

**Report of the Forty-fourth meeting
of the Commission**
(Hobart, Australia, 20 to 31 October 2025)

This is a preliminary¹ version of the CCAMLR-44 Report
as adopted on Friday 31 October 2025.

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	8
Adoption of the Agenda	8
Status of the Convention	9
Chair's report	9
Proposals for new measures	9
Headquarters agreement	13
Implementation of Convention objectives	14
Objectives of the Convention	14
Performance reviews	17
Management of marine resources	18
Advice from the Scientific Committee	19
Krill resources	19
Krill in Statistical Area 58	39
Fish resources	40
Statistical Area 48	41
Statistical Area 58	42
Statistical Area 88	44
Non-target species	46
Ecosystem monitoring	46
Spatial management	46
Review of existing Marine Protected Areas (MPAs)	46
Proposals for new Marine Protected Areas	47
Other spatial management issues	57
Impacts of climate change on the conservation of Antarctic marine living resources	58
Implementation and compliance	61
Advice from SCIC	61
CDS Fund expenditure	62
Implementation of the CDS	62
Vessel inspections	63
Vessel monitoring system (VMS)	63
Promotion of compliance	64
Transshipment	65
Non-contracting Party engagement strategy	65
Proposals for new and revised conservation measures	65
Conservation Measure 10-03	65
Conservation Measure 10-04	66

Conservation Measure 10-09	66
Conservation Measure 10-10	67
Conservation Measure 21-01 and 21-02	68
Conservation Measure 31-02	68
Conservation Measure 32-XX	68
Conservation Measure 51-06	68
CCAMLR Compliance Report	69
Illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing in the Convention Area	73
Fishery notifications	75
Advice from the Scientific Committee to SCIC	80
Other business	81
CCAMLR Scheme of International Scientific Observation	81
Conservation measures	82
Review of existing measures	83
Implementation and Compliance	83
General fishery matters	84
Toothfish catch limits	85
Icefish catch limits	85
Other fishery matters	86
Administration and finance	86
Review of the 2025 budget, the 2026 budget and forecast budget for 2027	87
Cooperation with the Antarctic Treaty System and international organisations ...	89
Cooperation with the Antarctic Treaty System	89
Cooperation with international organisations	89
Reports of observers from international organisations	91
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	93
Administrative matters	93
Appointment of the Executive Secretary	93
Election of officers	93
Invitation of Observers	94
Next meeting	95
Other business	95
Report of the Forty-fourth Meeting of the Commission	99
Close of the meeting	100
Tables	101
Annex 1: List of Registered Participants	102
Annex 2: List of Documents	129

Annex 3:	Opening Address by the Governor of Tasmania, Her Excellency the Honourable Barbara Baker AC	137
Annex 4:	Agenda	140
* Annex 5:	Report of the Standing Committee on Implementation and Compliance 2025 (SCIC-2025)	
* Annex 6:	Report of the Standing Committee on Administration and Finance 2025 (SCAF-2025)	

* Annexes 5 and 6 are available on the CCAMLR website.

**Report of the Forty-fourth
Meeting of the Commission**
(Hobart, Australia, 20-31 October 2025)

Opening of the meeting

1.1 The Forty-fourth Annual Meeting of the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR-44) met at its Headquarters in Hobart from 20 to 31 October. It was chaired by Mr R. Bulloch (UK).

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

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

1.4 The following non-Contracting Parties were represented as Observers: Colombia, the Republic of Singapore. Türkiye and the United Arab Emirates 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), Association of Responsible Krill harvesting companies (ARK), the Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition (ASOC), the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat (ATS), the Coalition of Legal Toothfish Operators (COLTO), Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), the International Association of Antarctica Tour Operators (IAATO), INTERPOL, the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), the International Whaling Commission (IWC), Oceanites Inc., the Regional Plan of Action to Promote Responsible Fishing Practices including to Combatting Illegal, Unreported, and Unregulated Fishing Practices in the Region (RPOA-IUU), the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR), the Scientific Committee on Oceanic Research (SCOR), the Southern Ocean

Observing System (SOOS), the South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation (SPRFMO).

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, Mr Nils Vanstappen (Belgium) thanked the Governor for her remarks, along with the Government of Australia, the State of Tasmania and the City of Hobart for their hospitality. He noted that the current triple crises of climate change, biodiversity loss and pollution required an even greater vision to safeguard the Antarctic for future generations to come by consensus, and that upholding the principles of the Antarctic Treaty System was more essential than ever. He expressed hope that all Members would do their utmost to rise to the occasion and continue making progress on the very important task of conserving Antarctic marine living resources.

1.9 The Chair recognised the passing during the year of Dr Monde Mayekiso, past Chair of the Commission and Head of Delegation for South Africa, and Sir Guy Green, past Governor of Tasmania and a long-time friend and supporter of CCAMLR. The meeting observed a minute of silence in their memory.

1.10 A number of opening statements were made by Members.

1.11 Ukraine made the following statement:

‘For the fourth consecutive year, Ukraine is compelled to draw the attention of the CCAMLR community to the ongoing aggressive war waged by the Russian Federation against our nation, with the explicit aim of territorial annexation. Large areas of Ukrainian territory remain under Russian occupation, and the Russian Federation persists in its attempts to seize additional land, heedless of the thousands of lives lost weekly. These hostilities have reduced Ukrainian cities, villages, forests, and fields to desolate wastelands, littered with mines and unexploded ordnance that will pose mortal dangers for years to come.

Almost daily, Russian drones and missiles strike the homes of Ukrainian civilians, claiming the lives of adults and children alike.

Most CCAMLR Member States, through various international fora beyond this Commission, have called for an end to Russian aggression and the establishment of peace through an internationally agreed mechanism to prevent the resumption of conflict.

The President of Ukraine has repeatedly affirmed, and continues to affirm, Ukraine's readiness to engage in direct negotiations with the Russian Federation at the leadership level, without preconditions. Ukraine has consistently expressed its willingness to pursue a comprehensive ceasefire and initiate a peace-building process. Yet Russia repeatedly undermines these efforts, professing a desire for lasting peace while its actions speak to the contrary.

The Russian aggression continues to severely impact Ukraine's activities in Antarctica, including its participation in CCAMLR. This Commission has long served as a vital international platform for open discussions and decisions regarding the conservation and sustainable use of Antarctic marine living resources, benefiting all Member States without exception. The collaborative spirit of CCAMLR ensures that the national interests of every CCAMLR Member are considered.

It is therefore with profound shock that Ukraine learned of the imprisonment of a distinguished Ukrainian scientist, Leonid Pshenichnov, by Russian authorities in the occupied territory of Crimea. Mr. Pshenichnov, a respected member of the CCAMLR scientific community for decades, has been detained on charges related to his scientific contributions as part of Ukraine's delegation to CCAMLR.

Dear Colleagues, many of you have witnessed Mr. Pshenichnov's dedicated work within CCAMLR over the years. His contributions are documented in the Commission's reports and the Scientific Committee papers, forming a part of our shared legacy. Is it acceptable for the CCAMLR community to stand by while a Ukrainian biologist, who has devoted his life to the study, conservation, and rational use of Antarctic marine living resources, faces persecution and imprisonment by Russia?

We urgently call upon CCAMLR Members to support our aspiration to restore peace in Ukraine and to compel the aggressor state to take tangible steps toward peace — ceasing hostilities and directing all efforts toward diplomatic resolution. We demand that the

Russian Federation immediately release Ukrainian scientist Leonid Pshenichnov and urge all CCAMLR parties to prevent the persecution of our esteemed colleague in this manner.’

1.12 Norway noted that the Commission meeting was a continuation of last year’s discussions, which ended in a stalemate. It recalled a lack of progress on Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) and the need for new conservation measures, on which the Commission had not been successful at CCAMLR-43. It noted that all Members would be held accountable in the absence of progress, and that all must demonstrate a more flexible attitude to proposed measures now on the table. Norway stressed the Commission’s commitment to establishing MPAs and expressed hope that it had submitted a proposal for the Weddell Sea MPA that could be agreed by all Members. It affirmed its support for Ukraine’s call for the immediate release of Leonid Pshenichnov.

1.13 The EU and its Member States made the following statement:

‘The EU and its Member States condemn in the strongest possible terms the Russian Federation’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 are concerned by the information just shared by Ukraine on the detention of a member of its delegation to this meeting.’

1.14 Australia made the following statement:

‘Australia supports the statements made by Ukraine, Norway and the EU.

Australia once again condemns Russia's illegal and immoral invasion of Ukraine.

The Australian delegation is also gravely concerned about the Ukraine delegation’s report that Ukraine’s Science Committee Adviser and Ukraine’s representative at previous CCAMLR meetings for over 20 years has been detained in Crimea; and we are deeply concerned about his situation and wellbeing.

As host and a member of CCAMLR, we are particularly alarmed that the reported detention of the Ukrainian scientist is connected to his role in CCAMLR meetings as a long-standing member of the Ukrainian delegation. This is unacceptable.

We call on Russia to bring this situation to an end and ensure that he is free to represent Ukraine at CCAMLR in the future.

We continue to call on Russia to comply with its obligations under international law, and to immediately cease its aggression against Ukraine.’

1.15 Korea made the following statement:

‘Korea thanks the Government of Australia for hosting us in Hobart.

The Republic of Korea would like to congratulate you on your appointment as Chair of the Commission and commends your leadership and steady coordination of intersessional activities. We also thank the Secretariat for its dedicated efforts throughout the year and acknowledge the constructive engagement of all Members in advancing CCAMLR’s objectives.

As CCAMLR faces an increasingly complex policy and operational environment, it is important that our decisions continue to reflect both scientific integrity and practical feasibility. The continued credibility of this organisation depends on our ability to ground every measure in objective standards and cooperative dialogue.

In this regard, Korea reaffirms that the Commission’s management decisions must continue to be guided by the best available scientific data. To that end, it is essential that multinational scientific research activities be enabled and supported, allowing the collection and sharing of data necessary for sound, evidence-based management. Maintaining an open and cooperative scientific environment is vital to sustaining CCAMLR’s credibility as a science-driven organisation.

Korea supports continued progress in the discussion of MPAs, guided by robust scientific advice and mutual confidence among Members. As noted by the Honourable Governor this morning, CCAMLR has the record krill catch this year in the absence of proper distribution mechanism among the Subareas. In this context, we also emphasise the importance of further improving krill fishery management in Area 48, including the balanced spatial distribution of the appropriate trigger level, to ensure both

ecological sustainability and equitable access among those who participate in the fishery.

Korea attaches great importance to enhancing the efficiency and transparency of the compliance evaluation process, which is central to maintaining trust in CCAMLR's monitoring and control system.

Finally, Korea supports strengthening cooperation with other international and regional organisations to combat IUU fishing and reinforce collective efforts to promote transparent, rules-based fisheries governance. At the same time, CCAMLR should begin considering how it will interact with the new international framework established under the Biodiversity Beyond National Jurisdiction (BBNJ) Agreement, to ensure coherence and complementarity in global ocean governance.

Before closing, Korea would like to express its sincere gratitude to the outgoing Executive Secretary Dr. David Agnew for his eight years of dedicated service to the Commission, which we believe has contributed significantly to the reputation and global recognition of the Organisation.

Korea remains fully committed to contributing constructively to the work of the Commission and to advancing a science-based, balanced, and cooperative management framework for the Southern Ocean.'

1.16 The UK made the following statement:

'We would like to express our sincere appreciation to the Government of Australia for its generous hospitality, and to the CCAMLR Secretariat for their continued dedication and support to the work of the Commission. The United Kingdom aligns itself with the statements made by Ukraine, the EU and its Member States, Norway, Australia, and the Republic of Korea. As highlighted by others, it is essential that the Commission continues to operate with flexibility and pragmatism in order to make meaningful progress on the key issues before us at this meeting. The United Kingdom also reiterates its call for the Russian Federation to bring an end to its ongoing military aggression against Ukraine. We urge Russia to uphold its obligations under international humanitarian and human rights law, and to ensure the immediate release of civilians who have been arbitrarily detained.'

