ii) include in Annex 10-03/B references to the recording of the inspection of marine mammal and bird exclusion devices on trawl gear, and
- (iii) include product codes for boiled, peeled and oil for krill products.

9.5 The Commission noted there was no consensus on the proposals.

9.6 The Commission adopted a revision of CM 10-03 to include an alternative CCAMLR port inspection form to be used in conjunction with the Agreement on Port State Measures (PSMA) inspection form and a waiver of the requirement for advanced submission of the information in Annex 10-03/A in cases of port entry involving medical emergency.

9.7 The Commission considered the proposed revision to CM 10-04 by Australia, New Zealand, Korea, Norway, the United Kingdom and the USA (CCAMLR-43/43) to require all Contracting Parties whose fishing vessels are operating in the Convention Area to submit VMS data to the Secretariat no later than one hour after receipt.

9.8 The Commission noted that there was no consensus on the proposal.

General fishery matters

9.9 The Commission considered the proposal by the EU to revise CM 21-01 to specify a requirement for a scientific observer to be on board for new fisheries and to revise CM 21-02 to specify that scientific observers should be appointed in accordance with SISO (CCAMLR-43/45).

9.10 The Commission noted that there was no consensus on the proposal.

9.11 The Commission considered the Secretariat's proposals to revise CM 23-01, paragraph 2, regarding the reporting deadline and to revise CM 23-01, paragraph 7 to clarify when the Secretariat should issue a closure notice for any fishery using the five-day catch and effort reporting system (CCAMLR-43/19).

9.12 The Commission adopted the revision of CM 23-01, paragraph 2, and there was no consensus on the proposal for CM 23-01, paragraph 7.

9.13 The Commission considered the Secretariat's proposals to revise CM 25-02, Annex C to update gear diagrams and adopted a revision to CM 25-02.

9.14 The Commission adopted a revision to CM 25-03 to extend a trial of mitigation devices for krill fishing vessels who use a net monitoring cable, with specifications for vessels that have undertaken the trial successfully.

Fishery regulations

9.15 The Commission considered the proposal by the Russian Federation to revise CM 31-02 to clarify the management procedures regarding the delayed retrieval of longline gear after the closure of fisheries (CCAMLR-43/35).

9.16 The Commission noted that there was no consensus on the proposal.

9.17 The Commission considered the proposal by the European Union and its Member States for a new CM 32-XX on the protection of notothenioid fish nest areas in the Convention Area, by closing such areas to fishing (CCAMLR 43/01), recalling its consideration at SC-CAMLR-42 (paragraphs 3.60 and 3.61).

9.18 The Commission noted that there was no consensus on the proposal.

Exploratory fisheries

9.19 The Commission adopted revisions of CM 41-01 and CM 41-10 to realign and clarify the respective requirements of research hauls to be conducted when fishing in Subarea 88.2 SSRU H (paragraphs 4.60 and 7.49).

9.20 Additionally, the Commission adopted revision of CM 41-01 to permit a vessel to cease a research haul for the purpose of preventing gear loss or securing the safety of a vessel or those on board (paragraph 7.50).

Toothfish catch limits

9.21 The Commission endorsed the advice of the Scientific Committee on catch limits in the fisheries for *D. mawsoni* in Subarea 48.4 and adopted CM 41-03 (2024).

9.22 The Commission endorsed the Scientific Committee's advice on catch limits (SC-CAMLR-43, Tables 4 and 5). The Commission adopted the following conservation measures for fisheries targeting *D. mawsoni* and/or *D. eleginoides*:

CM 41-04 – exploratory fishery for *D. mawsoni* in Subarea 48.6

CM 41-05 – exploratory fishery for *D. mawsoni* in Division 58.4.2

CM 41-06 – exploratory fishery for *D. eleginoides* in Division 58.4.3a

CM 41-07 – exploratory fishery for *D. mawsoni* in Division 58.4.3b

CM 41-08 – exploratory fishery for *D. eleginoides* in Division 58.5.2

9.23 The Commission adopted CMs 41-09 and 41-10 noting the updated catch limits for these fisheries, and that the access paragraphs for both Conservation Measures had not been reinstated (paragraph 4.11).

9.24 The Commission did not reach consensus on the issue fishery classification in CM 41-11 and endorsed the Conservation Measure containing only the Scientific Committee’s advice on catch limits (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraph 3.73), and noting that directed fishing for *D. mawsoni* shall not take place in 2024/25 in Division 58.4.1.

Icefish catch limits

9.25 The Commission endorsed the Scientific Committee’s advice on the limits for the fishery for *C. gunnari* in Division 58.5.2 and adopted CM 42-02 (2024).

Krill fisheries

9.26 The Commission endorsed the advice of the Scientific Committee to specify the use of one or more marine mammal exclusion devices in Conservation Measures 51-01 (2024), 51-02 (2024), 51-03 (2024), and 51-04 (2024), and adopted revisions to these Conservation Measures.

9.27 The Commission considered the proposal by the delegations of Argentina, Australia, New Zealand, Norway, the United Kingdom, and the United States to amend CM 51-06 (CCAMLR-43/40) to require at least one observer on every vessel be appointed under the Scheme of International Scientific Observation (SISO).

9.28 The Commission noted that there was no consensus on the proposal.

9.29 The Commission could not reach consensus on a revision to CM 51-07. Consequently, this Conservation Measure lapsed (paragraph 4.45).

Protected Areas

9.30 The Commission considered a revision to CM 91-02, Annex A, required by the adoption of ATCM-46 of Measure 17 (2024) and adopted CM 91-02 (2024).

Other fishery matters

9.31 The Commission considered the proposal by the USA for a Resolution on Labour and Safety Standards in CCAMLR Fisheries, noting that labour abuses and safety issues on fishing vessels had received significant attention in recent years.

9.32 The Commission noted that there was no consensus on the proposal.

9.33 The USA made the following statement:

‘The United States is disappointed with the outcome of the discussions on our proposal for a new, non-binding Resolution on Labor and Safety Standards in CCAMLR Fisheries (CCAMLR-43/32). We had productive discussions during SCIC and produced

a revision of the proposal that addressed concerns heard around the table. We heard from some Members that they needed to consult on the proposal with colleagues back home. As such, it seemed that the Resolution might be able to move to drafting group.

However, we then heard this week arguments that such a Resolution is outside of the purview of CCAMLR and should be handled by the International Labor Organization and International Maritime Organization. CCAMLR manages fishing activities in the Convention Area, which are carried out by fishing vessels and their crews. As such it is within CCAMLR's purview to take certain steps for safety and health of the crew aboard those vessels, including with regard to fair working and living conditions aboard vessels. It is part of ensuring responsible fishing, per the FAO Code of Conduct. In fact, CCAMLR has agreed that it has a mandate to manage safety issues under Resolution 23/XXIII: Safety on board vessels fishing in the Convention Area, and so there is precedent. Furthermore, any steps taken to address fair working conditions and safety of crew can improve vessel safety overall, thereby decreasing risks to the environment in the Convention Area.

International fisheries bodies have made great strides in recent years adopting non-binding measures for labor standards in their fisheries. CCAMLR now continues an unfortunate trend of failing to adopt basic measures to improve management of its fisheries by failing to adopt a non-binding Resolution on labor and safety standards for all crew on board fishing vessels. We would like to acknowledge the support we received from many Members and the productive discussions and express regret that some Members were unable to support the proposal at this time.'

9.34 China made the following statement:

'China reiterated its objection to the US proposal concerning labour. The Commission is an organisation for conservation. CCAMLR lacks a mandate to deal with labour issues based on the CAMLR Convention. In addition, there is a global competent authority, that is International Labour Organization which is responsible for the labour issue. We shall let the professional platform do professional things and avoid the fragmentation of the rules and policies, which is truly the best way to safeguard the interest and safety of labour.'

9.35 Australia made the following statement:

'As per our statement of previous years, Australia advises the Commission that any fishing or fisheries research activities in that part of Divisions 58.4.3a, 58.4.3b and 58.5.2 that constitutes the Australian exclusive economic zone (EEZ) around the Australian Territory of Heard Island and McDonald Islands must have the prior approval of Australian authorities. Unauthorised or illegal fishing in these waters is a serious offence under Australian law. Australia seeks the assistance of other CCAMLR Members in ensuring their nationals and vessels are aware of the limits of the Australian EEZ and the need for prior permission to fish there. Australia has implemented strict controls to ensure that fishing in its EEZ occurs only on a sustainable basis. Presently, fishing concessions are fully subscribed and no further concessions for legal fishing in the EEZ are available. Australian legislation provides for large penalties for illegal fishing in Australia's EEZ, including the immediate forfeiture of foreign vessels

found engaged in such activities. Any enquiries about fishing in the Australian EEZ should be made initially to the Australian Fisheries Management Authority.

Australia is proud that our fisheries management practices, including in the Southern Ocean, are world's best practice, and that our industry has a strong reputation for sustainable fishing and environmental stewardship. Like all fisheries operating within Australia's EEZ, the toothfish fishery at Heard Island and McDonald Islands, or HIMI, is managed under domestic legislation, including regular management review informed by the best available science. The HIMI fishery has held Marine Stewardship Council certification since 2012. Our rigorous domestic requirements and fisheries management practices are, at a minimum, consistent with those prescribed through CCAMLR's Conservation Measures, and in many instances exceed CCAMLR requirements.

Australia's staunch commitment to comprehensive marine conservation at HIMI is further demonstrated by the recent announcement by our Minister for the Environment and Water, that the Australian Government intends to expand the HIMI Marine Reserve by almost 310,000 square kilometres. This expanded marine protected area will cover 91% of Australia's HIMI EEZ, providing stronger protection for the marine environment, while also allowing the continuation of an environmentally responsible, sustainable fishery.

In this context, Australia regrets there was not support this year to set a catch limit for the HIMI fishery using the CCAMLR Decision Rules. This demonstrates declining confidence in the CCAMLR Decision Rules. Accordingly, Australia is pleased the Commission has supported work by the Scientific Committee to undertake conduct a comprehensive review of the CCAMLR Decision Rules and potential alternatives through Management Strategy Evaluation. Such work is urgently required to ensure CCAMLR's Decision Rules are robust to the effect of climate change and changed productivity in fish stocks and, importantly, to give the Commission confidence to set catch limits for all fisheries, on a predictable and defined basis, that are precautionary and consistent with the Commission's conservation objective in the long term.

At this meeting Australia has agreed to a toothfish catch limit for 2024/25 and 2025/26 in our HIMI fishery that is significantly lower than the catch limit generated by the CCAMLR Decision Rules, in recognition of the time required for testing of alternatives to the CCAMLR Decision Rules. This demonstrates our strong and unwavering commitment to CCAMLR's conservation objective and to a precautionary approach, including in fisheries management, but should be considered a temporary arrangement while this fundamental work is advanced. It is not acceptable to us to introduce interim rules that have not been tested through a scientifically rigorous MSE. We would not do this under our robust domestic laws and we do not consider this appropriate for CCAMLR. This important work by the Scientific Committee will require dedicated involvement from all relevant Members. We look forward to participating, including to contribute based on our domestic experience and expertise.'

Administration and Finance

10.1 The Vice-Chair of the Commission, Ms S. Langerock (Belgium), presented the report of SCAF-2024 (Annex 7) and thanked Ambassador M. Gowland (Argentina), the Chair of SCAF, for his excellent chairing of the SCAF meeting.

10.2 The Commission endorsed the advice of SCAF and accepted the Audited Financial Statements for 2023 (SCAF-2024, paragraph 5).

10.3 The Commission noted the report of the Executive Secretary (CCAMLR-43/05) and endorsed that the Secretariat, in cooperation with the Government of Australia, pursue the renewal of the lease on 181 Macquarie Street, Hobart, for the period 2025–2030.

10.4 The Commission endorsed CCAMLR-43/26 Rev. 1, containing a proposal for the development of a CCAMLR Communications Strategy as identified as a core priority in the 2023-2026 Strategic Plan. The Commission approved the draft Terms of Reference for an e-group to undertake this work (SCAF-2024, paragraph 11 and Appendix 1).

10.5 The Commission endorsed the draft procedures for the recruitment and appointment of the Executive Secretary (SCAF-2024, Appendix 2).

10.6 The Commission discussed a suggestion to conduct the interviews of the five candidates to be shortlisted for the Executive Secretary role virtually as a cost saving measure.

10.7 Many Members noted this matter had been discussed and in person interviews were agreed to in SCAF. They also noted it has been previous practice for CCAMLR Executive Secretary candidates to attend interviews in person.

10.8 Noting that candidates able to attend an in-person interview may be advantaged over candidates who can only attend a virtual interview, the Commission agreed that the usual practice of in-person interviews as specified in SCAF-2024, Appendix 2 would apply.

10.9 The Commission noted the activities of the General Capacity Building Fund (GCBF) (SCAF-2024, paragraph 16) and endorsed the decisions of the General Capacity Building Fund Panel and the recommendations from SCAF regarding capacity building (SCAF-2024, paragraphs 18 and 19).

Review of the 2024 budget, the 2025 budget and forecast budget for 2026

10.10 The Vice-Chair introduced SCAF-2024, paragraphs 20–43, noting that higher demands on the Secretariat and some costs rising at a faster rate than the consumer price index (CPI) are making it increasingly difficult to deliver long-term financial sustainability of the General Fund.

10.11 The Commission endorsed SCAF's approval of the revised budget for 2024 (Annex 5).

10.12 The Vice-Chair thanked Argentina for convening the intersessional meetings of the Sustainable Financing Intersessional Correspondence Group (ICG) noting that the Commission had requested it to identify sustainable financing options for increased cost recovery for

fisheries management and other administrative activities in 2024 and provide a proposal to CCAMLR-43 (CCAMLR-42, paragraph 10.9).

10.13 SCAF had noted that CCAMLR-43/09 (and CCAMLR-43/BG/46) proposed some options for generating an additional A\$500 000 income in 2025 from a combination of the following three elements of income: Member equal share contributions, Member fishing share contributions and notification fees.

- (i) Option 1 proposed a small increase in equal share contributions over CPI, and a larger and equally shared increase in the other two elements.
- (ii) Option 1a applied Option 1 over a two-year period.
- (iii) Option 2 proposed a slightly higher increase in equal share contributions and the balance contributed equally between the other two elements.
- (iv) Option 3 proposed no increase over CPI for the equal share and the balance contributed equally between the other two elements.

10.14 The Commission noted that many Members had stated that they could accept Option 1 or 1a and could show flexibility to consider other options, especially given the importance of reaching an agreement on a sustainable financing option without delay. Brazil noted that it preferred Option 3 but in a spirit of compromise could accept Option 1.

10.15 China indicated that like some other CCAMLR Members, it also held a zero growth principle for the budget of international organisations. China noted that in order to give further support to the work of the Secretariat, China is willing to show its flexibility to increase the budget on a balanced approach. China introduced its proposal that all three elements of funding should increase on equal proportion, and indicated that this proposal has been included as Option 5 in the paper submitted by the Secretariat (CCAMLR-43/BG/46).

10.16 Russia noted that the workload of the Secretariat should be considered or revised where needed as the essential first step to achieve sustainable financing goals. Russia did not find a basis to support any of the proposed options. It reiterated that its position was expressed during the SCAF meeting.

10.17 Many Members thanked the Secretariat for continuing to deliver an efficient level of service with limited budgetary resources and expressed appreciation for work done to achieve organisational efficiencies.

10.18 Some Members emphasised their preference for a zero growth budget, while other Members stressed the difficulty of maintaining a zero growth budget while Secretariat workload, new initiatives, and demands were increasing.

10.19 The Commission requested the Secretariat to prepare a paper identifying potential efficiencies in the budget based on the Rules of Procedures of the Commission and looking at best practices of the ATCM, and possibly other international organisations including practice on running efficient meetings to be considered by SCAF-25.

10.20 Noting SCAF's discussion on this issue (SCAF-2024, paragraphs 39–41) the Commission supported a proposal to work intersessionally to prioritise workload and demands

on the Secretariat and to consider additional methods of obtaining operational efficiencies, including options for meeting related services and cost reductions.

10.21 China noted that the MPA Special Fund had not incurred expenditure over the last three years and that there is no budgeted expenditure planned for the two coming fiscal years, which may indicate inefficiency of the use of some Special Funds.

10.22 The Commission agreed to consider possible ways to improve the functioning of all Special Funds, including the MPA Special Fund, with the aim to relieve some of the expenditure burden from the General Fund budget.

10.23 The Commission recalled its previous adoption of a mechanism for reviewing the continuing need for Special Funds that were unused for a number of years (CCAMLR-37, paragraph 4.11) and requested the Secretariat to prepare a review of the Special Funds, including their terms of reference and history of utilisation, for CCAMLR-44.

10.24 The Commission amended and adopted the revised 2024 budget, the 2025 budget, and the forecast budget for 2026 (Annex 5). This budget applies the principle of zero real growth using the Australian CPI at June 2024 to determine inflationary increases.

10.25 Germany congratulated this year's CCAMLR scholarship recipient, Dr. Zoleka Filander from South Africa, and looked forward to supporting Zoleka's work and seeing the results of her work. Germany thanked the Commission for the ongoing support given to the scholarship program and praised the contributions made to science by recipients. Funding of the scholarship program relies on support of the General Science Capacity Fund, and there may be insufficient remaining funds to support scholarships beyond 2025.

10.26 South Africa thanked the CCAMLR Secretariat and welcomed the awarding of the scholarship scheme to South African representative Dr Zoleka Filander. South Africa is optimistic that this will strengthen the South African delegation's participation while also contributing and providing scientific outputs that are fundamental and relevant to the priorities of the Secretariat activities. South Africa would like to thank Dr Katharina Teschke from Germany for agreeing to mentor a South African representative.

Administration Matters

10.27 The Commission noted the website update provided in CCAMLR-43/BG/20 and endorsed SCAF's recommendations on Performance Review 2 (SCAF-2024, paragraph 48).

10.28 The Vice-Chair introduced SCAF's discussion on a draft Code of Conduct for CCAMLR events (SCAF-2024, paragraphs 53–63). She noted that during SCAF many Members had thanked the co-proponents (Australia, France, the Republic of Korea and the United States) for their work on this matter. The Vice-Chair further noted that during SCAF, many Members had stated that they were aware of instances of intimidating and other inappropriate behaviours that had occurred at CCAMLR meetings and had expressed disappointment at the lack of progress made in adopting a Code of Conduct.

10.29 As consensus had not been reached on the proposed Code of Conduct, SCAF referred CCAMLR-43/39 to the Commission.

10.30 On behalf of the co-proponents, Australia recalled that the draft CCAMLR Code of Conduct proposal was first presented at CCAMLR-42, following agreement at CCAMLR-41 to undertake this work. CCAMLR-42 had heard strong support for the Code from many Members, and concerns raised by some. The proponents had amended the draft Code to address the concerns raised, including removing the important remediation elements, with the hopes of adopting a Code that still provided a set of clear behaviours CCAMLR could agree to adopt in undertaking its work. The co-proponents were disappointed that these good faith efforts to compromise on the draft Code were not met with consensus support this year in SCAF. They encouraged the Commission to maintain focus on this important matter and to continue to consider opportunities to make progress in future.

10.31 Australia made the following statement on behalf of the Code of Conduct co-proponents:

‘We would like to highlight our commitment to ensuring that all attendees can participate in CCAMLR events in an inclusive, respectful and safe environment, including in person, virtual or hybrid meetings, Working Groups, electronic working groups (e-Groups), conferences, receptions, scientific and technical events, expert meetings, workshops, side events and any other forum organised, hosted, or sponsored in whole or part by CCAMLR.

We further highlight the importance of participants in CCAMLR events maintaining the highest ethical and professional standards, and express our expectation that all participants behave with integrity, respect and courtesy towards all individuals attending, or involved with, any CCAMLR event, including by:

Listening and valuing others’ different viewpoints and experiences;

Using inclusive language, tone and posture; and

Contributing to CCAMLR events with good intent and in the spirit of cooperation that is fundamental to the Antarctic Treaty System.

We express our further expectation that participants at CCAMLR events behave in a manner that demonstrates respect for all persons and take positive steps to foster an inclusive environment. Consistent with these expectations, we note that unacceptable behaviours would include bullying; harassment, including sexual harassment; discrimination; retaliation; improper influence or pressure; and refusal to engage professionally, as elaborated in CCAMLR-43/39.

We encourage all Members to opt-in to this Code of Conduct and follow its guidance.’

10.32 Many Members stated their strong support for the Code of Conduct and aligned themselves with the statement made by the co-proponents. They highlighted that other international organisations have similar codes of conduct, and a CCAMLR Code of Conduct would support Members’ collective work in line with key Antarctic Treaty System values of collaboration and respect.

10.33 Some Members stated they could not agree to the Code of Conduct as it exceeded the mandate of the Commission and was not of relevance. In this respect Russia stressed an urgent

need to ensure implementation of the Headquarters Agreement by the host country as the priority.

10.34 China was of the view that there are existing channels and authorities handling such events and that delegates to CCAMLR meetings act as representatives of their respective governments, not subject to the governance of CCAMLR. Furthermore, China considers that CCAMLR enjoys friendly cooperation amongst its Members and therefore a Code of Conduct is not needed. China stressed that different international organisations have different natures and situations and the practice of other organisations should be borrowed with caution.

10.35 In response to a request from one Member, the Executive Secretary confirmed the status of the implementation of Code of Conduct issues in the Secretariat:

‘The CCAMLR Secretariat does not implement the UN Code of Conduct directly. However, the suite of policies that we have in place covers most of the issues identified in the UN Code of Conduct.

The suite of policies that apply to the Secretariat staff use local and national standards taken from Fair Work Australia, Safe Work Tasmania and the Australian Human Rights Commission and are created in consultation with Secretariat staff as employees working at the Secretariat are subject to Australian laws and legislation.

Relevant policies and procedures include:

- (i) Staff Regulations, in particular Regulation 1.2;
- (ii) CCAMLR Secretariat Code of Conduct;
- (iii) Workplace anti-Discrimination, anti-Harassment and anti-Bullying Policy;
- (iv) Disciplinary Policy for managing misconduct and serious misconduct; and
- (v) CCAMLR Values and Behaviours.’

10.36 Many Members expressed disappointment that consensus had not been reached to adopt the Code of Conduct and recalled that, in accordance with Article IX of the Convention, it is firmly within the Commission’s mandate to take forward this work to ensure its Members can undertake their work in respectful environment. They stated their support for progressing the Code of Conduct at future meetings.

10.37 The Commission reviewed SCAF’s discussion on the circulation of COMM CIRCS to observers (SCAF-2024, paragraphs 64 to 67) recalling the request for the Secretariat to work on this issue (CCAMLR-42, paragraphs 3.1 to 3.10).

10.38 Many Members supported the proposal and recognised its value to increase CCAMLR’s organisational transparency.

10.39 Russia expressed itself not in favour of changing the current practices and stressed the special status of Members and Observers and the lack of a permanent status of an organisation as an Observer.

10.40 The Commission agreed to leave the current circular distribution procedures unchanged and requested that the Secretariat continue with work to propose improvements or modifications to the process for discussion at CCAMLR-44.

10.41 The Commission reviewed SCAF's discussion on the Access to Documents / DOI project (SCAF-2024, paragraphs 68 and 69).

10.42 In response to a request from China, the Secretariat confirmed that it intended a precautionary approach to the release of meeting papers. An addition to the procedures described in paragraph 5.13 of the Standard Operation Procedures (SOPs) will specify that all papers that are potentially sensitive, including those that may include data subject to the CCAMLR Data Access Rules, which should be marked for the attention of Members.

10.43 The Commission approved SCAF's recommendation to endorse the project workplan, including waiving the requirement to expedite this process to clear the backlog of CCAMLR documents submitted prior to 2003 (SCAF-2024, paragraph 69).

10.44 The Commission considered SCAF's discussion on Headquarters meeting arrangements, noting the request of CCAMLR-41 (SCAF-2022, paragraph 73) that this matter be kept under review. The Commission endorsed SCAF's recommendation to retain the meeting dates system currently applied.

Cooperation with the Antarctic Treaty System and international organisations

11.1 The Commission noted CCAMLR-43/10, submitted by the Secretariat, which presented the ways in which CCAMLR cooperates with other organisations, including under the formal Arrangements and Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs) that CCAMLR has signed with other regional organisations. The Secretariat recommended that the Commission authorise renewal of the cooperation agreements with SPRFMO and ACAP.

11.2 The Commission endorsed the renewal of the cooperation agreements with SPRFMO (paragraph 5.52) and ACAP for three years.