1.17 New Zealand echoed other Members' comments thanking the Government of Australia, the Chair, the CCAMLR Secretariat and the Governor of Tasmania, and emphasised that the Convention's conservation objective was more important than ever. New Zealand added its voice to that of previous speakers in support of Ukraine and in resolute condemnation of Russia's aggression against Ukraine. New Zealand expressed its dismay at the arrest of Dr Leonid Pshenichnov in Crimea and called for his immediate release from Russian imprisonment.

1.18 Uruguay made the following statement:

'Uruguay would like to express its sincere appreciation to you, the Vice-Chair, and the Secretariat for the efficient organisation of this Forty-fourth meeting. We also extend our gratitude to the Government and the people of Tasmania for their warm hospitality.

Uruguay would like to especially acknowledge the work of the Executive Secretary, Mr David Agnew, whose dedication and professionalism have significantly contributed to strengthening the Commission. We express our appreciation and best wishes for the new chapter he is about to begin.

Uruguay welcomes the continued prioritisation of climate change on the Commission's Agenda and reaffirms the need for our decisions to be based on the best scientific evidence available.

Our country also reiterates its commitment towards the establishment of MPAs as they are the critical tool for the conservation of Antarctic ecosystems. This a responsibility that the Commission assumed in 2002, when it became the first international body to commit to establishing a network of MPAs in line with the recommendations of the UN World Summit on Sustainable Development. We trust that continued dialogue among the Parties will lead to further progress towards consensus-based conservation measures.

Finally, Uruguay underscores the importance of the principle of good faith as the foundation of our deliberations. Only through trust, transparency and cooperation we all shall be able to strengthen the spirit of the Convention and fulfil its objectives.'

1.19 The Russian Federation thanked the CCAMLR Secretariat and the Government of Australia for the organisation of the meeting which allowed for all delegations to be represented

at and to participate in the session, unlike previously. It congratulated the new Chair of the Commission on his appointment.

1.20 Russia noted that some political statements made by other Members were yet another example of a deviation from the objective of the Convention as stipulated by Article 2. It affirmed that the aforementioned matters were outside of the mandate of the Commission under Article 9, and that, moreover, such matters were not presented in line with the CCAML Rules of Procedure. It emphasised that the inclusion of such issues constituted neglect of the real issues requiring attention of the Commission instead of making progress in the development of unified approach to MPAs or consideration of other relevant instruments. It stressed that matters concerning Russian citizens are within the jurisdiction of the Russian Federation in accordance with international law and should not be raised in the context of the CCAML framework.

Organisation of the meeting

Adoption of the Agenda

2.1 The Agenda, as drafted, was adopted (Annex 4).

2.2 The Chair invited nominations for the currently vacant roles of Vice-Chair of the Commission and Chair of the *ad hoc* Conservation Measures Drafting Group (CMDG) for 2025.

2.3 The USA proposed Dr Liz Brierley (Australia) for the position of Vice-Chair of the Commission. The nomination was seconded by Korea and accepted by Australia.

2.4 The USA nominated Ms Jane Rumble (UK) to the position of CMDG Chair, and the UK confirmed its willingness to accept this role.

2.5 The Commission welcomed these proposals and appointed Dr. Liz Brierley as Vice-Chair of the Commission and Ms Jane Rumble as Chair of CMDG.

Status of the Convention

2.6 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 43rd Meetings of the Commission. It noted that the number of Contracting Parties to the Convention accordingly remains thirty-seven. A copy of the status list for the Convention is available online at the Australian Treaties Database.

Chair's report

2.7 The Chair introduced his report (CCAMLR-44/BG/17) as read.

Proposals for new measures

2.8 To facilitate the review of proposals for new measures, the Chair invited the UK and Norway to introduce the following papers:

- (i) A proposal introduced by Norway for implementing the Krill Fishery Management Approach (KFMA) in Subarea 48.1 (CCAMLR-44/26); and
- (ii) A proposal introduced by the UK of options for spatial distribution of krill fishery catches in Area 48 (SC-CAMLR-44/02).

2.9 Korea made the following statement:

‘Korea thanks Norway for its thoughtful work on a more adaptive framework for Subarea 48.1. As the relevant paper will be also considered by the Scientific Committee, we see merit in the direction and offer the following points for refinement, subject to Scientific Committee (SC) advice.

First, the proposal would benefit from an explicit harvest control package: agreed reference points for biomass and predator performance, with clear in-season and interannual adjustment rules, complemented by an annual performance review, and we should avoid any significant increase in the trigger level.

Second, to mitigate risks from seasonal crowding, we suggest either rebalancing the winter-weighted caps toward the summer period or adopting rolling monthly/quarterly caps with proportionate hot-spot/move-on provisions.

Third, to preserve gear neutrality across different fishing methods, including conventional trawl, we encourage effort-management safeguards (e.g., reasonable per-vessel/fleet catch caps, limits on simultaneous vessels within a unit, and guardrails on continuous pumping time) so that effective fishing pressure—not just totals—is managed.

Fourth, for spatial closures, it would be helpful to set transparent criteria and procedures to adjust boundaries when monitoring indicates risk displacement or unintended concentration, while keeping fishery measures distinct from ongoing MPA boundary discussions.

Fifth, operational requirements—such as grey-water restrictions and in-area transshipment limits—may warrant careful consideration, clear safety/science and operational exceptions, and consideration of equitable arrangements for the costs of enhanced acoustics, observer/EM, and data access for the SC.

Korea looks forward to the Scientific Committee's advice on scientific elements, and also to policy/science dialogue to move our efforts to improve krill management forward. In this regard, Korea is committed to working constructively with other Members to develop a robust, ecosystem-based and gear-neutral approach for Area 48.1.'

2.10 Chile thanked the proponents of both proposals for their work, noting that though they contained different components, both spoke to the precautionary management of the krill fishery. Chile considered that many elements of monitoring and data needed to be improved and noted with concern that the approaches put forward did not include the proposed Domain 1 Marine Protected Area (D1MPA), which was a key priority to offer additional protection to the ecosystem.

2.11 Argentina made the following statement:

'I would like to begin by recalling what both the Governor and many delegations present here said: that we are a conservation organisation. We, as a Commission, clearly define ourselves as a conservation organisation.

We would like to thank the proposals presented by both the United Kingdom and Norway, which are providing some concrete options related to krill management.

In that sense, we want to support what Chile has pointed out in this regard.

We recognise that there are relevant elements in both proposals that require further technical discussion in the Scientific Committee. For example, the unification of management units from 5 to 3. In that sense, we hope that the Scientific Committee can provide clear advice that will allow this Commission to make informed decisions.

We are aware that we are all concerned about the non-renewal of CM 51-07 last year, but we want to emphasise that the urgent should not overshadow the important, nor the main objective we all have. For many years, numerous Members have worked toward a balanced harmonisation between a fisheries management strategy and the creation of an MPA in Domain 1. This harmonisation is at the heart of this organisation.

Last year, although no consensus was reached, significant progress was made on a harmonisation proposal that combined increased catch limits—a dimension of interest to some Members—with a redesign of the MPA model, including general and temporary protection zones to preserve key areas for krill-dependent predators. This reflects a balance between fisheries and conservation interests, and the commitment of multiple Members to a comprehensive management system.

Within this framework, we would like to emphasise the importance of continuing to move toward a solution that includes an integrated package of measures for the fisheries management strategy and the proposed MPA in Domain 1.’

2.12 Russia thanked the UK and Norway for their presentations, noting that several aspects would require further discussion by the Scientific Committee. It emphasised that the direct link made by some Members between the KFMA and MPAs, also considered in previous meetings, may be premature. It indicated its willingness to discuss these matters further and suggested that additional pillars (beyond the three key components outlined in the Norwegian proposal) may make the approach even more stable.

2.13 China thanked Norway and the UK for their proposals and expressed its appreciation for their respective progress. It noted that the current trigger level as contained in Conservation Measure 51-01 was first considered introduced in the 1990s, and that Members needed to consider how to now move forward the KFMA on the basis of the best available science. It

further remarked that arguments regarding seasonal protection, and year-round and seasonal closed zones would need particular further scientific discussion.

2.14 Australia expressed its firm and unwavering commitment to the conservation objective of the CAMLR Convention, and the precautionary approach to decision-making and management, based on the best available science, that is fundamental to advancing that objective. It noted that effective management of the krill fishery was an essential requirement for consistency with Article 2 of the CAMLR Convention. Australia supported ongoing efforts to harmonise implementation of the revised KFMA and the establishment of a Marine Protected Area in the Antarctic Peninsula but stressed that reinstating the precautionary spatial distribution of krill catches in the Antarctic Peninsula must be an immediate priority for all Members. It thanked Norway and the UK for their considered proposals and highlighted the importance of ensuring the ongoing operation and development of the krill fishery did not outpace the Commission's ability to monitor and manage the fishery and its impacts on the wider ecosystem.

2.15 The USA thanked the UK and Norway for their respective proposals, thanked the other speakers for their comments on the krill fishery, and acknowledged also the work by many other Members who had put forward creative and constructive ideas over the years to date. It underscored that the discussion demonstrated how Members were seized by these issues and noted the importance of beginning conversations on krill management while the Scientific Committee was still in session. It requested that the Secretariat explore possible times for the Commission to meet during this week with both scientific and policy personnel, noting it would be willing to moderate such discussions if useful.

2.16 Ukraine thanked Norway and the UK for their proposals, noting that each was built on a solid scientific basis. It stressed that the precautionary approach to management of the krill fishery required a balance be maintained between conservation and fisheries, to be explored further by the Scientific Committee.

2.17 Norway welcomed the proposal made by the USA regarding further discussions and affirmed its willingness to take part.

2.18 New Zealand thanked Norway and the UK for their proposals and looked forward to progressing work that ensures that krill fishing is precautionary and does not threaten ecosystem integrity. It highlighted a number of important elements to be included, namely the return of spatial distribution to prevent overconcentration of fishing, a robust fisheries management system supported by science to avoid risks of overfishing; the deployment of international

observers to support independent data collection; an increase in compliance and monitoring measures; and harmonisation with the Domain 1 MPA and improved spatial management.

2.19 The Chair recognised the interest of Members to progress these discussions informally in the first week of the meeting, and agreed to work with the Chairs of SCIC, SCAF and the Scientific Committee in order to find a time for such discussions on Wednesday, 22 October 2025.

Headquarters agreement

2.20 The Chair thanked the Australian authorities and CCAMLR Secretariat for their work to ensure the equal right to representation of all Members in accordance with the Convention. He noted that these efforts had resulted in additional measures being put in place to support CCAMLR delegates in their applications for visas, including the issuance of 3-year visas to many delegates, and that delegates had encountered no visa problems when attending CCAMLR-43 and CCAMLR-44. The Chair further recalled that some delegations had requested that the topic remain a focus for additional work and discussions during 2025. The Chair reminded Members of the 8–10-week processing time noted in the guidance and asked Members to follow all of the guidance to assist with the visa process.

2.21 Russia noted that a great deal of effort had been made to improve the situation of visa issuance, and that progress had been made. It highlighted that this had been possible thanks to the combined efforts of the Government of Australia, the CCAMLR Secretariat and the Commission as a whole, recalling the critical importance of implementation of the Headquarters Agreement to all delegations.

2.22 The USA expressed its appreciation for the detailed information shared during the intersessional period, and its gratitude to the Australian authorities and the CCAMLR Secretariat for their impressive work on these issues. It appreciated Russia's acknowledgement of recent progress and noted its optimism that the Commission could now move past this issue.

2.23 The Commission agreed that, given previous concerns had been effectively responded to, it would consider at this meeting on the dates of the next meeting under Agenda Item 12, and that it would not hold an intersessional Heads of Delegation (HoD) meeting to confirm the dates of CCAMLR-45. The Commission further requested the Secretariat to continue to liaise closely with the Australian authorities on this issue.