11.3 ACAP thanked the Commission for agreeing to extend the MoU between CCAMLR and ACAP for a further 3 years. ACAP looked forward to the continuation of cooperation with CCAMLR colleagues and noted that much of ACAP's input to CCAMLR deliberations, especially in WG-IMAF and the Scientific Committee, relates to seabird by-catch mitigation. In addition, ACAP highlighted its regular updating of advice and guidelines related to the H5N1 avian influenza outbreak (<https://www.acap.aq/resources/disease-threats/avian-flu>) and a brochure outlining its achievements and the challenges it has faced over the last 20 years, as well as future opportunities (<https://www.acap.aq/about-acap>). ACAP encouraged interested CCAMLR Members to attend meetings of its working groups in 2026 and noted that its triennial Meeting of the Parties will be held in Dunedin, New Zealand, in May 2025.

11.4 The Commission noted CCAMLR-43/30, submitted by the CCAMLR Secretariat and the Government of Peru, which presented a draft MoU between CCAMLR and the Government of Peru to enhance cooperation in relation to the work of the Scientific Committee, foster engagement in its work and the exchange of data consistent with CCAMLR's data access rules.

11.5 The Commission endorsed the signing of the MoU between CCAMLR and the Government of Peru.

11.6 Chile welcomed this endorsement which will allow for even greater information to be provided on krill stocks, particularly in the Antarctic Peninsula, noting Peru's expertise in krill acoustics and ecosystem monitoring, which are relevant to the management of the krill fishery in the region. Chile recalled that during 2024, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador and Peru have implemented a regional krill group, focused on coordinating Latin American efforts for the study of this species and hoped that the first results will be presented to CCAMLR in the near future.

Cooperation with the Antarctic Treaty System

11.7 The Commission noted CCAMLR-43/BG/04, submitted by the Executive Secretary, which presented a summary report of the Forty-sixth Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties Meeting (ATCM 46) held in Kochi, India, from 20 to 30 May 2024.

Cooperation with international organisations

11.8 The Commission noted that the IWC adopted a resolution on cooperation within Antarctica during its 69th meeting (IWC69) held in September 2024, in Lima, Peru. The Secretariat shared in COMM CIRC 24/107 – SC CIRC 24/78 the adopted resolution as well as a letter of invitation from the IWC Secretariat to further strengthen the cooperation between CCAMLR and the IWC. Recalling that the Convention Article XXIII(3) includes that the Commission shall seek to develop cooperative working relationships with inter-governmental and non-governmental organisations such as the IWC, the Commission discussed the establishment of a formal arrangement, such as a Memorandum of Understanding, with the Secretariat of the IWC to facilitate strengthened cooperation between organisations.

11.9 Many Members agreed to the establishment of an MoU with IWC. Russia noted the importance of this issue but considered it premature given the current workload of the CCAMLR Secretariat. The Commission strongly supported cooperation with the IWC and agreed that Members could initiate discussions with the IWC regarding an MoU, and that this issue will be considered at CCAMLR-44.

Reports of observers from international organisations

11.10 ARK announced that Rongcheng East China Fisheries Corporation, operating FV *Hua Xiang 9* had joined ARK thereby increasing the number of ARK-affiliated companies to ten. ARK highlighted its continued support of the development of the KFMA as exemplified by the acoustic surveys conducted in Subareas 48.1 and 48.2, the co-finance of the Harmonisation Symposium, and its active participation in the discussions leading to the MPA and catch-limit scenarios elaborated at the Symposium. ARK also informed the implementation of Voluntary Restriction Zones (VRZs) for the 6th consecutive year, with the entire fishing fleet complying with the voluntary closures. Finally, ARK recommended the implementation of a Daily Catch

and Effort Reporting System when the quota assigned or left is smaller than 30 000 tonnes, adjustment that would avoid catch overruns and is a necessary step for implementing the revised KFMA.

11.11 The Commission noted CCAMLR-43/BG/36, submitted by SCAR, which presented its annual report to CCAMLR, providing information on its Scientific Research Programmes (INSTANT, Ant-ICON and AntClimNow), ecosystem reporting initiatives (ACCE and SAER), its groups and co-sponsored groups (SCAR FISH, C-CAGE, AnMAP, ICED, SOOS, AWHN, SKEG and EDI) and other initiatives (DCC-SOR, Antarctic Environments Portal, SCAR Fellowships and organisation of the next International Polar Year (IPY)).

11.12 SCAR highlighted the SCAR Action Group on Wildlife Health which developed a biological risk assessment and a practical guide for operators and scientists interacting with wildlife, which outlined likely risks from HPAI H5N1 and ways to reduce these. SCAR noted Ant-ICON with SCATS continued their fellowship program (the 2025 call is now open) which enables an early to mid-career researcher to participate in ATCM/CEP and SC-CAMLR meetings as part of the SCAR delegation (Dr Noémie Friscourt presented her background paper to SC-CAMLR-43). SCAR indicated it will continue to provide objective and independent advice on scientific issues to the Antarctic Treaty System and as such stands ready to assist CCAMLR as required.

11.13 The Commission noted CCAMLR-43/BG/34, submitted by ASOC, which presented its annual report to CCAMLR, highlighting papers submitted to CCAMLR-43 addressing issues that included safety and environmental impact of fishing vessels, a report from the compliance workshop co-hosted with the Republic of Korea, an analysis of the FAO transshipment guidelines, the relationship between science and conservation, and several papers presenting the results of scientific research relevant to CCAMLR. ASOC also highlighted that it has actively supported Antarctic conservation by funding scientific research, fostering dialogue among CCAMLR stakeholders, supporting the Harmonisation Symposium, and organising various educational and outreach initiatives.

11.14 The Commission noted CCAMLR-43/BG/02 Rev. 1, submitted by COLTO, which presented the final report on the COLTO Gear Workshop, held in Oslo, Norway, on 15 and 16 August 2024. Topics discussed at the workshop included the use and maintenance of demersal autoline gear in toothfish fisheries, gear loss minimisation, lost gear recovery, gear end-of-life use, and the FAO Voluntary Guidelines on the Marking of Fishing Gear and how current CCAMLR longline requirements compare. COLTO highlighted its contributions to CCAMLR this year which included the CCAMLR toothfish tag lottery (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraph 10.21), and that they looked forward to continuing working with CCAMLR Members on unidentified gear in the Convention Area. COLTO also announced they recently provided funding to produce a toothfish tagging training video, which was an outstanding recommendation from the 2023 CCAMLR Tagging workshop (WS-TAG-2023).

11.15 The Commission thanked SCAR, ASOC, ARK and COLTO for their valuable contributions to its work.

Reports from CCAMLR representatives at meetings of international organisations in the previous intersessional period and nominations of representatives to forthcoming meetings of relevant international organisations

11.16 The Commission noted with gratitude the reports of CCAMLR Observers to international meetings that took place in the 2023/24 intersessional period (CCAMLR-43/BG/01, BG/08, BG/13, BG/22, BG/23, BG/31, BG/32, BG/37, BG/42, BG/43, BG/45 Rev. 1).

11.17 The Commission considered the calendar of 2024/25 meetings of organisations or arrangements and nominated observers for the Commission (Table 1).

Administrative matters

Election of officers

12.1 The Commission thanked Mr V. Tsybaliuk for his dedication and excellent execution as Chair of the Commission for the 2023 and 2024 meetings.

12.2 The Commission elected the United Kingdom to the position of Chair of the Commission for the 2025 and 2026 meetings.

12.3 The Commission confirmed the recommendation from SCIC that Mr A. Berry (New Zealand) be elected as SCIC Chair for 2025 and 2026, and expressed its gratitude to Ms M. Engelke-Ros (USA) for chairing SCIC over the last four years.

12.4 The Commission welcomed Ambassador M. Gowland (Argentina) as the Chair of SCAF for 2024 and 2025 and Ms Suzanne McGuire (USA) as Vice-Chair of SCAF for 2024 and 2025.

12.5 The Commission encouraged Members to consider nominations for Vice-Chair of SCIC.

Invitation of observers

12.6 The Commission will invite the following to attend the Forty-fourth Meeting of the Commission as Observers:

- (i) non-Member Contracting Parties – Bulgaria, Canada, Cook Islands, Finland, Greece, Mauritius, Islamic Republic of Pakistan, Republic of Panama, Peru and Vanuatu
- (ii) other States in dialogue with CCAMLR – Indonesia and Luxembourg
- (iii) NCPs trading in re-exported *Dissostichus* spp. that has not been previously landed in the port of a Contracting Party or NCPs cooperating with CCAMLR by participating in the CDS, who are cooperating with CCAMLR through limited access to the e-CDS – Colombia, Mexico, Singapore and Thailand

- (iv) NCPs not participating in the CDS but possibly involved in harvesting, landing and/or trade of toothfish in accordance with the NCP Engagement Strategy – Cambodia, Dominican Republic, Indonesia, Kuwait, Malaysia, Maldives, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Trinidad and Tobago, Türkiye, United Arab Emirates and Viet Nam
- (v) NCP Flag States of vessels listed on CCAMLR NCP-IUU Vessel List – Republic of Angola, Islamic Republic of Iran, Nigeria and Togo.

12.7 The following inter-governmental organisations will be invited to attend CCAMLR-44 as Observers: ACAP, ATS, CCSBT, CEP, CITES, COMNAP, CPPS, FAO, IATTC, ICCAT, IOC, INTERPOL, IUCN, IWC, RPOA-IUU, SCAR, SCOR, SEAFDEC, SEAFO, SIOFA, SOOS, SPRFMO, UNDOALOS, UNEP and WCPFC.

12.8 The following non-governmental organisations will be invited: ARK, ASOC, COLTO, IAATO and Oceanites Inc.

Next meeting

12.9 The Commission agreed to use the process determined in 2023 (CCAMLR-43, paragraphs 12.8–12.11), repeated below with dates amended, to set the dates for the 2025 meeting.

12.10 The Commission confirmed that CCAMLR-44 will take place in person at the CCAMLR Headquarters building (181 Macquarie Street) in Hobart, Australia, and set dates from 20 to 31 October 2025 subject to paragraphs 12.11 to 12.13 for further approaches, and decisions, if needed.

12.11 The Commission agreed that the CAMLR Convention shall be applied in its entirety including its Article VII(3) and Article XIII(2). In this regard the Commission recalled that the Commission shall hold a regular annual meeting. The Commission further recalled that each Member of the Commission shall be represented by one representative who may be accompanied by alternate representatives and advisers.

12.12 The Commission instructed the Executive Secretary to consult with the Australian authorities on the application of the Headquarters Agreement in order to ensure equal right to representation of all Members in accordance with the Convention. In addition, the Commission requested that the Executive Secretary send a letter to the Australian authorities early in the new year, to reiterate that the Headquarters Agreement shall be implemented in full including Article 19, and to recall its Article 25.

12.13 The Commission also noted that a virtual Heads of Delegation meeting will be scheduled in the last week of February or the first week of March during the 2024/25 intersessional period to review progress towards the timely organisation of the annual meeting including to confirm the dates and to promote timely issuance of visas for Members' delegations or take alternative decisions according to the Rules of Procedure, where relevant.

Other business

13.1 Argentina made the following statement:

‘The Government of the Argentine Republic once again recalls that the Malvinas, South Georgias and South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime areas form an integral part of Argentine national territory and, being under illegitimate British occupation, are the subject of a sovereignty dispute recognised by Resolutions 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII), 31/49, 37/9, 38/12, 39/6, 40/21, 41/40, 42/19 and 43/25 of the United Nations General Assembly, as well as by the resolutions annually adopted by the United Nations Special Committee on Decolonization, which call on the two parties to the sovereignty dispute - that is, the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom - to resume negotiations until a fair, peaceful and definitive solution to the dispute is reached, taking due account of the interests of the inhabitants of the Malvinas Islands.

Argentina reiterates that in Statistical Subareas 48.3 and 48.4 only the multilateral system of this Convention is legally applicable.

Furthermore, Argentina recalls that the following actions are illegal and invalid:

- (i) activities carried out in the CCAMLR Convention area by vessels registered in the Malvinas, South Georgias and South Sandwich Islands, or operating with these islands as their base, or flying the flag of alleged British authorities in these islands, which Argentina does not recognise;
- (ii) inspections in port and at sea carried out by these alleged authorities;
- (iii) the issuing of or intervention in catch documents carried out by these alleged authorities;
- (iv) the imposition by them of fishing licenses;
- (v) any other unilateral action taken by the aforementioned colonial authorities in these territories.

The Argentine Republic reaffirms its sovereign rights over the Malvinas Islands, South Georgias Islands, the South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime spaces.’

13.2 The UK made the following statement:

‘The UK rejects Argentina’s statement.

The UK once again reiterates that it has no doubt about its sovereignty over the Falkland Islands and South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, and its sovereignty or sovereign rights in the surrounding maritime zones, as is well known to all delegates.

We also draw to the Commission’s attention that any fishing, fisheries research or other scientific research activities in the part of Subarea 48.3 and 48.4 that constitutes the South Georgia & the South Sandwich Islands maritime zone must have the prior approval of the islands’ Government.

We recall the statements we have made about the management of the South Georgia fisheries during this year's meeting of SCIC, and in previous years. We reiterate that the Government of South Georgia & the South Sandwich Islands has implemented strict controls to ensure that fishing within its maritime zone occurs only on a sustainable basis and in line with the best available science. The fisheries are managed and operated so as to comply fully with the Convention and all applicable Conservation Measures and we reiterate our rejection of any suggestion to the contrary.

With reference to the Argentina's intervention (in SCIC) to the statement made by the Chairman of the Conference at which the Convention was adopted. The United Kingdom rejects the interpretation of the statement set out by Argentina. The text of the 1980 Chairman's Statement is, in its paragraph 5, unambiguous. It relates to unanimity in relation to the existence of state sovereignty, and thus recognises a difference between islands north of 60 degrees South and islands within the Antarctic Treaty Area. It does not reference unanimity as to which state is sovereign.

The UK will continue to implement CCAMLR provisions in a constructive way, in due recognition of that interpretation of the 1980 statement, as well as with Article IV of the Convention.'

13.3 Argentina made the following statement:

'Argentina rejects the British statement and reiterates its widely known legal position.'

13.4 France made the following statement:

'France hosted the One Planet-Polar Summit, the first international summit dedicated to the cryosphere, in Paris from 8 to 10 November 2023. The event brought together more than 800 participants, including hundreds of scientists of some forty nationalities, explorers, polar operators, foundations, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and representatives of indigenous peoples and local communities from Greenland, the Himalayas and the Andes. CCAMLR Executive Secretary David Agnew also attended.

21 discussion sessions enabled the stakeholders involved to share their observations and conclusions on the actions to be taken to protect the populations and ecosystems of the poles and glaciers and enable them to adapt to the collapse of the cryosphere.

The results of this work were presented to 19 ministers for research and the environment, as well as to the heads of state and government present at a high-level session chaired by French President Emmanuel Macron, during which the Scientific Advisory Board's report, the most up-to-date report on the melting cryosphere, was presented.

The Summit led to the adoption of a political declaration, the 'Paris Call for Glaciers and Poles', endorsed to date by 36 countries, as well as the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) and the World Meteorological Organisation (WMO)'.

13.5 The USA thanked France for their strong interest in encouraging international collaboration on the cryosphere and noted that the appropriate place for decisions on issues affecting the Antarctic is within the Antarctic Treaty System, including this Commission.

13.6 The Commission noted that Ms S. Langerock (Belgium) will be unlikely to attend future meetings and wanted to reflect their gratitude for her services over several years as Chair of SCAF and Vice-Chair of the Commission.

Report of the forty-third meeting of the Commission

14.1 The report of the forty-third meeting of the Commission was adopted.

Close of the meeting

15.1 At the conclusion of the meeting the Chair thanked all of the Members and their delegates for their cooperation, efforts and flexibility to ensure the adoption of the report. He further thanked the Chairs of SCIC, SCAF and the Scientific Committee, the Executive Secretary and the Secretariat team, the interpreters, Congress and other support staff for ensuring the meeting logistics and organisation ran smoothly.

15.2 China thanked the Chair for his leadership for his two-year term as chair, noting that there were many challenges during the period and that the circumstances of this meeting were unprecedented for many reasons.

15.3 On behalf of all Members Belgium expressed their thanks for his professionalism in chairing the meetings and wished him the best for future endeavours.

15.4 The Executive Secretary, on behalf of the Secretariat, thanked the Chair for his kind support over the last two years, and presented him with an engraved gavel.

15.5 The Chair closed the 43rd meeting of the Commission.

Table 1: Nominated representatives to international meetings in 2024/2025.

Entity	Dates (where available)	Venue (where available)	Observer
The Agreement for the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP) MoP	19 May to 23 May 2025	Dunedin, New Zealand	New Zealand
The Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting (ATCM)	23 June to 3 July 2025	Milan, Italy	*
The FAO Committee on Fisheries (COFI)	2026	Rome, Italy	*
The Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna (CCSBT)	6 to 9 October 2025	Bali, Indonesia	
The Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC)	2025	U.S.A, TBC	
The International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT)	11 November to 18 November 2024	Cyprus	USA
The Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC)	7 to 17 April 2025	La Réunion, France	Australia
The International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) - World Conservation Congress	9-15 October 2025	Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates	
The International Whaling Commission (IWC)	2026	Australia	Australia
The Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO)	15 September to 19 September 2025	Halifax, Canada	
The North East Atlantic Fisheries Commission (NEAFC)	12 November to 15 November 2024	London, UK	Norway
The South East Atlantic Fisheries Organisation (SEAFO)	27 November to 28 November 2024	Swakopmund, Namibia	
The Southern Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement (SIOFA)	30 June to 4 July 2025	Port Louis, Mauritius	EU
The South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation (SPRFMO)	17 February to 21 February 2025	Santiago, Chile	EU
The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)	8 December to 12 December 2025	Nairobi, Kenya	Argentina
The Commission for the Conservation and Management of the Highly Migratory Fish Stocks of the Western and Central Pacific Ocean (WCPFC)	28 November to 3 December 2024	Suva, Fiji	

* The Commission normally requests the Executive Secretary to be its nominated Observer at these meetings.

PRELIMINARY

List of Registered Participants

List of Registered Participants

Chair		Mr Vitalii Tsymbaliuk Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine
Argentina	Head of Delegation:	Mr Fausto Lopez Crozet Ministry of Foreign Affairs, International Trade and Worship
	Alternate Representative:	Mr Darío Dzięwezo Polski Ministry of Foreign Affairs, International Trade and Worship
	Advisers:	Mr Alejandro Rodolfo Bonicatto Subsecretaría de Pesca y Acuicultura
		Mr Eduardo Raúl Cavallero Ministry of Foreign Affairs, International Trade and Worship
		Dr Dolores Deregibus Instituto Antártico Argentino/CONICET
		Mr Máximo Gowland Ministry of Foreign Affairs, International Trade and Worship
		Mrs Paola Gucioni Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores, Comercio Internacional y Culto
		Mrs Cynthia Hotton Ministry of Foreign Affairs, International Trade and Worship
		Dr Enrique Marschoff Instituto Antártico Argentino
		Ms Maria Isabel Molina Carranza Subsecretaría de Pesca y Acuicultura
		Mrs Ana Pastorino Ministerio de Relaciones exteriores, Comercio Internacional y Culto
		Dr Emilce Florencia Rombolá Instituto Antártico Argentino

Dr María Mercedes Santos
Instituto Antártico Argentino

Mr Nicolás Zingoni Vinci
Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores,
Comercio Internacional y Culto

Australia

Head of Delegation:

Ms Kelly Buchanan
Australian Antarctic Division, Department
of Climate Change, Energy, the
Environment and Water

Alternate
Representatives:

Ms Sally Carney
Australian Antarctic Division, Department
of Climate Change, Energy, the
Environment and Water

Advisers:

Mr Russell Miles
Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade

Ms Rhonda Bartley
Australian Antarctic Division, Department
of Climate Change, Energy, the
Environment and Water

Ms Bailey Bourke
Australian Antarctic Division, Department
of Climate Change, Energy, the
Environment and Water

Ms Olivia Delahunty
Australian Antarctic Division, Department
of Climate Change, Energy, the
Environment and Water

Ms Rachel Downes
Australian Fisheries Management Authority

Ms Danait Ghebrezgabhier
Australian Fisheries Management Authority

Ms Zoe Glasson
Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade

Ms Emily Grilly
WWF – Australia

Dr Constance Johnson
University of Wollongong

Ms Heather Johnston
Australia's Department of Agriculture,
Fisheries and Forestry

Dr So Kawaguchi
Australian Antarctic Division, Department
of Climate Change, Energy, the
Environment and Water

Dr Nat Kelly
Australian Antarctic Division, Department
of Climate Change, Energy, the
Environment and Water

Dr Tara Martin
Department of State Growth

Mr Dale Maschette
Institute for Marine and Antarctic Studies
(IMAS), University of Tasmania

Dr Cara Masere
Australian Antarctic Division, Department
of Climate Change, Energy, the
Environment and Water

Mr Fraser McEachan
Australian Fisheries Management Authority

Mr Ewan McIvor
Australian Antarctic Division, Department
of Climate Change, Energy, the
Environment and Water

Mr Malcolm McNeill
Australian Longline Pty Ltd

Ms Selina Stoute
Australian Fisheries Management Authority

Ms Lavanya Vasani
Attorney General's Department

Ms Anna Willock
Australian Fisheries Management Authority

Dr Philippe Ziegler

Australian Antarctic Division, Department
of Climate Change, Energy, the
Environment and Water

Belgium	Head of Delegation:	Ms Stephanie Langerock FPS Health, DG Environment
	Alternate Representative:	Dr Anton Van de Putte Royal Belgian Institute for Natural Sciences
Brazil	Head of Delegation:	Mr Eduardo Sfoglia Ministério das Relações Exteriores
	Alternate Representative:	Ms Maitê Schmitz Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Chile	Head of Delegation:	Mr Juan Enrique Loyer Greene Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Chile
	Alternate Representative:	Mr Francisco Berguño Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores de Chile
	Advisers:	Mr Héctor Bacigalupo SONAPESCA
		Mr Maximiliano Bello Mission Blue
		Dr César Cárdenas Instituto Antártico Chileno (INACH)
		Mr Luis Cocas Subsecretaría de Pesca y Acuicultura
		Mr Francisco Miguel Fernández Urzúa Servicio Nacional de Pesca y Acuicultura
Dr Lucas Krüger Instituto Antártico Chileno (INACH)		
Mr Francisco Lertora Dirección Nacional de Fronteras y Límites - DIFROL		
Ms Karen Rauch Asoc		

Mr Gonzalo Rojas
Servicio Nacional de Pesca y Acuicultura

Mr Nelson Eduardo Saavedra Inostroza
Directorate General of the Maritime
Territory and Merchant Marine

Mr Francisco Santa Cruz
Instituto Antartico Chileno (INACH)

Mr Juan Santibañez
Undersecretary for Fishing and Aquaculture

Mr Marcos Troncoso Valenzuela
Subsecretaría de Pesca y Acuicultura

**China, People's
Republic of**

Head of Delegation:

Mr Yang Liu
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Alternate
Representatives:

Dr Honglei LI
Chinese Arctic and Antarctic
Administration

Dr Xianyong Zhao
Yellow Sea Fisheries Research Institute,
Chinese Academy of Fishery Science

Mr Ming Zhao
Bureau of Fisheries, Ministry of Agriculture
and Rural Affairs

Advisers:

Dr Chun-wa Chu
Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation
Department, HKSAR Government

Professor Jian-Feng He
Polar Research Institute of China

Mr Hongliang Huang
East China Sea Fisheries Research Institute,
Chinese Academy of Fishery Science

Ms Lai Fun Virginia Lee
Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation
Department

Mr Mindong Li
Rongcheng East China Fisheries Co., LTD

Mr Yaopeng Li
China National Fisheries Corporation

Mr Rundong Lin
Fujian Zhengguan Fishery Development
Company, Ltd

Dr Jianye Tang
Shanghai Ocean University

Mr Wan yong Wang
Jiangsu Sunline Deep Sea Fishery Co., Ltd

Dr Xinliang Wang
Yellow Sea Fisheries Research Institute,
Chinese Academy of Fishery Science

Dr Lei Xing
Polar Research Institute of China

Professor Liu Xiong Xu
Shanghai Ocean University

Mr Hao Yang
Liaoyu Group Liaoning Pelagic Fisheries
Co., Ltd

Dr Yi-Ping Ying
Yellow Sea Fisheries Research Institute

Mr Han Yu
Liaoning Pelagic Fisheries Co., Ltd

Ms Wing-sum Teresa Yuen
Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation
Department, HKSAR Government

Mrs Hui Ying Zhang
the Bureau of Fisheries of the Ministry of
Agriculture and Rural Affairs of the
People's Republic of China

Ms Yun Bo Zhang
China Overseas Fisheries Association

Dr Guangtao Zhang
Institute of Oceanology, Chinese Academy
of Sciences

Dr Yunxia Zhao
Yellow Sea Fisheries Research Institute

Ms Wenting Zhao
MFA, China

Mr Yue Zheng
MFA, China

Professor Guoping Zhu
Shanghai Ocean University

Mr Jiancheng Zhu
Yellow Sea Fisheries Research Institute,
Chinese Academy of Fishery Science

Ecuador

Head of Delegation: Mrs Rebeca Espinoza Bernal
Ministerio de Producción, Comercio
Exterior, Inversiones y Pesca

Alternate
Representatives: Dr Patricia Castillo-Briceño
MPCEIP

Mr Marco Antonio Santos Castañeda
Ecuador Oceanographic and Antarctic Navy
Institute (INOCAR)

Advisers: Mr Jorge Costain
Transmarina S.A.