2.24 The Commission agreed to retain Agenda Item 2.5 for one further year, in order to monitor progress.

Implementation of Convention objectives

Objectives of the Convention

3.1 Chile made the following statement:

‘I would like to take the floor on this Agenda Item, established in the 1990s to reflect upon and jointly attempt to answer some key questions: Are we doing what is necessary to fulfil the objectives of the Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources and its rational use? How can we move forward on some of the priority issues that have remained stagnant, generating growing frustration not only among the Members of this Commission but also among representatives of civil society and industry?’

Under this Agenda Item, a number of initiatives have emerged seeking precisely to address those questions: the symposia held in Valdivia and Santiago; the successive performance reviews; the Declaration on the 40th Anniversary of the Commission; and, more recently, the third special meeting of this Commission held in Santiago in June 2023, as well as the Harmonisation Symposium in Incheon, Korea, in June 2024. Some of these efforts have been more successful than others in achieving their aims, yet all have sought in good faith to advance our work and foster mutual understanding among our countries.

However, today our delegation cannot let this opportunity pass without expressing its concern over the slow pace that this Commission has shown in recent years in advancing certain emblematic projects. Such stagnation causes significant harm to this forum. This is a multilateral body, and we must continue to promote initiatives such as this one to strengthen multilateralism.

We therefore have a unique opportunity to demonstrate that we can overcome this stagnation and reach meaningful agreements in pursuit of conservation and the rational use of resources. Dialogue remains the main tool that States possess to overcome their

differences. It must be carried out in good faith and with a commitment to results, insofar as we adhere to these objectives.

Dialogue has been the driving force of the Antarctic Treaty System—a multilateral framework of which this forum forms an integral part. Our dialogue is key to addressing the challenges faced by the Antarctic Continent, including its fragile marine ecosystems.

We invite all to reflect on the importance of dialogue and of achieving results that meet the objectives of the Convention. This invitation also extends to cooperation in generating relevant and robust information that supports the best available science. Let us remember that science is at the very heart of CCAMLR.

Our intervention this morning is not only a call for greater understanding among our delegations this week; above all, it is a call to action—because the challenges we face demand nothing less.’

3.2 Korea highlighted the importance of avoiding shifting baselines, reiterating that the strength of CCAMLR is its reliance on the best available science. Korea further reflected that the ongoing efforts for krill management in Area 48 include the consideration of spatial management provisions and MPAs, demonstrating CCAMLR’s use of best available science in the application of the precautionary principle.

3.3 Belgium agreed with the statements made by Korea and Chile. Belgium expressed concern about the risk of Shifting Baseline Syndrome within CCAMLR. Belgium stressed that CCAMLR’s baseline is rooted in its objective of conservation, which includes rational use, based on the best scientific evidence available and in line with the ecosystem-based and precautionary approaches. Noting stagnation in establishing a representative system of MPAs, Belgium expressed grave concern that MPA proposals were held to higher standards of scientific certainty than fisheries proposals by some. Belgium called on the Commission to renew its commitment to active conservation.

3.4 Argentina reflected on the core values of the Convention, noting that CCAMLR is an integral component of the Antarctic Treaty System and that both institutions uphold international cooperation as a fundamental principle. Argentina acknowledged that conservation under CCAMLR includes rational use, while reiterating that conservation remains the primary objective of the Convention.

3.5 The UK acknowledged SCAR's valuable contributions to the Scientific Committee (SC-CAMLR-44/BG/13 and SC-CAMLR-44/BG/18) and highlighted the uncertainty that climate change presents for the Commission. It further emphasised that ongoing fishing activities in the Convention Area illustrated the need to advance spatial fisheries management. The UK noted that CCAMLR has recently faced external criticism and stressed the importance of more effectively demonstrating its achievements, particularly its strong record of establishing best practices that have been adopted by fisheries management organisations globally.

3.6 Russia noted that the objectives of the CAMLR Convention are achieved through a broad suite of instruments, in particular conservation measures, which enable both conservation and the rational use of Antarctic marine living resources, tools not commonly available in other fisheries management organisations. Russia stressed the need for consistent criteria across all fisheries for participation and management, highlighting current differences in approaches applied to the scientific review processes with respect to various fisheries.

3.7 China stressed that scientific basis is important for the work of CCAMLR and the Commission should not treat the scientific basis selectively. China also observed that lower scientific standards are being applied to the establishment and operation of MPAs while higher standards are applied to krill management by many Members, which creates imbalance.

3.8 New Zealand thanked Chile, Argentina and the UK for recalling the importance of the objective of the Convention and CCAMLR's exceptional history, and the strong and world leading framework that we have in the Convention and as part of the Antarctic Treaty System. New Zealand further supported others' comments on science being at the heart of CCAMLR's work, including on the important decisions before the Commission to return to precautionary management and to progress management and protection work during this meeting.

3.9 Uruguay emphasised the importance of MPAs, noting that they are a central conservation measure within CCAMLR's framework and play a key role in strengthening and preserving ecosystems.

3.10 Canada acknowledged the unique challenges of polar environments and the threats posed by climate change and biodiversity loss. It highlighted discussions within the Scientific Committee regarding warming waters in the Convention Area and noted parallels with changes occurring in the Arctic. Canada emphasised that the Commission should consider the dynamics of both polar regions in its deliberations and decision-making.

3.11 ASOC highlighted concerns that Shifting Baseline Syndrome is emerging within CCAMLR's conservation approach. While acknowledging CCAMLR's pioneering role in precautionary, ecosystem-based management, ASOC noted recent setbacks such as the lapse of CM 51-07 for krill and stalled progress on MPAs, despite strong scientific support and global momentum toward '30x30'. ASOC cautioned that this downward shift in ambition risks undermining CCAMLR's legitimacy and urged renewed progress on establishing a representative MPA system and strengthening precautionary krill fisheries management.

Performance reviews

3.12 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-44/06.

3.13 The Commission noted that PR2 was considered by SCIC under Agenda Item 8 (SCIC-2025, paragraphs 213 to 215), by the Scientific Committee under Agenda Item 10 (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 10.2), and by SCAF (SCAF-2025, paragraphs 68 to 73). The Commission further noted SCAF's recommendation to amend the proposed response under CCAMLR-44/06, Recommendation 24 (SCAF-2025, paragraphs 72 and 73). The Commission endorsed this recommendation and tasked the Secretariat with updating the CCAMLR website accordingly.

3.14 Some Members noted progress in advancing compliance-related initiatives such as revisions to CM 10-09 to strengthen control of transshipments this year. Some Members supported Korea's proposal for appropriate revisions to Recommendation 12, subparagraphs 2 and 4. The Commission agreed to update the table to include the revision to CM 10-09 and endorsed the proposal to update the website accordingly, and noted the significant progress against PR2, encouraging ongoing efforts to finalise outstanding items.

3.15 New Zealand reflected on the SCIC Chair's remarks highlighting the significant progress achieved in advancing compliance-related matters this year. In light of this positive momentum, New Zealand encouraged the Commission to continue its efforts to finalise the remaining PR2 recommendations.

3.16 The Commission considered the proposal from the EU and its Member States (CCAMLR-44/25 Rev. 2) to conduct a third CCAMLR Performance Review (PR3) during the 2025/26 intersessional period, with the results and recommendations to be reported to CCAMLR-45. 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 focus on a five-year period which will evaluate the implementation of PR1 and PR2, identify new areas for improvement and assess the overall governance of CCAMLR. The EU has committed through a voluntary donation to cover the costs of the Performance Review.

3.17 Many Members supported the proposal for PR3, reflecting that it has been nine years since PR2 was undertaken and recognising the benefits of this work.

3.18 Some Members, noting the time elapsed since PR2, emphasised the need to fully assess its outcomes and reconsider priorities before commencing PR3. They further noted that the scope of PR3 should extend beyond MPAs and IUU fishing to include sustainable fishing and the role of NGOs. These Members also raised concerns that NGO participation on the review panel could be counterproductive and requested further clarity on the value of such involvement. In addition, they questioned the cost of a nine-Member panel and highlighted the need for further consideration of budget implications.

3.19 The EU and its Member States presented revised versions of their proposal (CCAMLR-44/25 Rev 1 and CCAMLR-44/25 Rev 2), aimed at addressing the concerns raised by Members. Changes included the removal of civil society and rational use experts from the review panel and clarifying that the Commission would decide on the follow-up to be given to the panel's findings and recommendations.

3.20 The Commission noted that consensus could not be reached on the proposal in CCAMLR-44/25 Rev 2 to undertake the Third Performance Review, noting the concerns raised regarding in particular the scope of the review and its priorities and financing.

3.21 The EU expressed disappointment that consensus could not be reached due to the opposition of one Member, reiterating its willingness to fund the review. It noted that unclear procedural concerns have prevented the Performance Review from proceeding, thereby hindering efforts to improve the functioning of the organisation.

Management of marine resources

4.1 The Commission noted annual updates on fisheries notifications (CCAMLR-44/BG/08 Rev. 1) and catches in the Convention Area (SC-CAMLR-44/BG/01).

Advice from the Scientific Committee

4.2 The Chair of the Scientific Committee, Dr C. Cárdenas (Chile), presented the report of the Scientific Committee (SC-CAMLR-44) and thanked the Scientific Committee for the significant progress made across a number of topics.

Krill resources

4.3 The Chair of the Scientific Committee summarised the discussions held regarding the management of the krill fishery in Area 48 (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraphs 2.13 to 2.76).

4.4 The Commission noted that the Scientific Committee reported that the krill catches in Statistical Area 48 during the 2024/25 season exceeded the trigger level of 620 000 tonnes specified in CM 51-01 by 4 917 tonnes. In the 2024/25 season, krill catches in Subarea 48.1 substantially increased, with about 58% of the catch taken from Subarea 48.1, such that the catch in this Subarea was more than double that of the previous season (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 2.13).

4.5 The Commission noted that the Scientific Committee reported that the high catches in Subarea 48.1 could not have occurred if CM 51-07 had remained in place. It also noted that the changes in fishing distribution during the 2024/25 fishing season may have been affected by sea ice coverage in Subareas 48.1 and 48.2, as well as the interannual dynamics of krill stocks and the patchy nature of krill distribution (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 2.22).

4.6 The Commission recalled that three components of the KFMA had been endorsed by the Commission (CCAMLR-38 paragraph 5.17) and noted significant progress made by the Scientific Committee (SC-CAMLR-44/BG/02; SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 2.26) on the revised KFMA. It also noted the elements requiring attention for the long term such as the development of a monitoring plan, the need for sustainable funding mechanisms and the elaboration of performance evaluation mechanisms, towards the full implementation of the KFMA (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraphs 2.42 and 2.44).

4.7 The Commission noted the Scientific Committee's endorsement of the incorporation of a continuously updated Krill Stock Hypothesis (KSH) into the relevant components of the KFMA (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 2.59) as well as the inclusion of an enhanced CCAMLR Ecosystem Monitoring Program (CEMP) as an integral part of implementing the KFMA (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 2.60).

4.8 The Commission considered CCAMLR-44/26 and SC-CAMLR-44/BG/23, submitted by Norway, which outlined a proposal for transitioning the krill fishery management system in Area 48 from a fixed quota regime to a dynamic KFMA via a staged approach (see also paragraph 2.8). The documents discuss Management Unit configurations, seasonal spread of the catch, introduction of protection areas, and reintroducing the spread of the catch in Subareas in 48.2 to 48.4 based on the expired CM 51-07. This implies modifications to CM 51-01, as well as the establishment of a new CM 51-08 to regulate krill fishing in Subarea 48.1, enhanced data collection to support the approach, and harmonisation with the proposed Domain 1 Marine Protected Area (D1MPA).

4.9 The Commission considered SC-CAMLR-44/02, submitted by the UK, which presented proposals to establish a replacement for CM 51-07 to prevent the concentration of krill catches (see also paragraph 2.8). The document summarises the current situation and, for the scenario that it is not possible to adopt a KFMA that is harmonised with the D1MPA proposal this year, proposes two options for an interim measure to spread fishing effort and catches.