Mrs Manuela Rosalía Fernández de
Córdova
Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores y
Movilidad Humana

Dr Rafaela Hurtado
Viceministry of Aquaculture and Fisheries
Resources, Ministry of Production,
Foreign Trade, Investment and Fisheries

European Union

Head of Delegation: Ms Fiona Harford
European Union

Alternate
Representative: Ms Barbara Focquet
European Commission

Adviser: Dr Sebastián Rodríguez Alfaro
European Union

France	Head of Delegation:	Ms Caroline Krajka Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	Alternate Representative:	Ms Claire Lecerf Ministère de l'Europe et des Affaires Etrangères
	Advisers:	Ms Audrey Bourdette Terres australes et antarctiques françaises
		Dr Marc Eléaume Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle
		Mrs Diane Fauconnier Regional Economic Department- Embassy of France in Australia
		Professor Philippe Koubbi Sorbonne Université
		Mrs Adèle Moisan French Ministry of the Sea
Dr Yan Ropert-Coudert IPEV		
Germany	Head of Delegation:	Mr Bernd Söntgerath Federal Ministry of Food and Agriculture
	Alternate Representative:	Professor Bettina Meyer Alfred Wegener Institute for Polar and Marine Research
	Advisers:	Ms Patricia Brtnik Federal Agency for Nature Conservation
		Dr Stefan Hain Alfred Wegener Institute for Polar and Marine Research
		Ms Rebecca Konijnenberg Alfred Wegener Institute, Helmholtz Centre for Polar and Marine Research
	Dr Katharina Teschke Alfred Wegener Institute for Polar and Marine Research	

India	Head of Delegation:	Dr GVM Gupta Centre for Marine Living Resources and Ecology
	Alternate Representatives:	Dr R Sendhil Kumar Centre for Marine Living Resources and Ecology
		Dr Aparna Shukla Ministry of Earth Sciences, Government of India
Italy	Alternate Representatives:	Dr Maurizio Azzaro Institute of Polar Sciences
		Dr Anna Maria Fioretti Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	Advisers:	Dr Erica Carlig Erica Carlig
		Dr Laura Ghigliotti National Research Council of Italy (CNR), Institute for the study of the anthropic impacts and the sustainability of the marine environment (IAS)
		Dr Carla Ubaldi ENEA – Antarctic Technical Unit
Japan	Head of Delegation:	Dr Joji Morishita Minister of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
	Alternate Representatives:	Mr Taisuke Iwano Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
		Mr Ryo Onodera Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
		Mr Toya Takehara Fisheries Agency of Japan
		Mr Kazuya Usami Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries

Advisers:

Mr Naohiko Akimoto
Japanese Overseas Fishing Association

Dr Nobuo Kokubun
National Institute of Polar Research

Mr Tomohiro Kondo
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Mr Naohisa Miyagawa
Taiyo A & F Co. Ltd.

Mr Satoshi Miyazaki
Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry

Dr Mao Mori
Japan Fisheries Research and Education
Agency

Mr Hideki Moronuki
Japan Overseas Fishing Association

Ms Haruka Okamoto
Taiyo A&F Co

Dr Takehiro Okuda
Fisheries Resources Institute, Japan
Fisheries Research and Education
Agency

Mr Takeshi Shibata
Taiyo A & F Co. Ltd.

Mr Kyo Uehara
Taiyo A & F Co. Ltd.

Korea, Republic of Head of Delegation: Ms Jung-re Riley Kim
Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries

Alternate Representative: Ms Sumin Jeong
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of
Korea

Advisers: Mr Gap-Joo Bae
Hong Jin Corporation

Mr Hyun Joong Choi
TNS Industries Inc.

Mr Sang-jin Choi
Korea Overseas Fisheries Association

Dr Sangdeok Chung
National Institute of Fisheries Science
(NIFS)

Mr Jang Geun-ho
Fisheries Monitoring Center (FMC) of the
Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries of
Korea

Mr Seonjung Jeon
JEONG IL CORP.

Mr Kunwoong Ji
Jeong Il Corporation

Mr Ho-Jeong JIN
Korea Overseas Fisheries Association

Mr Taebin Jung
TNS Industries

Mr Seungwon Kang
Dongwon Industries Co. Ltd.

Mr Jeongwook Kim
HONGJIN CORPORATION

Mrs Yanghee Kim
Distant-Water Fisheries Division of
Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries

Dr Eunhee Kim
Citizens' Institute for Environmental
Studies

Ms Taerin Kim
Fishery Monitoring Center

Ms Jooyoun Lee
Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries of Korea

Mr Seungwhan Lee
Korea Overseas Fisheries Association

Mr Eunjae Lee
Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries

		Ms Seung Eun "Summer" Lee Korea Overseas Fisheries Cooperation Center
		Mr Hae Jun Lee Hongjin Company
		Mr Kyehong Park Hongjin Corporation
Namibia	Head of Delegation:	Ms Annely Haiphene Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources
	Alternate Representatives:	Mr Malcom Block Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources
		Mr Titus Iilende Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources
		Mr Ueritjiua Kauaria Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources
	Adviser:	Mr Fernando de Castro Rey Linetach,S.L.
Netherlands, Kingdom of the	Head of Delegation:	Mr Martijn Peijs Department of Nature and Fisheries
	Alternate Representative:	Dr Erik Molenaar Netherlands Institute for the Law of the Sea (NILOS)
	Adviser:	Dr Fokje Schaafsma Wageningen Marine Research
New Zealand	Head of Delegation:	Ms Alice Revell Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade
	Alternate Representative:	Ms Jana Newman Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade
	Advisers:	Mr Adam Berry Ministry for Primary Industries
		Mr Brian Cole The University of Waikato

Mr Simon Lamping
Department of Conservation

Ms Emily McGeorge
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade New
Zealand

Ms Michaela McGlade
Ministry of Primary Industries

Mr Enrique Pardo
Department of Conservation

Ms Ceisha Poirot
Antarctica New Zealand

Mr Darryn Shaw
Sanford Ltd

Mr Andy Smith
Smith Fishing Consultancy (Self employed
)

Ms Aimee Tang
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade New
Zealand

Mr Hamish Tijssen
Talley's Ltd

Mr Nathan Walker
Ministry for Primary Industries

Mr Barry Weeber
ECO Aotearoa

Norway

Head of Delegation:

Ms Mette Strengehagen
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Alternate
Representatives:

Mr Petter Meier
Ministry of Trade, Industry and Fisheries

Mr Knut Seim
Ministry of Foreign Affairs Norway

Advisers:

Ms Madeleine Jakobsen
Ministry of Climate and Environment

Dr Ann-Lisbeth Agnalt
Institute of Marine Research

Dr Gary Griffith
Norwegian Polar Institute

Ms Astrid Høgestøl
Norwegian Polar Institute

Dr Tor Knutsen
Institute of Marine Research

Dr Bjørn Krafft
Institute of Marine Research

Dr Cecilie von Quillfeldt
Norwegian Polar Institute

Ms Hanne Østgård
The Directorate of Fisheries

Poland

Head of Delegation: Mrs Justyna Szumlicz
The Long Distance Fisheries and
International Affairs Unit, Fisheries
Department, Ministry of Agriculture and
Rural Development

Adviser: Dr Anna Panasiuk
UNIVERSITY OF GDANSK

**Russian
Federation**

Head of Delegation: Mr Dmitry Kremenyuk
Federal Agency for Fisheries

Alternate
Representatives: Dr Svetlana Kasatkina
AtlantNIRO

Ms Yulia Zhuzhginova
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian
Federation

Advisers: Mr Evgeny Kim
Orion Co. Ltd

Mr German Lifanov
Vodoley LLC

Dr Andrey Petrov
Federal Agency for Fisheries

South Africa	Head of Delegation:	Dr Azwianewi Makhado Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment
	Advisers:	Mr Saasa Pheeha Department of Environment, Forestry and Fisheries.
		Mr Johannes de Goede Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment
		Dr Zoleka Filander Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment
		Mr Bernard John Liedemann Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment
		Ms Nicole Limberis Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment
		Mr Qayiso Kenneth Mketsu Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment
		Mr Mandisile Mqoqi Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment
		Mr Pheobius Mullins Braxton Shipping
		Ms ELIZABETH MAGDALENE SHER Braxtonshipping
		Mr Sobahle Somhlaba Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
Mrs Nicolette Vink Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment		
Spain	Head of Delegation:	Mr Luis Belmonte González Ministry for Agriculture, Fisheries and Food

	Alternate Representative:	Mr Roberto Sarralde Vizuet Instituto Español de Oceanografía-CSIC
	Adviser:	Mr Joost Pompert Pesquerias Georgia, S.L
Sweden	Head of Delegation:	Dr Thomas Dahlgren University of Gothenburg
	Alternate Representative:	Dr Pia Norling Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management
Ukraine	Head of Delegation:	Ambassador Vasyl Myroshnychenko Embassy of Ukraine in Australia
	Alternate Representative:	Dr Kostiantyn Demianenko Institute of Fisheries, Marine Ecology and Oceanography (IFMEO), State Agency of Ukraine for the Development of Melioration, Fishery and Food Programs
	Advisers:	Dr Evgen Dykyi National Antarctic Scientific Center of Ukraine
		Mr Andrii Fedchuk National Antarctic Scientific Center, Ukraine
		Mr Sergiy Goncharuk Terra Trans LLC
		Ms Vironika Honcharuk Terra Trans LLC
		Mr Dmytro Marichev LLC Fishing Company NEPTUNO
		Dr Leonid Pshenichnov SSI "Institute of Fisheries, Marine Ecology and Oceanography" (IFMEO) of the State Agency of Melioration and Fisheries of Ukraine
		Mr Oleksandr Yasynetskyi Terra Trans LLC

United Kingdom	Head of Delegation:	Ms Jane Rumble Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office
	Alternate Representative:	Ms Kylie Bamford Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office
	Advisers:	Dr Mark Belchier British Antarctic Survey
		Dr Martin Collins British Antarctic Survey
		Dr Timothy Earl Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science (Cefas)
		Mr James Fosbery FCDO
		Dr David Goddard Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office
		Dr Susie Grant British Antarctic Survey
		Ms Sue Gregory Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office
		Dr Simeon Hill British Antarctic Survey
Mrs Rhona Kent WWF UK		
Mr Peter Thomson Argos Froyanes		
United States of America	Head of Delegation:	Ms Ona Hahs Office of Ocean and Polar Affairs, Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs
	Alternate Representative:	Dr Lauren Fields National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)

Advisers:

Ms Nicole Bransome
The Pew Charitable Trusts

Ms Jamie Briggs
U.S. Department of State

Ms Kimberly Dawson
National Oceanic and Atmospheric
Administration (NOAA), Fisheries

Ms Meggan Engelke-Ros
National Oceanic and Atmospheric
Administration (NOAA)

Mr Jacob Goldschlager
US Consulate General Melbourne – US
Department of State

Ms Julia Goss
National Oceanic & Atmospheric
Administration

Dr Jefferson Hinke
National Marine Fisheries Service,
Southwest Fisheries Science Center

Mr Adam Issenberg
National Oceanic and Atmospheric
Administration

Dr Christopher Jones
National Oceanographic and Atmospheric
Administration (NOAA)

Dr Chris McCarthy
AAAS-AFPI

Ms Suzanne McGuire
U.S. Department of State

Ms Alisa Modica
U.S. Consulate General Melbourne - U.S.
Department of State

Ms Erika Olson
U.S. Embassy Canberra

Mr David Pearl
NOAA Fisheries Office of Law
Enforcement

Dr Polly A. Penhale
National Science Foundation, Division of
Polar Programs

Dr Andrew Titmus
National Science Foundation

Mr Conrad Tribble
U.S. Consulate General Melbourne

Dr George Watters
National Marine Fisheries Service,
Southwest Fisheries Science Center

Uruguay

Head of Delegation: Ambassador Alberto Fajardo
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Advisers: Mr Juan Dominici
Uruguayan Antarctic Institute (UAI)

Dr Yamandú Marín
Direccion Nacional de Recursos Acuaticos
(DINARA)

Observers – Acceding States

Canada

Alternate
Representatives: Ms Olivia Lassaline
Fisheries and Oceans Canada

Mr Gabriel McDonald
Fisheries and Oceans Canada

Ms Jessika Woroniak
Fisheries and Oceans Canada

Advisers: Ms Samantha Hogg
Global Affairs Canada

Ms Laura Hoy
Transport Canada

Ms Stephanie Keast
Environment Climate Change Canada

		Mr David Taillefer Environment and Climate Change Canada
Finland	Head of Delegation:	Ms Johanna Lammi Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland
	Alternate Representative:	Ms Outi Mähönen Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment of Lapland
Mauritius	Alternate Representatives:	Mr Abhishaye Jeawon Ministry of Blue Economy, Marine Resources, Fisheries and Shipping
		Mrs Yogeshwaree Sukdeo Ministry Of Blue Economy, Marine Resources, Fisheries and Shipping
Panama	Head of Delegation:	Mr Alexis Peña Autoridad de los Recursos Acuáticos de Panamá
	Advisers:	Mr Mario Aguilar ARAP
		Mrs Melissa Aguilar Autoridad de los Recursos Acuáticos de Panamá
		Mrs Génesis García Autoridad de los Recursos Acuáticos de Panamá
Peru	Head of Delegation:	Ambassador Vitaliano Valencia Embassy of Peru
	Alternate Representatives:	Mrs Lorena Campos Cavero Embassy of Peru in Australia
		Mr Edgar Alejandro Castilla López Dirección General de Supervisión, Fiscalización y Sanción
		Mrs Karla Córdova Morales Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Peru
		Mr Rubén Pablo Londoño Bailon Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Peru

Mr Jorge Eduardo Maguiña Aliaga
Ministry of Production of Peru

Ms Celia Elizabeth Méndez Chumpitazi
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Peru

Ms Teresa Pedemonte Reategui
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Peru

Mr Daniel Torres Pinguz
Embassy of Peru

Mr Riter Vargas Rojas
Vice Ministry of Fisheries and Aquaculture
of Ministry of Production

Ms Mishell Andrea Vidal Raurau
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Peru

Observers – Non-Contracting Parties

Colombia

Alternate
Representatives:

Dr Javier Plata
National Fisheries and Aquaculture
Authority (AUNAP)

Mr Julio Sierra
National Fisheries and Aquaculture
Authority (AUNAP)

Singapore

Head of Delegation:

Mr Han Kiat Tan
Singapore Food Agency

Advisers:

Ms Juliat Tan
Singapore Food Agency

Ms Jannie Wan
Singapore Food Agency

Dominican Republic

Head of Delegation:

Ms Dorka Yasmin Evangelista Pérez
Ministry of the Environment and Natural
Resources Dominican Republic.

Luxembourg

Head of Delegation:

Dr Pierre Gallego
Ministry of Environment

Observers – International Organisations

ACAP

Head of Delegation:

Dr Christine Bogle

		Secretariat of the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels
	Alternate Representative:	Dr Wiesława Misiak Secretariat to the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels
ATS	Head of Delegation:	Mr Albert Alexander Lluberas Bonaba Secretariat of the Antarctic Treaty
IUCN	Head of Delegation:	Dr Heidi Weiskel IUCN
	Alternate Representative:	Professor Catherine Iorns Victoria University of Wellington, NZ
	Adviser:	Ms Anais Remont University of Wollongong
IWC	Head of Delegation:	Dr Iain Staniland International Whaling Commission
SCAR	Head of Delegation:	Professor Cassandra Brooks University of Colorado Boulder
	Alternate Representative:	Professor Mary-Anne Lea Institute for Marine and Antarctic Studies (IMAS)
	Advisers:	Dr Noémie Friscourt University of Tasmania, Institute for Marine and Antarctic Studies
		Mr Sebin Lee SCAR
		Dr Chandrika Nath Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research
		Professor Gary Wilson University of Waikato
SCOR	Head of Delegation:	Dr Alyce Hancock Southern Ocean Observing System (SOOS)
	Adviser:	Mr Clément Astruc Delor EHESS - UTAS - French ministry for Environment

SIOFA Head of Delegation: Mr Thierry Clot
Southern Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement

UNDOALOS Head of Delegation: Ms Amber Maggio
United Nations - Division for Ocean Affairs
and the Law of the Sea

WCPFC Adviser: Mr Tim Jones
Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission

Observers – Non-Governmental Organisations

ARK Head of Delegations: Dr Javier Arata
Association of Responsible Krill harvesting
companies (ARK)

Mrs Valeria Carvajal
Federación Industrias Pesqueras del Sur
Austral (FIPES)

Alternate
Representative: Mr Pål Einar Skogrand
Aker BioMarine Antarctic AS

Advisers: Mr Enrique Gutierrez
Pesca Chile

Mr Sang-Yong Lee
Jeong-Il Corporation

Mr Steven Rooney
Rimfrost AS

ASOC Head of Delegation: Ms Claire Christian
Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition

Advisers: Mr Evan Bloom
ASOC

Mr Jiliang Chen
Law School, Macquarie University

Ms Holly Curry
Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition

Ms Barbara Cvrkel
The Pew Charitable Trusts

Mr Emil Dediu
The Pew Charitable Trusts

Dr Lyn Goldsworthy
Institute for Marine and Antarctic Studies,
University of Tasmania

Mr Randal Helten
Friends of the Earth Japan (FoE Japan)

Mr Chris Johnson
WWF-Australia

Ms Andrea Kavanagh
The Pew Charitable Trusts

Mr Nicholas Kirkham
The Pew Charitable Trusts

Ms Kazue Komatsubara
Friends of the Earth Japan

Ms Mary Liesegang
Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition

Dr Susanne Lockhart
Southern Benthics

Dr Ricardo Roura
Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition

Ms Meike Schuetzek
Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition

Mr Matt Spencer
Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition

Mr Yiting Sun
Conservation International China

Ms Francheska Ilse Tacke
Environmental Action Germany (DUH)

Dr Rodolfo Werner
The Pew Charitable Trusts & Antarctic and
Southern Ocean Coalition

Ms Miaomiao Yin
Macquarie University

COLTO	Head of Delegation:	Mr Rhys Arangio Coalition of Legal Toothfish Operators
	Alternate Representative:	Mr John Alexander Reid Polar Seafish Ltd
	Advisers:	Mr Michael Cronje Sanford
		Dr Deborah Davidson Argos Frøyanes Ltd
		Mr Bernard Fox Sanford
		Ms Trish Henry Polar Seafish Ltd
		Mr Dean Jurasovich Sanford
		Mr Hans Jacob Mustad Mustad Autoline
		Mr Andrew Newman Argos Froyanes Ltd
		Mr Ismael Pérez Lafonia Sea Foods SA
		Mr Laurent Pinault SAPMER
		Ms Brodie Plum Talley's Ltd
	Ms Phoebe Esther Reid Polar Seafish Ltd	
	Mr Theo Verios Austral Fisheries Pty Ltd	
Mr Laurent Virapoullé Pêche Avenir S. A		
IAATO	Head of Delegation:	Ms Amanda Lynnes International Association of Antarctica Tour Operators

Alternate
Representative: Ms Lisa Kelley
International Association of Antarctica Tour
Operators

Oceanites

Head of Delegation: Dr Grant Humphries
Black Bawks Data Science

Alternate
Representatives: Mr Ron Naveen
Oceanites, Inc.

Professor Philip Trathan
Oceanites, Inc.

PRELIMINARY

Secretariat

Executive Secretary

Dr David Agnew

Science

Science Manager

Dr Steve Parker

Fisheries and Observer Reporting Coordinator

Isaac Forster

Science Data Officer

Daphnis De Pooter

Fisheries and Ecosystems Analyst

Dr Stéphane Thanassekos

Fishery Monitoring and Compliance

Fisheries Monitoring and Compliance Manager

Todd Dubois

Compliance Officer

Eldene O'Shea

Fisheries Monitoring and Compliance Data Officer

Henrique Anatole

Research, Monitoring and Compliance Analyst

Claire van Werven

Data Assistant

Alison Potter

Administrative Assistant

Anna Balis

Finance and Administration

Finance, Administration and HR Manager

Alexandra Seager

Accountant

Terri McDermott

Human Resources Officer

Angie McMahon

Administrative Services Officer

Amelia Stoneham

Administration Assistant

Nicki Squibb

Communications

Communications Manager

Catherine Stubberfield

Communications Assistant

Mariana Cordeiro

French Translator/Team Coordinator

Karine Bachelier

Russian Translator/Team Coordinator

Olga Kozyrevitch

Russian Translator

Anar Umerkhanova

Russian Translator

Blair Denholm

Spanish Translator/Team Coordinator

Facundo Alvarez

Spanish Translator

Alejandra Sycz

Print Production

Bowen Zhang

Data and Information Systems

Data and Information Systems Manager

Gary Dewhurst

Systems Analyst

Ian Meredith

Software Developer

Mingyun Qie

Technical Business Analyst

Mitchell John

Web Project Officer

Dane Cavanagh

Interpreters (ONCALL Conference Interpreters)

Ms Cecilia Alal
Ms Patricia Avila
Mr John Benson
Ms Lyubov Bezkrovna
Mrs Elena Bocharova-Booth
Mr Andrey Efimenko
Ms Claire Garteiser
Dr Erika Gonzalez
Dr Sandra Hale
Ms Oksana Katorjevskaya
Ms Camille Lapierre
Mr Benoit Malmontet
Ms Silvia Martinez
Dr Elena Mihalik
Dr Marc Orlando
Mr Philippe Tanguy

PRELIMINARY

PRELIMINARY

List of Documents

List of Documents

CCAMLR-43/01	Proposal for a new CM on fish nest areas Delegation of the European Union
CCAMLR-43/02	Draft conservation measure for a Weddell Sea Marine Protected Area – Phase 1 Delegations of the European Union and its Member States, Norway, Uruguay, Australia, the United Kingdom, New Zealand, the United States of America, Republic of Korea, India, Ukraine, and Chile
CCAMLR-43/03	Examination of the audited financial statements for 2023 Executive Secretary
CCAMLR-43/04	Review of the 2024 Budget, Draft 2025 Budget and Forecast Budget for 2026 Executive Secretary
CCAMLR-43/05	Executive Secretary’s Report 2024, including the Second Year Implementation Report for the Secretariat’s Strategic Plan (2023-26) Executive Secretary
CCAMLR-43/06	Performance Review 2 – summary of outcomes CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-43/07	Draft Procedures for Recruitment and Appointment of the Executive Secretary CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-43/08	Activities of the General Capacity Building Fund (GCBF) – 2024 GCBF Panel
CCAMLR-43/09	Report of the Intersessional Correspondence Group on Sustainable Finance 2024 CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-43/10	Cooperation with other organisations CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-43/11	CCAMLR Compliance Evaluation Procedure (CCEP) Summary Report and analysis CCAMLR Secretariat

CCAMLR-43/12	Reporting Gear Details and Types in Notifications CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-43/13	Vessel sighting reports CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-43/14 Rev. 1	IUU fishing activity and trends in 2023/24 and IUU Vessel Lists CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-43/15	Inspection Implementation Report CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-43/16	NCP engagement strategy review and plan CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-43/17	Enhancing the CCAMLR Search and Rescue (SAR) data request system: Updates and system improvements CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-43/18	Revision of CM 41-01 and 41-10 for the requirement of research hauls in SSRU 88.2H CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-43/19	Report on the krill catches in the CCAMLR Subarea 48.1 for the 2023/24 season CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-43/20	CDS Fund expenditure proposal CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-43/21	CDS Implementation and Data Analysis CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-43/22	Comments on the harmonisation of the implementation of the revised Krill Fishery Management Approach (KFMA) and the establishment of the Domain 1 MPA in Subarea 48.1 Delegation of the Russian Federation
CCAMLR-43/23	On the importance of fulfilling obligations under the Headquarters Agreement Delegation of the Russian Federation
CCAMLR-43/24	Comments on revising the Conservation Measure CM 51-07 Delegation of the Russian Federation