4.10 The Commission considered CCAMLR-44/24, submitted by Argentina and Chile, which presented a revised proposal for a conservation measure establishing a Marine Protected Area in Domain 1. The proponents indicated that the proposal was developed following transparent and collaborative consultations over several years and was adapted to align with the KFMA in a harmonised approach. The proponents highlighted the dynamic nature of the proposal, intended to co-exist and co-evolve with the KFMA.

4.11 The Commission thanked the proponents for the proposals and welcomed their continued efforts.

4.12 Most Members considered that the D1MPA proposal is ready for adoption, is based on best available science, and is needed to protect this rapidly changing and ecologically significant area. They also noted that protections would benefit the krill fishery. They noted that the proposal reflects several years of negotiation and has been substantially revised to address the concerns of Members.

4.13 Some Members considered that the implementation of the KFMA and the revision of the D1MPA proposal could be progressed in parallel but not be implemented as a forced combination.

4.14 The Commission discussed these proposals during plenary as well as during informal meetings (see also paragraph 2.19) and considered different options to progress.

4.15 Russia stressed that the MPA proposal should be considered under Agenda Item 5, spatial management, but not under Agenda Item 4, management of marine resources. Russia further indicated absence of agreement within the Commission to harmonise KFMA with an MPA proposal and pointed out the need for the D1MPA proposal to be updated in line with the development and implementation of KFMA.

4.16 Chile made the following statement:

‘Mr Chair, Chile promotes sustainable fishing while at the same time encouraging the conservation of Antarctic marine fauna and flora. Without conservation, there can be no sustainable fishing. Actions that promote conservation do not necessarily imply a closure of fisheries; rather, they aim to achieve an appropriate balance between conservation and rational use, with the precautionary principle as the guiding axis of our decisions as a Commission.

MPAs move in this very direction. My country has decided to establish 43% of its maritime territory under protection within our Exclusive Economic Zone. Does this mean that Chile can no longer fish in its Exclusive Economic Zone? Of course not. These conservation measures ensure that marine living resources will remain available not only for industry but also for future generations.

Chile views with concern the situation described in the Scientific Committee’s report regarding the krill fishery in Subarea 48.1. We are equally concerned, as many delegations have pointed out, about the expiration of Conservation Measure 51-07, and we value the fact that our industry voluntarily withdrew from Subarea 48.1 once the 155 000-tonne limit established by that lapsed Conservation Measure for the Subarea were reached.

Chile appreciates the efforts of many countries that have decided to take action in this regard. The High Ambition Coalition for Nature and People, which seeks to protect at least 30% of the oceans by 2030 and now counts 122 countries among its Members, is an example of this and represents a key objective of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.

Let us make CCAMLR, Mr. Chair, another such example. This Commission has a unique opportunity in its hands. All delegations present are aware of the challenges this forum faces. If we are unable to move forward in this direction—to continue protecting the Southern Ocean—and instead focus only partially on a new approach to krill fishery

management while disregarding the science that underpins the need for conservation, we will miss the unique opportunity to show the world that sustainable fishing and conservation can indeed go hand in hand.

Therefore, the debate we are holding on a new approach to the krill fishery must go hand in hand, in a harmonised manner, with the revised proposal to establish a Marine Protected Area in Domain 1. This proposal does not entail a closure to sustainable fishing—we all know that. And we recall that this proposal has been made more flexible since 2019, reducing protection zones in Subarea 48.1 to accommodate the availability of areas for the development of the fishery.

We have a unique opportunity to demonstrate that public wellbeing and environmental protection—that sustainable fishing and ocean conservation—are entirely compatible and mutually reinforcing. Fishing without conservation is not sustainable. Without spatial and temporal distribution of catches, without protection zones, without a robust ecosystem monitoring plan, fishing cannot be sustainable and risks depleting the resource and causing irreversible impacts on the ecosystem—something none of us wants. Conservation leads to greater abundance of resources.

We are currently in a situation that satisfies no one. Some wish to increase the trigger level; others advocate for conservation and moderation. Let us show the world that CCAMLR can achieve these objectives in a harmonised way. The harmonised process is a concrete expression of cooperation from the Global South, consistent with the principles of public wellbeing and environmental protection, of sustainable fishing alongside ocean conservation.

An increase in catch limits together with the adoption of the DIMPA is possible. We said clearly, we don't support any increase beyond the current trigger level in Area 48, without the full implementation of DIMPA. Chile is a fishing nation. It fishes sustainably and under robust domestic regulations. If my country has been able to do it—imperfectly, as everything can be improved—then this Commission can do it as well.'

4.17 The EU and its Member States made the following statement:

'We note with deep concern that in the 2024/25 fishing season, the trigger level was reached for the first time, exceeded even, and that more than 50% of catches were taken in a single Subarea, Subarea 48.1. This is the result of CCAMLR's failure last year to

renew CM 51-07, which means that the trigger level can now be harvested in its entirety across any of the Subareas within Area 48.

The current situation is clearly not precautionary. It would be irresponsible to continue the krill fishery on this basis.

It is urgent that CCAMLR bring back a distribution of the trigger level in Area 48.

While we acknowledge the aspirations of those Members who want to increase krill catches in the short term, we strongly believe that a precautionary management framework must be in place first to ensure that the expansion of the fishery is sustainable.

This includes developing and implementing proper monitoring mechanisms and data collection plans, including increased krill research requirements, to assess the impact of increased fishing pressure on the ecosystem and to inform future management decisions. A sustainable funding mechanism is also needed to support this work.

Improvements are also needed to the krill fishery management system. We therefore support the proposals submitted to this meeting to require the deployment of SISO observers on board krill vessels, the near real time transmission of VMS data by krill vessels to the Secretariat, as well as the inspection of all vessels landing krill and krill products.

Another key element that we believe needs to be in place is the DIMPA, proposed by Argentina and Chile, which we fully support and consider ready for adoption. The proposal will, among others, maximize spatial protection of representative habitats, ecosystem processes and critical life-cycle areas for Antarctic krill. We welcome the proponents' efforts to harmonise the establishment of DIMPA with the implementation of the revised KFMA. This is the right way forward.

Although work on the implementation of the KFMA is progressing well, we are not there yet. An interim solution is therefore needed in the meantime, starting with the reinstatement of a precautionary distribution of catches across the Subareas of Area 48.

The EU and its Member States stand ready to engage constructively this week to reach agreement on an approach that respects the objective and principles enshrined in the

Convention. We caution against putting short term commercial gain before the long-term sustainability of the krill fishery and ecosystem protection.’

4.18 The Commission discussed a staged approach to the implementation of the KFMA despite the different understanding of Members on relevant essential elements of krill management. The Commission further discussed the Scientific Committee recommendation on the urgent need to implement an interim conservation measure to distribute catches across the Subareas 48.1 to 48.4 (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 2.25-2.30).

4.19 The Commission also discussed the possibility of agreeing on an interim measure for the coming season.

4.20 Most Members sought a measure that would avoid the concentration of catch that occurred in the 2024/25 season.

4.21 Most Members reiterated the clear advice from the Scientific Committee that the current situation, with a trigger level of 620 000 tonnes in CM 51-01 alone, is not precautionary due to the local concentration of the catch and that there is an urgent need to distribute catches (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 2.25).

4.22 Some Members recalled a voluntary commitment from ARK to distribute their catch in line with the lapsed CM 51-07 but that this had not occurred.

4.23 Some Members argued for the readoption of CM 51-07 for the next season as an interim measure. The Commission did not reach agreement on this proposal.

4.24 The Commission recalled that the current trigger level was based on the sum of maximum historic catches reported at the time in each Subarea and not linked to the assessment of krill biomass (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 2.38). Russia noted that the catch limit for Area 48 established in accordance with paragraph 2 of the Conservation Measure 51-01 was significantly higher than the trigger level.

4.25 Many Members recalled that while an updated catch limit of 668 101 tonnes for Subarea 48.1 was considered to be based on the use of the best available science (SC-CAMLR-41, paragraphs 3.46), disagreement regarding its implementation precluded its adoption (SC-CAMLR-41, paragraphs 3.50, 3.51 and 3.67).

4.26 Some Members noted that an agreed catch limit of 5.61 million tonnes is stipulated in CM 51-01 (paragraph 2), that the trigger level is precautionary, and that a scientific assessment of ecosystem impact is needed to evaluate the effect of fishing concentration.

4.27 Russia noted that any updated catch limit for Subarea 48.1 must remain within the trigger level according to CM 51-01. Russia further noted that an agreed catch limit in Area 48 stipulated in CM 51-01 (paragraph 2) is substantially higher than the trigger level and at the same time precautionary. Russia stressed that development of science-based criteria and diagnostics for scientific assessment of potential ecosystem impact of the krill fishery is needed to evaluate the effect of a local concentration of the catch and to develop distribution of catches as part of the KFMA. Russia noted that the management of the krill fishery in Subarea 48.1, as well as in Subareas 48.2–48.4 should be implemented as part of a coordinated management of the Area 48 fishery and that such coordinated management of the krill fishery is being implemented under CM 51-01 to ensure compliance with Article II of the Convention.

4.28 Most Members supported efforts to progress the harmonisation of the KFMA and D1MPA, encouraged enhanced collaboration and highlighted the urgent need for a solution to the concentration of the fishery. They noted that the establishment of the D1MPA and Seasonal and General Protection Zones would support specific conservation objectives and the sustainability of the fishery, enhance resilience to the effects of climate change, and drive scientific progress through increased monitoring efforts. Those Members noted that changes to the krill fishery should not outpace marine protection and that a harmonised approach would need to include monitoring and data collection plans (for the fishery and ecosystem), sustainable funding mechanisms, and improvements to fishery management measures (including SISO observers, VMS and port inspections).

4.29 The United States noted that supporting sustainable populations of krill in the Antarctic Peninsula provides for a healthy, well-managed and sustainable fishery, and to a responsible U.S.-based tourism industry.

4.30 Russia indicated that the development of the KFMA should be precautionary and based on the necessary scientific justification, rather than addressing the issue of the harmonisation of the KFMA with proposals for establishment of the D1MPA that are not agreed upon by the Members of the Commission.

4.31 Through a series of informal discussions, proponents developed proposals for an interim conservation measure to manage the krill fishery for the next two fishing seasons. While the proposals diverged on some points – mainly whether the trigger level should be increased and

whether areas closed to fishing should be included – these presented some commonalities (e.g. raising the Subarea 48.1 catch limit, distributing catch limits over a candidate group of Management Units (MUs) and over meteorological seasons, establishing a monitoring strategy and keeping the 48.2–48.4 trigger level allocation unchanged from the lapsed CM 51-07).

4.32 Some Members indicated that the interim measure could be implemented on the basis of the advice regarding the revised KFMA and monitoring strategies, with exemption to the trigger level.

4.33 Many Members indicated that such an increase of the trigger level should be considered alongside spatial distribution, improved management measures, monitoring and data collection and spatial protection.

4.44 While disagreements remained, the Commission noted the willingness of Members to collaborate on this issue further to find a common ground and move forward.

4.45 Many Members recalled the preamble of CM 51-01, in which it agreed that krill catches should not exceed a set (i.e. ‘trigger’) level in Area 48 until a procedure for division of the overall catch limit into smaller management units has been established.

4.46 Some Members noted that elements of some interim proposals that pertained to the D1MPA required further consideration and advice from the Scientific Committee.

4.47 Most Members reiterated that the D1MPA was ready for adoption, and while recalling that the harmonisation of the KFMA and the D1MPA was the Commission’s mandate (CCAMLR-42, paragraphs 4.32 to 4.36), agreed to show flexibility by adopting an interim measure which did not address that mandate to ensure acting upon the Scientific Committee’s consideration (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 2.25). These Members noted that adopting an interim measure would give additional time to progress the harmonisation between the KFMA and the D1MPA.