CCAMLR-43/25	Update on Access to Documents Procedures and Assignment of Digital Object Identifiers (DOIs) CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-43/26 Rev. 1	Proposal for the Development of a CCAMLR Communications Strategy CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-43/27	Distribution of Commission and Scientific Committee Circulars to Observers CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-43/28	Arrangements for the annual meetings at CCAMLR Headquarters CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-43/29	Conveners Report of the Symposium on Harmonisation of Conservation and Krill Fishery Management Initiatives in the Antarctic Peninsula Region Watters, G and J.R. Kim
CCAMLR-43/30	Draft Memorandum of Understanding between CCAMLR and the Government of Peru CCAMLR Secretariat and the Government of Peru
CCAMLR-43/31	Proposal for a third CCAMLR performance review Delegations of the European Union and its Member States
CCAMLR-43/32	Resolution on Labor and Safety Standards in CCAMLR Fisheries Delegation of the United States of America
CCAMLR-43/33	Proposals for the Classification of Toothfish Fishery Nomenclature under the CCAMLR Regulatory Framework Delegation of the Russian Federation
CCAMLR-43/34	Proposals on management procedures for toothfish fisheries in Statistical Subareas 88.1 and 88.2 Delegation of the Russian Federation
CCAMLR-43/35	Proposals to amend CM 31-02 Delegation of the Russian Federation
CCAMLR-43/36	Draft Amendment to Conservation Measure CM 91-04 (2011) Common Framework for the Establishment of CCAMLR Marine Protected Areas Delegation of the Russian Federation

- CCAMLR-43/37 Revised proposal for a Conservation Measure establishing a Marine Protected Area in Domain 1 (Western Antarctic Peninsula and South Scotia Arc)
Delegations of Argentina and Chile
- CCAMLR-43/38 Proposed new Annex to Conservation Measure 21-02 for finfish research proposals for exploratory fisheries
Delegations of Australia, Japan and the Republic of Korea
- CCAMLR-43/39 A draft Code of Conduct for CCAMLR Events
Delegations of Australia, France, the Republic of Korea and the United States
- CCAMLR-43/40 Proposals for Improved Management of CCAMLR's Krill Fisheries: SISO Observers
Delegations of Argentina, Australia, New Zealand, Norway, the United Kingdom, and the United States
- CCAMLR-43/41 Proposal on the approach for establishing new MPAs under the CAMLR Convention
Delegation of China
- CCAMLR-43/42 Proposals for Improved Management of CCAMLR's Krill Fisheries: Port Inspections
Delegations of Australia, New Zealand, the Republic of Korea, and the United States
- CCAMLR-43/43 Proposals for Improved Management of CCAMLR's Krill Fisheries: VMS
Delegations of Australia, New Zealand, Norway, the Republic of Korea, the United Kingdom, and the United States
- CCAMLR-43/44 Draft conservation measure for an East Antarctic Marine Protected Area
Delegations of Australia, the European Union and its Member States, India, New Zealand, Norway, Republic of Korea, Ukraine, the United Kingdom, the United States of America, and Uruguay
- CCAMLR-43/45 Proposal to amend CMs 21-01 and 21-02
Delegation of the European Union
- CCAMLR-43/46 Proposed revision to CM 25-03
Delegation of Norway

CCAMLR-43/47 Rev. 1	Draft conservation measure for a Weddell Sea Marine Protected Area – Phase 2 Delegations of Norway and the United Kingdom
CCAMLR-43/48	Suggestions for establishing Marine Protected Areas in the CCAMLR Convention Area: regulation of the uniform process for establishing MPAs and the Commission's management of MPAs Delegation of the Russian Federation
CCAMLR-43/49	Amendments to Conservation Measure 41-01 Delegation of Australia
CCAMLR-43/50	Report of the Forty-third Meeting of the Scientific Committee (Hobart, Australia, 14 to 18 October 2024)
CCAMLR-43/51	Report of the Meeting of the Standing Committee on Implementation and Compliance (SCIC) (Hobart, Australia, 14 to 18 October 2024)

CCAMLR-43/BG/01	CCAMLR Observer Report (Argentina) to the Sixth session of the United Nations Environment Assembly of the United Nations Environment Programme, from 26 February to 1 March 2024, in Nairobi, Kenya Delegation of Argentina
CCAMLR-43/BG/02 Rev. 1	COLTO Gear Workshop - Final Report COLTO
CCAMLR-43/BG/03	Description of the Budget CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-43/BG/04	Report of the CCAMLR Observer to the Forty-sixth Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties Meeting (ATCM 46) (Kochi, India, 20-30 May 2024) Executive Secretary
CCAMLR-43/BG/05 Rev. 1	Summary of activities of the Commission during the 2023/24 intersessional period - Report of the Chair 2024 Chair of the Commission
CCAMLR-43/BG/06 Rev. 1	Chair's Guide to the order of business Chair of the Commission

CCAMLR-43/BG/07	Practical implementation of the harmonised Krill Fishery Management Approach CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-43/BG/08	Report from the CCAMLR Observer (New Zealand) to the 12th Regular Session of the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) Delegation of New Zealand
CCAMLR-43/BG/09 Rev. 1	Fishery Notifications 2024/25 CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-43/BG/10	Reconciliation of CDS data with monthly fine-scale catch and effort data CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-43/BG/11 Rev. 1	Support to CCAMLR to identify and deter illegal, unreported, and unregulated (IUU) fishing activities that undermine the objectives of the CAMLR Convention CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-43/BG/12	Cooperation to combat illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing and enhance compliance monitoring 2023/24 CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-43/BG/13	Report by CCAMLR Observer (Norway) on the 42nd Annual Meeting of the North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission (NEAFC), 14 – 17 November 2023 Delegation of Norway
CCAMLR-43/BG/14	Update on Data Systems CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-43/BG/15	Transshipment implementation report CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-43/BG/16	Vessel monitoring system (VMS) implementation report Secretariat
CCAMLR-43/BG/17	A progress update and planned next steps under the agreed Workplan on addressing Unidentified Fishing Gear in the Convention Area Delegations of New Zealand, Republic of Korea and Australia, and the CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-43/BG/18 Rev. 1	Improving Maritime Domain Awareness (MDA) in the Convention Area to combat IUU fishing CCAMLR Secretariat

CCAMLR-43/BG/19	Implementation of Conservation Measure 10-08 CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-43/BG/20	Website Update CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-43/BG/21	Server Refresh Proposal CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-43/BG/22	Report of the CCAMLR Observer to the 36th meeting of FAO Committee on Fisheries (Rome, 8 – 12 July 2024) and the 10th meeting of the Regional Fishery Bodies Secretariats' Network (Rome, 5 - 6 July 2024) Executive Secretary
CCAMLR-43/BG/23	Report from the CCAMLR Observer (United States of America) on the 2023 International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT) Regular Meeting Delegation of the United States of America
CCAMLR-43/BG/24	Aerial surveillance patrols undertaken by New Zealand during the 2023/2024 Ross Sea CCAMLR Season Delegation of New Zealand
CCAMLR-43/BG/25 Rev. 1	Policy issue arising from CCAMLR inspections undertaken from HMS Protector during the 2023-24 season Delegation of the United Kingdom
CCAMLR-43/BG/26	Navigating the combined effects of D1MPA and KFMA on krill fishing: An industry perspective ARK
CCAMLR-43/BG/27	2024 Report to SC-CAMLR-43 and CCAMLR-43 by the Association of Responsible Krill harvesting companies (ARK) ARK
CCAMLR-43/BG/28 Rev. 1	A sustainable strategy for the long-term monitoring of krill populations ARK
CCAMLR-43/BG/29	Information from France on the organization of the One Planet – Polar Summit held in Paris, 8-10 November 2023 Delegation of France
CCAMLR-43/BG/30	Update of the CCAMLR Inspector Identification Document Delegation of the United Kingdom

CCAMLR-43/BG/31	Report from the CCAMLR Observer (Australia) to the 28th Annual Meeting of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC) Delegation of Australia
CCAMLR-43/BG/32	Report from the CCAMLR Observer (European Union) to the 29th annual meeting of the South East Atlantic Fisheries Organization (SEAFO) Delegation of the European Union
CCAMLR-43/BG/33 Rev. 1	Implementation of electronic monitoring systems (EMS) in Chile to control discards, incidental bycatch and fishing regulation Delegation of Chile
CCAMLR-43/BG/34	ASOC Report to CCAMLR ASOC
CCAMLR-43/BG/35	Benefits of large-scale marine protected areas Delegation of the European Union and its Member States
CCAMLR-43/BG/36	The Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR) Annual Report to CCAMLR 2023/24 SCAR
CCAMLR-43/BG/37	Report from the CCAMLR Observer to the 12th Annual Meeting of the South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation (SPRFMO) Commission Delegation of New Zealand
CCAMLR-43/BG/38	An analysis of FAO Voluntary Guidelines for Transshipment and CCAMLR transshipment regulations Delegation of the Republic of Korea and ASOC
CCAMLR-43/BG/39 Rev. 1	Report on informal compliance workshops Delegation of the Republic of Korea and ASOC
CCAMLR-43/BG/40	Safety and the environmental impact of CCAMLR fishing vessels ASOC
CCAMLR-43/BG/41	Monitoring, control and surveillance activities undertaken by the State of Chile during the 2023-2024 season Delegation of Chile

CCAMLR-43/BG/42	Report from the CCAMLR Observer (European Union) to the 46th annual meeting of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO) Delegation of the European Union
CCAMLR-43/BG/43	Observer's Report for the 69th meeting of the International Whaling Commission in Lima, Peru, 23-27 September 2024 Delegation of Australia
CCAMLR-43/BG/44	Priorities for next steps on the D1 MPA and krill fisheries management ASOC
CCAMLR-43/BG/45 Rev. 1	Report from the CCAMLR Observer (New Zealand) to the 31st Annual Meeting of the Extended Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna (CCSBT) Delegation of New Zealand
CCAMLR-43/BG/46	SCAF Consideration of Sustainable Finance Options 2024 CCAMLR Secretariat *****
SC-CAMLR-43/01	2024 Review of the South Orkney Islands Southern Shelf Marine Protected Area Delegations of the United Kingdom, Argentina, the European Union and its Member States, Norway and Uruguay
SC-CAMLR-43/08	Recommended Pathway for CCAMLR Consideration of Antarctic Specially Protected and Antarctic Specially Managed Areas that contain a Marine Area Delegation of the United States of America
SC-CAMLR-43/09	The status of the South Orkney Islands Southern Shelf Marine Protected Area (SOISS MPA) Delegation of the Russian Federation
SC-CAMLR-43/BG/01	Catches of target species in the Convention Area CCAMLR Secretariat
SC-CAMLR-43/BG/03	Information in support of the 2024 review of the South Orkney Islands Southern Shelf Marine Protected Area Delegations of the United Kingdom, Argentina, the European Union and its Member States, Norway and Uruguay

SC-CAMLR-43/BG/12	2024 Report by Oceanites, Inc. — Monitoring Update Oceanites
SC-CAMLR-43/BG/15	Antarctic and Southern Ocean climate change and the environment: update on recent research and SCAR activities relevant to CCAMLR SCAR
CCAMLR-42/37	Comments on the Revised Proposal for a Conservation Measure Establishing a Marine Protected Area in Domain 1 (Western Antarctic Peninsula and South Scotia Arc) (CCAMLR-SM-III/06) Delegation of the Russian Federation
CCAMLR-SM-III/09	Comments and suggestions on the draft Ross Sea region MPA Research and Monitoring Plan Delegation of the Russian Federation

**Opening Address by the Governor of Tasmania,
Her Excellency the Honourable Barbara Baker AC**

PRELIMINARY

**Opening Address by the Governor of Tasmania,
Her Excellency the Honourable Barbara Baker AC**

‘Mr. Chair, Your Excellencies, Distinguished Delegates,

Good morning and welcome to the 43rd annual meeting of the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources here in Hobart. It is an honour to open this important conference once again. I extend a very warm welcome to Mr. Tsymbaliuk in his second year as Chair of the Commission. We are delighted to have you with us as you continue your Commission’s leadership during this pivotal period.

I begin by acknowledging the Muwinina people upon whose Country we gather. I acknowledge today’s Tasmanian Aboriginal Community as ongoing custodians of Country. I recognise their enduring culture and deep connection to land, sea, and waters.

It is a great pleasure for me to be able to address the Commission. The City of Hobart, as many of you know, is proud to be Australia’s Antarctic Gateway. This unique status is something we deeply cherish. It reflects the central role that Tasmania plays in supporting Antarctic research, exploration, and conservation efforts. Our City’s long-standing connection with Antarctica is more than just geographical—it is woven into the fabric of Hobart’s identity.

Hobart is also proud to serve as the headquarters of CCAMLR. We are always inspired by the breadth and depth of the work conducted here. We value the deep and enduring relationship between the Commission and our City. The presence of Antarctic professionals year-round enriches our local community.

Through the collaborative efforts of the Tasmanian Polar Network, which includes research institutions, logistical operators, and government bodies, Hobart continues to strengthen its reputation as a hub for Antarctic and Southern Ocean science and conservation. Recent developments such as the expansion of our airport, the ongoing Mac Point development, and the Antarctic Women’s Network initiative are testaments to our commitment to bolster Tasmania’s capabilities as a leading supporter of Antarctic efforts.

And, of course, we continue to value and support the key research conducted by our Institute for Marine and Antarctic Science, as part of our University of Tasmania, and by our Australian Antarctic Division.

Over the coming weeks, I know that your discussions will once again tackle the complexities of preserving Antarctic marine life in a rapidly changing world. We cannot ignore the profound impacts that climate change is having on Antarctica. In recent months, we have witnessed changing temperatures across the globe. Antarctica has not been immune to this trend. The Antarctic heatwave earlier this year saw temperatures soar to 50 degrees above normal, serving as a stark reminder of the urgent need for action. These events all reinforce the importance of your work here, as the marine ecosystems you strive to protect face ever-greater challenges.

One of the key developments this year has been the progress made in the Krill Fishery Management Approach. The discussions at the various intersessional working groups, along with the Harmonisation Symposium held in the Republic of Korea, represent critical steps towards creating a more unified and effective krill management system. The work to harmonise

the proposed Marine Protected Area in the Antarctic Peninsula with a precautionary and ecosystem-based approach to krill fishery management, underscores the Commission's commitment to both conservation and rational use.

The fact that member nations work collaboratively to implement such significant initiatives indicates both your commitment to science-based inquiry leading to tangible outcomes, and also the esteem with which the Commission is held, on the international stage.

As you embark on your deliberations over the next two weeks, I wish you all every success in those deliberations. The challenges are immense. However, the history of this Commission shows that through cooperation, dedication, and innovation, great things can be achieved.

Thank you once again for choosing Hobart as the host for this significant event. I hope your time here is productive. I also hope that you have the chance to enjoy our beautiful city.

I shall conclude with my very best wishes for your deliberations during the meeting. I look forward to hearing about your progress on the many topics you have for consideration.

It is now my pleasure to hand back to your Chair to begin this 43rd Annual Meeting of the Commission.

Thank you.'

Agenda for the Forty-third Meeting of the Commission

PRELIMINARY

**Agenda for the Forty-third Meeting of the
Commission for the Conservation of
Antarctic Marine Living Resources**

1. Opening of the meeting
2. Organisation of the meeting
 - 2.1 Adoption of agenda
 - 2.2 Status of the Convention
 - 2.3 Chair's Report
 - 2.4 Proposals for New Measures
 - 2.5 Meeting the obligations under the Headquarters Agreement between the Commission and the Government of Australia
3. Implementation of Convention objectives
 - 3.1 Objectives of the Convention
 - 3.2 Second Performance Review
4. Management of marine resources
 - 4.1 Advice from the Scientific Committee
 - 4.2 Krill resources
 - 4.3 Fish resources
 - 4.4 Non-target species
 - 4.4.1 Fish and invertebrates
 - 4.4.2 Seabirds and marine mammals
 - 4.4.3 Bottom fishing and vulnerable marine ecosystems
 - 4.5 Ecosystem monitoring
5. Spatial management
 - 5.1 Review of existing Marine Protected Areas
 - 5.2 Proposals for new Marine Protected Areas
 - 5.3 Other spatial management issues
6. Impacts of climate change on the conservation of Antarctic marine living resources
7. Implementation and compliance
 - 7.1 Advice from SCIC
 - 7.2 CCAMLR Compliance Report
 - 7.3 Illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing in the Convention Area
8. CCAMLR Scheme of International Scientific Observation

9. Conservation measures
 - 9.1 Review of existing measures
 - 9.2 Consideration of new measures and other conservation requirements
10. Administration and Finance
 - 10.1 Advice from SCAF
 - 10.2 Review of the 2024 budget, the 2025 budget and forecast budget for 2026
11. Cooperation with the Antarctic Treaty System and international organisations
 - 11.1 Cooperation with the Antarctic Treaty System
 - 11.2 Cooperation with international organisations
 - 11.2.1 Reports of observers from international organisations
 - 11.2.2 Reports from CCAMLR representatives at meetings of international organisations in the previous intersessional period and nominations of representatives to forthcoming meetings of relevant international organisations
 - 11.2.3 Cooperation with regional fisheries management organisations (RFMOs)
12. Administrative matters
 - 12.1 Election of officers
 - 12.2 Invitation of observers
 - 12.3 Next meeting
13. Other business
14. Report of the Forty-third Meeting of the Commission
15. Close of the meeting.

Budget for 2025 and Forecast Budget for 2026

PRELIMINARY

General Fund – Budget for 2025 and Forecast Budget for 2026

Inflation rate used is June 2024 Australian CPI of 3.8% for 2025, estimated Australian CPI inflation of 3.0% in 2026

	2024	2025	2026	Notes
	Revised budget	Budget	Forecast budget	
General Fund				
Income				
Core Members' Contribution	4 368 968	4 537 659	4 667 998	Assuming no new members joining in 2025 or 2026
Additional income		0	0	Additional income to generate a balanced budget.
Interest	210,251	177 178	160 279	Investment interest rates are assumed to gradually decline in 2025 and 2026
Staff Assessment Levy (SAL)	710 000	696 886	753 754	The SAL represents income deducted from staff salaries in respect of tax.
Sales (Tagging)	63 300	65 705	67 677	Tagging equipment costs are passed on to the fishing companies in the form of cost-recovery.
Miscellaneous income – Fishery Notifications	711 158	733 080	770 310	Provision is made for refunds of notification fees if fishing in some areas does not proceed.
Miscellaneous income – Rent Contributions	502 794	521 900	537 557	Rent expenditure expected to increase at CPI
Miscellaneous income – Grants	185 740	220 000		Final payment from the 2024 EU grant (Ref. 101092707).
Miscellaneous income – Other	70 000	80 000	82 000	Income from hiring out Secretariat meeting facilities transferred to the Asset Replacement Fund
Fund Transfers	- 70 000	- 80 000	- 82 000	Transfers to the Asset Replacement Fund
Total income	6 752 210	6 952 408	6 957 574	
Expenditure				
Salaries	4 625 287	4 673 307	4 829 838	No recruitment of one vacant position approved within the Strategic Plan 2023-2026.
Equipment	450 508	464 023	390 624	Minor capital items, annual software and hardware purchases/leases web site and data systems.
Depreciation	205 000	184 750	194 750	Equipment purchased over A\$1 000 is depreciated over its estimated useful life.
Insurance and Maintenance	203 343	214 443	224 804	Insurance and building service costs (rates etc) continue to increase strongly.
Training	15 400	15 862	16 259	Training remains an important priority for the Secretariat and is delivered efficiently to save costs.
Meeting Facilities	566 600	583 598	598 188	Covers CCAMLR meetings hosted at Headquarters.
Travel	150 000	170 000	175 075	Travel to support CCAMLR working groups, other meetings and international representation.
Executive Secretary Recruitment		33 000	27 000	
Printing	10 686	11 092	11 425	
Communications	20 503	21 282	21 920	
Sundry (incl. audit)	143 915	148 232	151 938	Includes audit, recruitment and legal costs.

	2024	2025	2026	Notes
	Revised budget	Budget	Forecast budget	
Rent/cost of goods (tagging)	566 094	587 605	605 233	Contributions from the Australian and Tasmanian governments and COGS expenditure.
Total expenditure	6 957 335	7 107 194	7 247 053	
Transfer to GCBF				Transfers to the GCBF are not anticipated.
Transfer to GSCF				Transfers to the GSCF are not anticipated.
Transfer to WCF				Transfers to the WCF are not anticipated.
Transfer to Asset Replacement Fund				Transfers to the ARF are not anticipated.
Surplus/–Deficit	- 205 124	- 154 786	- 289 479	
General Fund balance at 01 January	730 577	525 453	370 667	
General Fund balance at 31 December	525 453	370 667	81 188	Note reducing General Fund balance

Equity Funds

	2024	2025	2026	
	Revised Budget	Budget	Forecast	Notes
Equity Funds				
Working Capital Fund				The WCF is now frozen for four years at the A\$1 350 000 balance agreed by SCAF-2023.
Income	-	-	-	
Expenditure				
Balance at 31 December	1 350 000	1 350 000	1 350 000	
Asset Replacement Fund				
Income	70 000	80 000	82 000	Income from hiring Secretariat meeting facilities are paid into this reserve.
Expenditure	- 70 000	- 235 000	-82 000	
Balance at 31 December	200 000	45 000	45 000	Please see note below.
Staff Replacement Fund				
Income	70 000	80 000	82 000	
Expenditure	- 2 978	- 51 000	- 128 000	Costs of relocation and home leave for internationally recruited staff.
Balance at 31 December	215 797	244 797	198 797	Please see note below.
Korea Contribution Fund				
Income				Final expenditure from the fund towards database development occurred during 2023.
Expenditure	-			
Balance at 31 December				
China Contribution Fund				
Income				
Expenditure	- 60 000	- 60 000	- 60 000	Expenditure on two internships per year.
Balance at 31 December	132 616	72 616	12 616	This Fund covers travel to facilitate the engagement of Members and the Secretariat in training opportunities.

Special Funds

	2024	2025	2026	Notes
	Revised Budget	Budget	Forecast	All special funds have some income from investment interest.
Special Funds				
General Capacity Building Fund				
Income	4 988	3 257	1 880	
Transfer GSCF to GCBF	15 000			
Expenditure	- 70 000	- 69 475	- 21 235	The GCBF supported 5 travel applications (A\$40 000) and paid the final A\$30 000 of the Uruguay Grant in 2024.
Balance at 31 December	172 375	106 157	86 805	
CDS fund				
Income	29 794	24 338	19 920	
Expenditure	- 70 000	- 187 500	- 78 100	Expenditure as approved by SCIC.
Balance at 31 December	1 288 177	1 125 014	1 066 834	
General Science Capacity Fund				
Income	6 821	3 419	609	
Expenditure				
Workshop Support	- 10 000	-15 000		
Scholarships	- 45 000	- 60 000	- 60 000	
Convenor Travel Support	- 60 000	- 75 000	- 60 000	Provision for funding 2 scholarships and 3 conveners per year at the increased rates agreed by the Scientific Committee in 2022.
Transfer GSCF to GCBF	-15 000			
Balance at 31 December	180 960	34 379	-85 012	
MPA Fund				
Income	4 256	3 665	3 500	
Expenditure				
Balance at 31 December	193 994	197 659	201 159	
CCAMLR Ecosystem Monitoring Program (CEMP) Fund				
Income	11 890	9 174	7 215	
Expenditure	- 56 432	- 87 075	- 68 527	Expenditure on approved CEMP projects.
Balance at 31 December	485 598	407 504	345 902	

Members' Contributions 2024, 2025, 2026
General Fund contributions – payable by 31 May

	Contributions 2024	Balance Outstanding (22 October 2024)	Contributions 2025	Forecast Contributions 2026
Argentina	149 986		155 686	160 356
Australia	169 531		174 680	179 210
Belgium	149 986	149 986	155 686	160 356
Brazil	149 986		155 686	160 356
Chile	163 657	34 316	168 789	172 535
China	190 953		199 956	196 644
Ecuador	149 986	149 064	155 686	160 356
European Union	149 986		155 686	160 356
France	184 597		191 329	197 297
Germany	149 986		155 686	160 356
India	149 986		155 686	160 356
Italy	149 986		155 686	160 356
Japan	150 987		156 849	161 816
Republic of Korea	180 061		186 021	191 112
Namibia	149 986	10 386	155 686	160 356
Netherlands	149 986	149 986	155 686	160 356
New Zealand	155 548		160 159	164 765
Norway	290 104		309 927	327 074
Poland	149 986		155 686	160 356
Russia	151 432	6 573	156 686	160 356
South Africa	151 875		157 195	161 596
Spain	152 227		158 212	163 373
Sweden	149 986		155 686	160 356
Ukraine	165 562		169 672	173 979
UK	160 865		167 523	171 923
USA	149 986		155 686	160 356
Uruguay	151 750		156 749	161 687
	4 368 968	500 311	4 537 659	4 667 998