4.48 The Commission spent a considerable amount of time and effort to reach an agreement on an interim solution for the management of the krill fishery, via informal discussions, multi- and bilateral conversations and a Head of Delegations meeting. Cognisant of their responsibility towards the Convention, all Members demonstrated flexibility and willingness to move forward in a constructive and collaborative way.

4.49 The Commission considered two proposals, developed during the meeting as well as in the margins, by Norway and the USA.

4.50 Norway presented a proposal which was an updated attempt at drafting an interim CM 51-08 which included adjustments to their original proposal to account for Members' feedback, particularly regarding closed areas. The USA presented a proposal which was a draft Resolution which attempted to establish a general common understanding of the way forward and a record of some of the elements that in the view of the USA seemed to be agreeable (see also paragraph 4.31) as a means to record the progress that was made.

4.51 While the Commission could not reach consensus on either proposal, the Commission noted that the distribution of catch limits on the basis of scientific advice was fundamental.

4.52 Some Members indicated that scientific clarity was needed regarding whether CM 51-01 alone was precautionary, partly due to the lack of definition of the concept of fishery concentration and quantification of its impact.

4.53 Most Members stated that the Scientific Committee's consideration was clear that the current situation is not precautionary (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 2.25).

4.54 China stressed that fishing operations are affected by many factors such as weather, sea ice condition, the unpredictable change in the spatial-temporal distribution itself and even fishing behaviour. China noted that the aggregation of fishing activities in an area is the nature of fisheries, and that it had not led to negative ecological impacts last year in Subarea 48.1. China encouraged all Members to explore the functional interaction between fishing activities and krill-dependent predators at the scientific level. In this sense, China stressed that the concentration of fishing activities is not an issue which needs to be addressed, or with which the Commission need be concerned. China noted that all vessels and all Members complied with the provisions of CM 51-01 and the ARK VRZ last year. China further stated that this proves that the current CM 51-01 still plays an effective role in conserving Antarctic marine living resources. China stressed that even if the current situation is not the most favourable situation for some Members, it is still fully consistent with the precautionary approach.

4.55 At the end of the discussion many Members reiterated that the reinstatement of CM 51-07 would be acceptable (or a similar solution, see SC-CAMLR-44 paragraph 2.29) while further progress is made, but some Members considered this as a move backwards from the use of the best available science. Many Members expressed serious concern that without

spatial distribution, there is a potential for concentrated catches that could further exacerbate strain on a region of Antarctica that is already experiencing rapid warming.

4.56 The Commission regretted the lack of consensus but noted the willingness of all Members to progress this work during the intersession. As such, it requested the Secretariat establish a Discussion Group to facilitate progress, encouraged all Members to join this effort as soon as possible, and indicated that Norway would lead these efforts.

4.57 Australia made the following statement:

‘Like many Members here today, Australia is extremely disappointed to see it is the intention of a small minority to increase the krill trigger limit in Area 48 without any desire to progress the harmonisation of the KFMA with the Domain 1 MPA. We are extremely concerned that we are going to walk away with yet another year without spatial distribution in the Krill Fishery.

If this pattern continues, it will contribute to an erosion of the Commission’s successes to date in achieving the conservation objective of the CAMLR Convention.

I recall that we are in this situation today because last year one Member showed an unwillingness to renew Conservation Measure 51-07. We had hoped that this year, after seeing the significant concentration of catch in Subarea 48.1 last season, CCAMLR would move towards consensus in line with clear advice from the Scientific Committee that spatial distribution should urgently be re-established. We feel it is important to reiterate that our long-standing practice of consensus in CCAMLR is about moving together, not a right of veto.

Australia considers the action of some Members has set back the conservation efforts in Area 48. Like many other Members, Australia cannot agree with an increase of the trigger limit without proper protection measures, data collection and monitoring in place. We also maintain that it is necessary to improve the management of krill fisheries through basic and practical assurance measures, consistent with best practice fisheries management in other CCAMLR fisheries and other international fisheries, such as the proposals discussed in this meeting for VMS, SISO and port inspections.

We reiterate our deep concern that the krill fishery will operate another season without spatial distribution. However, we are glad that CCAMLR has shown resilience and robustness to pressure to compromise on the conservation objective of the CAMLR

Convention. We have retained the trigger limit, refusing to increase it until the appropriate accompanying monitoring, data collection and spatial management measures are in place, as has been recommended by the Scientific Committee. This demonstrates that CCAMLR is working, and the Commission will not compromise on the conservation objective or walk back on our commitment to harmonise the KFMA with a Domain 1 MPA.

We also do not want to lose sight of the headway we have made this week. We are thankful for the long discussions we have had in this CCAMLR meeting formally and informally and we have heard the views raised by all Members. Australia, and we believe all Members of the Commission, want to see improved management of the Krill Fishery, including an eventual appropriate increase to the catch limits. This is to ensure a precautionary approach and rational use of the Krill fishery.

But as many others have noted, CCAMLR is not a Regional Fishery Management Organisation (RFMO) and needs to consider rational use in the context of its conservation objective. We believe there is a path forward which will see an agreement of this Commission to concurrently implement the D1MPA, implement robust monitoring and data collection requirements, and increase the krill catch limit based on the best available science. This requires all Members to come to the Commission with a genuine commitment to negotiate and compromise to achieve consensus to meet our agreed conservation objective.

We look forward to all Members continuing working together over the intersessional period, to ensure spatial distribution is re-established as a vital next step towards the longer-term objectives.'

4.58 The USA made the following statement:

'Well, friends, here we are. The United States wants to thank our colleagues for the discussions we've had over the last two weeks. We really did engage together as a Commission, and we saw the sort of creative solutions that arise when we work together, and the flexibility that can come in the spirit of working together to tackle tough problems and derive solutions. Over the course of 2 weeks we discussed proposals and ideas from a large number of Members, all of which advanced us in this goal and we got close to a solution. That is the spirit of CCAMLR and the Antarctic Treaty System, and why we all do what we do.

The United States aligns with our many colleagues who have expressed disappointment that despite our optimism and positivity, we are unable to agree even to an interim measure to spatially distribute the krill catch and agree to spatial management measures. We all agreed, at least at one point, that the current situation is not precautionary. We definitely all agreed that the current situation is not one that we want to maintain. We all agreed that we don't want to be here at the end of the day, effectively the last day, with no solution.

Yet here we are. Again. Not only unable to make progress but also unable to recover from last year, when one Member prevented the rollover of 51-07. Even though none of us this year like the status quo, we could not compromise enough to get beyond it.

Instead, we will have another year of undistributed catch in Area 48. And please recall that the Scientific Committee adopted catch limits with the understanding that there would be spatial subdivision. 51-01 alone does not provide that spatial distribution.

We've heard it from a number of delegations this year: the world is watching, and it will be disappointed. The pressure that is on us from all sides, including from industry, will build even further going forward, and may be ready to explode by CCAMLR-45.

But we do think that this year Members were negotiating in good faith to move forward, to build a foundation that would enable us to move toward the implementation of the KFMA and the D1MPA. And that gives us something to build on for next year. So the United States hopes that we will come with that same good faith and spirit and meet the moment next year. We urge everyone – including ourselves – to come to the table next year with determination, creativity, and flexibility. We look forward to those discussions.'

4.59 The UK agreed fully with both the Australian and US statements.

4.60 New Zealand added its voice in full to the interventions of Australia and the USA, reiterating its thanks to all Members for the hard work to progress precautionary krill management and MPAs at this meeting. New Zealand noted the substantial compromises Members were willing to make to agree an interim measure to address the urgent need to return the krill fishery to precaution, while giving confidence and trust towards progress on KFMA and the D1MPA. New Zealand expressed its deep regret that none of the many options to reinstate precautionary management were agreed at the meeting, and that one Member was only prepared to distribute the krill catch without adequate spatial protection and management of the

fishery and only with substantial increases in catch, which was not supported by science or consistent with CCAMLR fisheries management. New Zealand reiterated that in the context of rapid climate change in the Antarctic Peninsula region, and with respect to the science underpinning the DIMPA, it is clear that spatial distribution of fishing and protected areas are needed to support precautionary management. New Zealand called on Members to begin work now on harmonisation of the DIMPA and KFMA toward decisions next year that provide precautionary management arrangements consistent with the objective of the Convention.

4.61 Korea expressed disappointment that agreement on the spatial distribution of krill catch limits in Area 48 could not be reached despite substantial efforts and compromises by many Members. Korea reiterated that any adjustment to the krill trigger level should be contingent on a package comprising: (i) an agreed spatial distribution of catch; (ii) strengthened monitoring arrangements; and (iii) a clear commitment to progressing the Domain 1 MPA. Korea further noted that many Members agreed that spatial distribution is the minimum requirement for precautionary management of krill; however, even this minimum could not be achieved despite significant compromises from most Members.

4.62 Norway made the following statement:

‘Norway is disappointed that the Commission was unable to reach consensus at this year’s meeting. Our delegation, in cooperation with others, worked hard to seek common ground, and to find solutions that could suit all Parties.

We firmly believe in the importance of dynamic and ecosystem-based management of the krill fishery and monitoring. We believe that the implementation of KFMA will help us achieve this. We also believe that MPAs are a valuable tool to ensure sustainable rational use and conserve the Antarctic marine ecosystem.

We had hoped that this year’s meeting would bring us one step closer to the implementation of KFMA and the adoption of the DIMPA

Having said this, we are encouraged by the efforts made by Parties to collaborate in a constructive way over the last two weeks in an effort to seek common ground.

We have achieved a lot in this time, and look forward to continuing to work together with all Parties over the intersessional period to ensure that the Commission is well placed to reach consensus on this matter at next year’s meeting.’

4.63 Argentina made the following statement:

‘Argentina wishes to express its disappointment that we have been unable make progress with our role and objectives this year. Over 40 years ago, it was decided that the objective of the Convention was the conservation of Antarctic marine living resources, which includes rational use. Over a decade ago, we agreed on the establishment of a representative network of Marine Protected Areas. Two years ago, we agreed to move forward with the harmonisation process between the Krill Fishery Management Approach and the Domain 1 Marine Protected Area proposal. These agreements were reached in line with the letter and spirit of the Convention.

I would like to reiterate what I said yesterday. This organisation is the body under whose auspices we work to preserve the Antarctic marine ecosystem. We are at a critical moment — one in which we must keep in mind the reasons why the Convention exists and its value for all Parties.

Argentina continues to support the relevance of the Convention. Together with Chile, and many other Parties, we have been working for a long time on the Domain 1 MPA proposal, and we continue to take the view that the establishment of that MPA would benefit all Members, the Antarctic ecosystem and the krill management strategy.

There is no necessary conflict between fishing and conservation interests. The Convention clearly states that both dimensions can and should be addressed jointly. Hence, we will continue to work in the inter-sessional period to advance these objectives, which are fundamental to keeping the Convention alive and relevant. We will continue to demonstrate flexibility, a spirit of engagement and a willingness to find common ground, including consideration of the issues that remain outstanding for some Members, such as the Research and Monitoring Plan, while keeping in mind the objective of establishing a revised Krill Fishery Management Approach that includes robust, transparent, and participatory monitoring. This is what we have done through the different versions of our proposal.

Argentina commits to continue working on a roadmap that takes into account the interests of all Members, including the establishment of a Marine Protected Area in Domain 1.’

4.64 Chile made the following statement:

‘We wish to thank the delegations for the efforts made over the past two weeks in seeking consensus on this matter. However, like many other delegations, we regret that it has not been possible to reach consensus to move forward with a harmonised approach to the krill fishery alongside the adoption of the D1MPA.

We also regret that consensus was not reached to establish a conservation measure to distribute and spread catch limits within Area 48, maintaining only the current critical catch level established by Conservation Measure 51-01.

Likewise, we regret that it was not possible to reach consensus to reinstate Conservation Measure 51-07.

Chile thanks the majority of delegations that have expressed their support for the immediate adoption of the D1MPA. As has been noted by other delegations, the proposal seeks to strengthen, among other objectives, the spatial protection of representative habitats, ecosystem processes, and critical areas of the life cycle of Antarctic krill and its dependent predators.

We reiterate our commitment to advancing a harmonised process between the new KFMA and the establishment of the Domain 1 Marine Protected Area.

Chile’s oceanic vocation, its vulnerability to seven of the nine impacts of climate change, and the country’s unique geographical, ecological, and natural connection with Antarctica impose upon us not only a responsibility but also a lasting commitment to protection and conservation within the framework of multilateralism, respect for international law, and the international cooperation that underpins this forum.

We also reiterate that conservation and the rational use of Antarctic marine living resources are compatible objectives, and we believe that the establishment of MPAs in Antarctica precisely strengthens this compatibility.’

4.65 The EU and its Member States made the following statement:

‘We are disappointed that, following the expiration of CM 51-07 last year, consensus could once again not be reached on a spatial distribution of krill catches in Area 48. The Scientific Committee has advised that the current concentration of catches in Subarea

48.1 is not precautionary and, although all Members agreed that the current situation should not continue, it has not been possible to avoid that the krill fishery will continue to operate in an unsustainable manner for another season.

The current impasse underscores the widely diverging views among Members about CCAMLR's mission. For some Members, CCAMLR appears to be predominantly a fisheries management organisation. For most Members, including ourselves, CCAMLR's objective is conservation, and rational use must respect the precautionary principle, and the ecosystem approach enshrined in the Convention.

CCAMLR's continued failure to jointly progress work to deliver on the Convention's objective risks undermining its long-term credibility.

Throughout this meeting, we have consistently supported an approach that integrates the KFMA in Area 48, including a spatial distribution of catches, with the proposed Domain 1 Marine Protected Area, underpinned by a robust monitoring and data collection framework to deliver the data and information needed to inform future management decisions. Only an integrated approach can achieve a sustainable fishery and the long-term health and resilience of the Antarctic marine ecosystem and reconcile the concerns and interests of all Members.

We thank Members for their constructive engagement during this meeting and reaffirm our unwavering commitment to finding a way forward. We remain hopeful that with renewed efforts and an openness to dialogue and compromise, CCAMLR can overcome the deadlock. We call on all Members to engage in further consultations during the intersessional period in view to progressing this important matter at the next annual meeting.'

4.66 Germany made the following statement:

'I align myself with the Statement made by the EU and would like to share a few reflections:

This is my first time attending CCAMLR and I must say that I am impressed by this Commission and its governing bodies. Despite all geopolitical challenges we face, in the past two weeks, I have seen a sincere willingness and openness for a dialogue that I have not too often been witnessing these past years in the multilateral setting.

We all depart from different points of views, but we have tried to listen and by that better understand each other.

Through the quite demanding working process, in informal discussions and plenary sessions on a future KFMA, we have now a much better understanding of where we stand.

We have now a solid ground to build upon, and I urge everyone to use the momentum we have created and to continue the work for a harmonised KFMA. Germany feels that we need to overcome the unsustainable situation in Krill Fishery that we are facing at this moment and respect the foundation of this organisation, that is

- conservation, including rational use
- decision-making based on the best available science
- and the precautionary approach.

For us, CCAMLR stands first and foremost for conservation. Therefore, in the long run any KFMA must be harmonised with the MPA approach. What we now need is:

- Spatial distribution to avoid the concentration of krill fishery, in all Subareas and Area 48.1,
- seasonal closure
- an increased at-sea monitoring that allows us to collect data with maximum informational value for the effective implementation of KFMA
- a transparent and coordinated process to ensure that all data generated and analysed is accessible and builds the foundation for future management decisions.

Let me close by reminding us that it is our responsibility to find consensus, while respecting each other's views and remaining open to dialogue and finding compromise.'

4.67 China made the following statement:

‘China sincerely thanks your great efforts in advancing the process over the past few days, and we appreciate the efforts of all parties within these two weeks.

Last year, the Commission failed to reach a consensus, directly resulting in the expiration of CM 51-07. The expiration was not a request by any delegation, CM 51-07 itself provides that, this conservation measure will expire if agreement has not been reached. So, the expiration is the result of existing CCAMLR rule. China felt huge pity and very dissatisfied with the lack of consensus. After so many efforts, EMM had a consensus on increasing catch limit, SC had a same consensus, however, some Members insisted on a package, resulting in nothing. We are very disappointed and frustrated.

This year, we are once again very disappointed that the Commission cannot reach a consensus on the KFMA. Though we had repeatedly demonstrated our great compromise and flexibility, some Members insist on binding KFMA and MPA implementation together and disregarded solid scientific advice, resulting in nothing again this year, which is extremely disappointing. History repeats itself if we cannot learn some lessons from it.

Can we go back to CM 51-07? It is definitely not a choice. Before its expiration, CM 51-07 had been renewed for three years. This fact obviously demonstrates that we should move forward. From the perspective of science, at that time, it had already deviated from the best available science. The renewal of the Measure is no longer a redemption but a pointless delay, which weaken the willingness and eagerness of all parties to take more scientific and effective measures. From the perspective of practice, despite the expiration of CM 51-07, fishing activities continued in an orderly manner. There is no evidence suggesting that the expiration of CM 51-07 had adverse effects. Even the current situation is not the most favourable situation to some delegations, it is still fully consistent with the precautionary approach. So, we cannot go back to the outdated path of CM 51-07.

China would like to reiterate we understand the concerns of some Members of the establishment of MPAs, but the process should be based on solid scientific basis and follow an improved guidance. That is why we propose 3 steps approach with a sincere hope that we could move forward with this approach.

At this critical juncture, ignoring reality and blaming others is the most unhelpful thing to do. We should bring the negotiations back onto a science-based track. China will continue to support scientific research and looks forward to working with all Members to advance scientific understanding and enhance mutual trust. We hope that all the parties can solidly uphold the spirit of multilateralism, show our solidarity, sincerely cooperate with each other, we believe that we can achieve the goals and objectives of CCAMLR with our joint effort.'

4.68 Belgium made the following statement:

'We fully align with the statement made in the name of the EU and its Member States.

We came to this meeting with the firm conviction to, at least, solve the problems caused by the lapse of CM51-07 last year. Over the last year, the lack of spatial distribution measures resulted in an overconcentration of the catch of krill in a single part of Area 48. The Scientific Committee has informed us that this is not in line with our precautionary approach. And we all agreed that the current situation was unsustainable. Yet, we could not reach consensus on an interim solution to this problem. We find this highly concerning.

This has left us pondering the best way forward. In the short term, solving the issue of spatial distribution remains urgent. In the longer term, we remain convinced that the future of sustainable krill fisheries management lies in a harmonised approach. Implementation of D1MPA and KFMA should go hand in hand. Indeed, the adoption of D1MPA is an essential tool to ensure we respect the ecosystem approach - an essential part of our Convention - by offering climate refugia, protecting biodiversity hotspots, and providing baseline reference areas. This is also what the best scientific evidence available tells us is the best way forward for the conservation of the Antarctic marine ecosystem. During the meeting, we were heartened to hear broad support for continuing on this path. We look forward to working with all Members to move this harmonised approach forward.

Despite challenges in advancing on the conservation objective of this Commission recently, we remain convinced that our Convention and this Commission continue to provide the best basis for the management of the CAMLR Convention Area. We call on all Members to embrace the spirit of the Antarctic Treaty System in order to advance on our objective of conservation.'

4.69 South Africa made the following statement:

‘We would like to recognise all the proponents who were involved in the negotiations and discussions of this important matter. South Africa is disappointed for the lack of consensus on this important matter of advancing an interim measure that integrates KFMA and a number of conservation considerations such as spread of catch, spatial and temporal closures and monitoring as it has been discussed by many Members. This continued deadlock undermines CCAMLR’s credibility as a conservation body.

South Africa remains optimistic that the Members will continue to engage in insatiable efforts on the margin to move CCAMLR overcome these untenable circumstances and continue progress as a global leader in conservation and fisheries management.’

4.70 The Commission noted CCAMLR-44/BG/26, submitted by ARK, which highlights the many progresses achieved towards the implementation of the KFMA.

4.71 The Commission noted CCAMLR-44/BG/29, submitted by ASOC, which presented elements relevant to the harmonisation of the KFMA revision with the establishment of the D1MPA.

4.72 The Commission noted SC-CAMLR-44/BG/38, submitted by ASOC, which presented an analysis of Global Fishing Watch (AIS-based) data which showed a marked increase in apparent fishing effort in Subarea 48.1 during 2024/25 compared to 2023/24, particularly in predator-rich areas such as the Gerlache and Bransfield Straits. ASOC drew the Commission’s attention to this matter and its implications for the management of the fishery.

4.73 Oceanites informed the Commission that they were ready and willing to participate in the revision of the KFMA through data collection.

4.74 ASOC made the following statement:

‘ASOC is disappointed in this outcome, and echoes those who regret that we were unable to move forward with both krill fishery management measures and the D1MPA this week.

However, like Australia, we see it as very positive that so many Members demonstrated their clear adherence to CCAMLR’s conservation objective, and to their previous commitment to designate MPAs, and would not accept proposals that would erode those

commitments while expanding fishing in one of the most dynamic and rapidly changing areas of the world.

Members are bound by Article II to avoid lasting ecological damage, which means restraint in fishing operations – quite the opposite of the increase in concentrated fishing effort that we saw this year.

Overall, ASOC considers that it is ultimately better for CCAMLR to spend time reorienting itself to make sure all Members are going in the right direction than for CCAMLR to collectively go off a cliff. Fortunately, we see that we are not quite there yet, although we are getting close to the edge.’

Krill in Statistical Area 58

4.75 The Commission noted the Scientific Committee’s consideration of the management of the krill fishery in Area 58 (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraphs 2.77 and 2.78).

4.76 Australia made the following statement

‘Australia calls on the Commission to urgently update the catch limits in CM 51-02 and CM 51-03.

These updates are based on robust science. Significant resources have been allocated over multiple years to conduct high-quality krill surveys, perform analyses, and produce reliable biomass estimates.

We emphasise that the science underpinning these updates was formally endorsed by the Scientific Committee as the best available science (SC-CAMLR-42, paragraphs 2.98 and 2.99).

The Scientific Committee also backed the intersessional work led by Australia, responding to some Member’s comments at the Scientific Committee, examining the influence of sea ice coverage on krill densities which further strengthened the scientific foundation for this proposal.

There is no scientifically justifiable reason to delay or object to these updates. Australia urges the Commission to demonstrate its commitment to science-based decision making

and conservation leadership by adopting these updated catch limits without further delay.’

4.77 Many Members supported the proposed update to catch limits in Divisions 58.4.1 and 58.4.2, noting the high quality of the surveys and subsequent scientific analyses conducted by the proponents.

4.78 Some Members noted that the remaining scientific issues regarding the advice from the Scientific Committee (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 2.78), as well as issues pertaining to the trigger level, needed attention.

4.79 The Commission did not reach consensus on updating the krill catch limits in Divisions 58.4.1 and 58.4.2.

Fish resources

4.80 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-44, paragraphs 3.3 – 3.10), toothfish aging (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 3.11 – 3.12) and capacity building for toothfish stock assessments (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 3.21-3.23).

4.81 The Commission commended the scientific progress made on toothfish aging and expressed its support for the pathway forward on MSE and HCR work detailed in SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 3.10. The Commission noted the success of the Cap-DLISA workshop (CCAMLR-44/BG/31 Rev. 1) to build capacity for toothfish stock assessments and further noted the request for funding mechanisms to progress the work of the Scientific Committee and its Working Groups (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 3.23).

Statistical Area 48

4.82 The Commission considered the Scientific Committee discussion on fish stocks in Area 48 (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraphs 3.24 – 3.51).

4.83 The Commission noted the discussion on two research proposals for *D. mawsoni* in Subarea 48.2 (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraphs 3.37 – 3.44), and that there was no consensus for them to proceed in the 2025/26 season.

4.84 The Commission noted the willingness of the proponents of the two research plans (Chile and Ukraine) to undertake and present coordinated or joint research proposals to the Scientific Committee and its Working Groups in 2026.

4.85 The Commission noted the request of the Scientific Committee to provide guidance on whether scientific research fishing notified under CM 24-01 which focuses mainly on data collection within closed areas is a priority for the current work of the Commission (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 3.44).

4.86 The Russian Federation stressed that the Scientific Committee was tasked with assessing specific programmes rather than considering whether scientific research fishing within closed areas was within its Terms of Reference.

4.87 The Commission noted that conservation of Antarctic marine living resources was its priority, although it would consider well developed proposals for research in closed areas, provided the Scientific Committee and its Working Groups were satisfied with the research objectives and quality of data collection methodologies.

4.88 The Commission endorsed the advice of the Scientific Committee that the catch limit for *C. gunnari* in Subarea 48.3 be set at 3 430 tonnes for the 2025/26 season and 2 230 tonnes for the 2026/27 season (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 3.31).

4.89 The Commission noted the discussions on a research proposal for *D. eleginoides* in Subarea 48.3, management area A (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 3.45 – 3.51), including the Scientific Committee's consideration that to achieve the objective of the Convention, some parts of the Convention Area need to be closed to fishing and those areas must include some toothfish habitat (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 3.48).

4.90 The Commission noted that there was no consensus on the research proposal in Subarea 48.3 management Area A to proceed in the 2025/26 season (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 3.51).

4.91 Chile considered that the research proposal presented was robust in its methodology, had rational objectives, and had been designed and assessed by multiple scientific institutions. Chile further noted that the research proposal presented was within the CCAMLR regulatory framework and would provide valuable information on the stock of *D. eleginoides* in Subarea 48.3.

4.92 The Commission did not reach consensus on the proposed catch limits for Subarea 48.3 shown in Table 1 of SC-CAMLR-44 (see also paragraphs 7.41—7.51).

4.93 The Commission endorsed the advice of the Scientific Committee that the catch limit for *D. mawsoni* in Subarea 48.4 be set at 32 tonnes for the 2025/26 season, and that assessments for this Subarea be carried out every two years from 2026 to be in line with other toothfish stock assessments (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 3.33).

4.94 The Commission endorsed the advice of the Scientific Committee that the catch limit for *D. eleginoides* in Subarea 48.4 be set at 33 tonnes for the 2025/26 and 2026/27 seasons, and that assessments for this Subarea be carried out every two years to be in line with other toothfish stock assessments (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 3.34).

4.95 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 182 tonnes in Research Block 486_2, 60 tonnes in Research Block 486_3, 181 tonnes in Research Block 486_4, and 290 tonnes in Research Block 486_5 in the 2025/26 season (SC-CAMLR-44, Table 1).

Statistical Area 58

4.96 The Commission endorsed the advice of the Scientific Committee that the catch limit for *C. gunnari* in Division 58.5.2 be set at 1 429 tonnes for 2025/26 and 1 126 tonnes for 2026/27 seasons (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 3.54).

4.97 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-44, paragraphs 3.55 – 3.68).

4.98 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 1 of SC-CAMLR-44 (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 3.68).

4.99 Russia noted that in accordance with Conservation Measure 21-01, paragraph 1, the fishery in Division 58.4.1 should be considered as a new fishery given fishing activity had not taken place in this Area for more than the last two seasons.

4.100 Many 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 21-02 clearly identifies Division 58.4.1 as an exploratory fishery. These Members also noted that it would be inconsistent with CM 21-01, paragraph 1(iii), to designate the Division 58.4.1 fishery as a new fishery. They also noted that multiple gear types are not prohibited in any other CCAMLR fishery or multi-vessel research activities that collect data for assessment purposes. These Members further noted that the research plan for Division 58.4.1 provides an appropriate design to calibrate and test the effects of multiple gear types, and that WG-FSA-2025 had noted that there are many established methods to allow for calibration between gear types and that the proposed research satisfies the requirements of CM 24-01 Annex 2, Format 2- paragraph 3(a) (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 3.63).

4.101 The Commission noted the request from the Scientific Committee to provide advice on the definition and interpretation of ‘calibration/standardisation of sampling gear’ within Annex CM 24-01/A Format 2 paragraph 3(a) (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 3.66).

4.102 Russia considered that the format of ‘calibration/standardisation of sampling gear’ within Annex CM 24-01/A Format 2 paragraph 3(a) required consideration of both calibration and standardisation as these are critical elements for all research proposals. Russia emphasised the different content and focus of ‘calibration’ and ‘standardisation’ and considered 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).

4.103 Russia noted that currently there is no scientifically-based evidence agreed by the Scientific Committee that would allow proponents of the research plan in Division 58.4.1 to ignore the use of standardised fishing gear in multi-vessel research plans for toothfish in data-poor areas (SC-CAMLR -44, paragraph 3.60-3.62).

4.104 Many Members considered that calibration and standardisation were two separate concepts which should apply according to the context of the research plan. A research plan should therefore either propose standardisation or calibration measures, as appropriate for particular survey designs. These Members further considered that calibration is an estimation of a scaling parameter allowing the comparison of results of an experiment conducted with two or several different measurement methods, and that standardisation is an experiment conducted with the same measurement method controlling for all other factors that could influence the measure.

4.105 The Secretariat confirmed that the term “calibration/standardisation” in Annex CM 24-01/A Format 2 paragraph 3(a) was intended to mean calibration ‘or’ standardisation.

4.106 COLTO expressed their support for the work conducted on this research proposal by all the proponents, noting that research in Division 58.4.1 had not been undertaken since 2018 due to the blocking of the research proposal by one Member, and urged the Commission to endorse the research proposal.

4.107 The Commission endorsed the advice of the Scientific Committee that no new information was available on the state of fish stocks in Divisions 58.5.1 and 58.5.2 outside areas of national jurisdiction and that the prohibition of directed fishing for *D. eleginoides*, described in CM 32-02, remain in force in 2025/26 (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraphs 3.70 and 3.72).

Statistical Area 88

4.108 The Commission endorsed the 2025 Ross Sea shelf survey (RSSS) catch limit of 64 tonnes for 2025/26, 85 tonnes for 2026/27, and 64 tonnes for 2027/28 (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 3.82).

4.109 The Commission noted the discussions on early entry of vessels into the Ross Sea region in Subarea 88.2 in season 2024/25, up to 46 days prior to the opening of the fishery, and that the large number of vessels notified to fish in 2025/26 may cause difficulties forecasting a closure date for the N70 Management Area (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraphs 3.74–3.79). The Commission further noted that one vessel was already present on the fishing grounds in Subarea 88.2 N70 Management Area at the time of the meeting, before the Conservation Measure for this fishery for the coming season had been agreed.

4.110 The Commission expressed concern at the large numbers of vessels present prior to the Ross Sea region fishery opening in season 2024/25, and requested the Secretariat liaise with the Member whose vessel is currently present in Subarea 88.1 to understand their reasons for doing so (see also paragraph 7.56).

4.111 The Commission endorsed the advice of the Scientific Committee that the catch limits for Subarea 88.2 SSRUs 882C–H for the 2025/26 season be based on the trend analysis as shown in Table 1 of SC-CAMLR-44.

4.112 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 1 of SC-CAMLR-44, with Research Block 2 being effort limited to seven sets for each vessel and a catch limit of 20 tonnes (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraphs 3.83 and 3.84).

4.113 The Commission noted the discussions by the Scientific Committee on a proposal to establish Subarea 88.3 as an exploratory toothfish fishery, and that the current CCAMLR regulatory framework does not provide for a clear mechanism for research fisheries to move to exploratory status (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraphs 3.83-3.89). The Commission further noted the request from the Scientific Committee to provide guidance on the development of an exploratory fishery in this Area, and how this could be harmonised with the proposed D1MPA (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 3.90).

4.114 The Commission agreed that there is no current mechanism to proceed from a research fishery to an exploratory fishery under the current regulatory framework and requested the Scientific Committee and its Working Groups review the scientific information required to enable such a transition and present a proposal to the Commission to guide this transition.

4.115 Russia noted that harmonisation, as a task of the Commission and Scientific Committee, could only relate to the measures and instruments agreed by the Commission and should be consistent with existing conservation measures.

4.116 The Commission noted paper CCAMLR-44/BG/14, presented by Russia, on proposals for the classification of toothfish fishery nomenclature under the CCAMLR regulatory framework.

Non-target species

4.117 The Commission noted the discussions of the Scientific Committee on by-catch management in krill fisheries (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraphs 4.1 to 4.7), on incidental mortality of seabirds and marine mammals associated with fisheries (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 4.8 to 4.21) and on bottom fishing and vulnerable marine ecosystems (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraphs 4.22 to 4.33).

Ecosystem monitoring

4.118 The Commission noted the discussions by the Scientific Committee on ecosystem monitoring and management, including the discussions on progress towards developing a regular CCAMLR State of Antarctic Environment (SOAE) report (SC-CAMLR-44/BG/31) (SC-CAMLR-44 paragraphs 5.7 to 5.13).

4.119 The Commission commended this initiative and emphasised the importance of linking the SOAE with established global frameworks and looked forward to future updates.

4.120 The Commission recognised the value of the SOAE report, particularly in relation to climate change (see also paragraph 6.1), and welcomed the integration of climate change considerations into the Scientific Committee's work. The Commission noted that collaboration under the SOAE framework would benefit many groups, including SCAR, SOOS and Oceanites.

4.121 The Commission noted SC-CAMLR-44/BG/11 Rev. 1, submitted by Oceanites, which highlighted the long-term Antarctic Site Inventory (ASI) program.

Spatial management

Review of existing Marine Protected Areas (MPAs)

5.1 The Commission noted that the Scientific Committee endorsed the proposed framework and timeline for the 10-year review of the Ross Sea region Marine Protected Area (RSrMPA) in 2027, with the review to be informed by baseline data contained in the CCAMLR MPA Information Repository (CMIR) database and associated indicators (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraphs 6.1 to 6.3).

5.2 Some Members noted that the Research and Monitoring Plans (RMPs) for the RSrMPA and the South Orkney Islands Southern Shelf (SOISS) MPA have not been adopted by the Commission and that without well-designed RMPs, sufficient baseline data defining the initial state of ecosystems clearly and criteria for assessing the achievement of the objectives and targets of the MPA, the initial state of ecosystems and the MPA objectives and efficiency could not be evaluated. They thus noted that RMPs should be part of MPA proposals.

5.3 Some Members noted that the indicators and criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of the MPA still needed to be improved. They further noted that without an RMP there was no mechanism to evaluate the effectiveness of the MPA.

5.4 Most Members noted that the two RMPs had been developed and already implemented with ongoing contributions by many Members. They noted the RSrMPA RMP had been endorsed by the Scientific Committee and that a SOISS MPA RMP (although not required) had been presented and neither had been adopted by the Commission. They further noted that RMPs are not preconditions to the adoption of an MPA, as they are flexible tools designed to support scientific evaluation of an MPA. They noted that CM 91-04 requires only the priority elements for a research and monitoring plan to be included within an MPA proposal.

5.5 Most Members also noted that the Scientific Committee considered that the plan to review the RSrMPA meets the requirements of CM 91-05 and includes clear and measurable indicators, which will allow for a robust and transparent evaluation (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 6.15).

5.6 Many Members noted that the RSrMPA RMP and SOISS MPA RMP had broad support and called on Commission to endorse the RMPs.

5.7 Russia noted that the absence of the RMP approved by the Commission makes it impossible to assess the achievement of the objectives of the MPA for the reporting periods.

Proposals for new Marine Protected Areas

5.8 CCAMLR-44/09, presented by China, comprised an update to the 'Step-by-Step' approach (from CCAMLR-43/41) to provide a concrete and operational program for the review and establishment of MPAs by revision of CM 91-04. The first step of the approach entailed improving CM 91-04 through, inter alia, a definition of CCAMLR MPAs, clear requirements for baseline data and a complete research and monitoring plan, a mandatory designation of

period in the form of a sunset clause for MPAs. The second step involved revising existing and new MPA proposals to meet the new criteria, and the third step involved reviewing the revised MPA proposals. According to the road map proposed in the document, Members are invited to submit written comments on improving CM 91-04 before the 45th Meeting of the Commission. After discussing at the 45th Meeting of the Commission on the improvement of CM 91-04 and the revised draft CM 91-04, the Secretariat are authorised to submit the revised draft CM 91-04 for consideration at the 46th Meeting.

5.9 Many Members underscored that CCAMLR-44/09 was mostly focusing on process and some Members encouraged China to propose text for amending or supplementing CM 91-04 for future consideration by the Commission.

5.10 CCAMLR-44/28, CCAMLR-43/36 and CCAMLR-43/48, presented by Russia, considered procedural and implementation measures to manage a unified process for the scientifically based designation of MPAs and to regulate their operation by the Commission. The papers deem it crucial for the Commission to establish a program (or a 'roadmap') that outlines the practical application of the suggested procedures and implementation measures and urges the Commission to oversee the implementation of this program by its Members. Russia noted that a proposed version of the roadmap included: (i) amending CM 91-04 to introduce adequate procedural and implementation provisions for a unified process governing the establishment and management of MPAs in the Convention Area, and introduced Annexes A to D (Annex A. Legal management aspects of MPA in the Convention Area; Annex B. Benchmark checklist to regulate the unified process of MPA establishment; Annex C. MPA Management Plan; Annex D. MPA Research and Monitoring Plan); (ii) suspending discussions on new MPA proposals until the rules for this unified process, as outlined in revised CM 91-04 and Annexes A to D, have entered into force; and (iii) transitioning the SOISS MPA (CM 91-03) and the RSrMPA (CM 91-05) to fall under the revised governance framework of CM 91-04, based on the submission of all necessary documentation and by consensus of both the Scientific Committee and the Commission.

5.11 The Commission recalled previous discussions on earlier versions of these four papers (CCAMLR-43, paragraphs 5.16 to 5.22).

5.12 The Commission noted CCAMLR-44/BG/20, which reviewed CCAMLR-43/41 and found that many of the elements proposed are already included in CCAMLR's existing General framework for the establishment of CCAMLR MPAs (CM 91-04). The paper noted that CCAMLR MPAs are defined, baseline data are part of CCAMLR MPA practice, research and monitoring is effective, and consideration of periods of designation is provided for. The paper

concluded that CCAMLR's existing and proposed MPAs and MPA framework are scientifically robust and directly aligned with and supporting CCAMLR's objective.

5.13 China noted that there is no definition of an MPA in CM 91-04, which in China's view, leads to a lack of common understanding on what an MPA really is. China further noted that CM 91-04 does not provide any guidance for baseline data, and it only indicates the priority elements for RMP rather than specific requirements, which has proven unviable based on the current practice of MPAs in South Orkney Islands and Ross Sea region. It noted that CM 91-04 lacks a clear 'sunset clause' requirement. China stressed that the revision of CM 91-04 will enhance the effectiveness of the MPAs and welcomed all Members to jointly improve CM 91-04.

5.14 Most Members considered that the current framework provided in CM 91-04 is effective and covers most of the issues raised by China, and that developing new standards would only slow development of a representative system of MPAs. They considered that MPA objectives and designs would always need to be tailored to specific regions, issues and objectives. These Members noted that the current CM 91-04 was a fit for purpose framework and is appropriate to progress MPAs now. Some Members suggested that a joint revised proposal for a conservation measure could be developed by China and Russia taking into account the feedback other Members expressed on this topic.

5.15 Some Members considered that judging from the current practice of the SOISS MPA and the RSrMPA, the requirements in CM 91-04 are not sufficient. Those Members consider that CM 91-04 needs to be improved for serving as an effective guidance for the MPAs establishment and operation. They further considered that improvement of CM 91-04 will prove to be a time-saving and necessary step to advance the process of building MPAs for conservation of the Antarctic marine living resources.

5.16 The EU and its Member States recalled CCAMLR's commitment to establish a representative system of MPAs in the Convention Area and noted that the various proposals submitted by Members to establish additional MPAs would make a significant contribution in that regard. The EU and its Member States also described the important benefits of large-scale MPAs, including:

- (i) more effective achievement of ecological benefits and conservation of biodiversity 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 expanded natural laboratories to improve understanding of ecosystems function.

5.17 Some Members noted that MPAs are only one instrument for achieving the Convention objective, managing the effects of climate change, and considered that closed fisheries are essentially MPAs. They also recalled the procedural difference between fishery regulations, which are reviewed every year, and MPA proposals, which are only reviewed once, concluding the requirements for permitting fisheries are more robust than for establishing MPAs.

5.18 Most Members expressed their concern that some Members hold proposals to establish an MPA to a much higher standard in terms of the amount of information and analysis required, far beyond what is required to allow a fishery to proceed, in contradiction with the precautionary principle.

5.19 Russia noted that the existing proposals for the establishment of MPAs do not contain any evidence of threats from fishing or other anthropogenic impacts, nor any threats from climate change to marine living resources that require the urgency of ensuring their protection and safeguarding through the establishment of MPAs. Russia indicated that potential threats from anthropogenic activities and environmental factors were effectively managed by the Commission, through the precautionary and ecosystem approaches, based on the regular review of appropriate conservation measures. Russia considered that fishery management is reviewed frequently whereas MPA proposals are only reviewed once and noted that the requirements for permitting fisheries are more robust than for proposals establishing MPAs.

5.20 Most Members noted that current MPA proposals have been developed and constantly refined over a decade on the basis of the feedback from previous meetings and based on the best available science. These MPA proposals will enhance ecosystem resilience and buffer the effects of climate change by providing areas where additional stressors from fisheries are removed or controlled.

5.21 Some Members noted that the baseline data collected in the current MPA proposals cannot justify their broad objectives and large areas. They also noted that baseline data are critical to evaluate whether the MPA objectives were achieved.

5.22 Russia suggests that issues related to different interpretations of CM 91-04 should be resolved and that CM 91-04 should be amended to explicitly state that MPAs may be established on the basis of the best available data, which shall be sufficient to scientifically justify the establishment of MPAs in a particular water area (CCAMLR-44/28). Russia also noted that the relevance and urgent need to clarify the term ‘best available scientific evidence’ arises from key aspects of the current CCAMLR Agenda especially those related to spatial and marine resource management in the Convention Area.

5.23 In response to some Members stating that current data are not sufficient to make a decision about an MPA proposal, most Members considered that the concept of ‘sufficient science’ suggested by some Members was subjective, not precautionary, and inconsistent with the CAMLR Convention, which calls for using the best scientific evidence available as the basis for conservation measures. They also referred to Resolution 31/XXVIII (2009). They noted that the CM 91-04 framework using the best scientific evidence available was precautionary, pragmatic and flexible. These Members further noted that reasoning based on ‘sufficient science’ is inconsistent with the fundamental principles of CCAMLR and the precautionary approach.

5.24 CCAMLR-44/22 Rev. 1, authored by 19 Members and presented by France, proposed a conservation measure for the East Antarctic MPA (EAMPA). Co-proponents have worked with all Members on the draft conservation measure to take into account comments and feedback over the past 12 years. The co-proponents noted that the EAMPA would be a major contribution to the representative system of MPAs that CCAMLR decided to achieve in 2009. The intention of the EAMPA is to conserve the biodiversity of representative benthic and pelagic bioregions including key species and their habitats in these areas. The proposed conservation measure creates a comprehensive and resilient management framework, with clear timeframes for implementation and review.

5.25 Russia noted changes made to the EAMPA proposal over the past 12 years and pointed to outstanding recommendations to divide the EAMPA Area into three separate MPA proposals, accompanied by the period of each MPA’s designation and developing an RMP for each MPA proposal, including appropriate metrics and indicators for assessing effectiveness of each MPA. It emphasised that the climate change protection objectives of the MPA do not substantiate for EAMPA establishment (CCAMLR-43, paragraph 5.26), and that appropriate

metrics and indicators for assessing effectiveness of each MPA in relation to the pelagic and benthic ecosystems are needed.

5.26 China noted that there have been only small changes in the EAMPA proposal since 2018, and that the baseline data of the EAMPA proposal are inadequate to describe recent interannual changes on ecosystem level and to support assessment of achievements on the conservation objectives as well. It further noted that an operable RMP, and mechanisms and procedures of RMP assessment are absent.

5.27 Most Members noted that the EAMPA proposal has been refined over the past years, incorporating new scientific information from long-term research programs in the region and feedback from previous meetings. They noted that the three spatial management areas in the EAMPA were designed to protect a significant proportion of bioregions in East Antarctica. They noted significant environmental changes occurring in this region, and that the changes have consequences for seabirds or for the pelagic and benthic ecosystems of the continental shelf and underlined the urgent need for this MPA to conserve living resources in this pristine 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 also noted that fully developed RMPs are not a precondition to the establishment of MPAs, and that CM 91-04 requires only the priority elements for a research and monitoring plan. 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 (CCAMLR-43, paragraph 5.25). They reaffirmed that the attachment of a RMP to a MPA proposal was not a prerequisite for the adoption of an MPA by the Commission, as stated in the paragraph 3(iv) of CM 91-04.

5.28 Most 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 (CCAMLR-43, paragraph 5.26).

5.29 ASOC thanked the proponents for describing the urgent need for this MPA and considered that the proposal should be adopted without delay.

5.30 Germany presented paper CCAMLR-44/23 Rev. 1, on behalf of the proponents, proposing 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, is based on the best available science, including the priority elements for the RMP, and the RMP will benefit substantially by the WOBEC project (SC-CAMLR-44/BG/22). Further information about the WSMPA Phase 1 proposal is available at <https://wsmpa.de/en> and baseline data are available on the PANGAEA repository.

5.31 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 considered that the proposed conservation objectives were broadly stated, which in turn resulted in amplified planning areas by the Marxan model. They further noted that no threats have been identified and that their previous comments had not been taken into account (CCAMLR-42, paragraph 5.13), in particular a period of designation for the MPA had not been identified, and a RMP was not submitted.

5.32 Most Members noted that the WSMPA Phase 1 Area is an important, largely pristine, area of the global ocean and requires immediate protection as it is one of the last ‘frozen’ oceans and would be a valuable area to function as climate refugia and a scientific reference area. They considered that climate change constitutes a strong ecosystem threat. Most 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.

5.33 Some Members pointed out broad conservation objectives made the area in need of protection very large, which would make monitoring difficult and expensive, and the lack of data would make it difficult to evaluate the achievement of objectives.

5.34 Most Members noted that the size of the MPA should be dictated by the objectives, and that the RSrMPA had already demonstrated that the RMP was able to inform evaluation of the MPA objectives. They also noted that establishing a full RMP before adopting an MPA is not a requirement.

5.35 Many Members pointed out that the WSMPA Phase 1 had strong baseline data, with more than 100 data layers developed, identifying 54 conservation features which were used to identify priority areas for protection within the WSMPA Phase 1 planning area. These priority areas have been stable even as more data were added to the spatial prioritisation analysis.

5.36 ASOC noted the many comments from Members that clearly demonstrated why the Weddell Sea region was critical, especially to provide climate refugia, and that it was clear that it needs to be designated. ASOC considered that the Weddell Sea Phase 1 proponents had used well-established scientific methods and large amounts of data to develop the MPA proposal.

5.37 Norway presented paper CCAMLR-44/27 on behalf of the proponents, Norway, the UK and Australia, proposing a 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 and Observers since it was first presented at CCAMLR-42 and that the online Atlas with the underlying scientific evidence to support the design of WSMPA Phase 2 has been updated with the recent information since 2023.

5.38 Some Members noted that the Scientific Committee had not yet provided particular advice to the Commission. They further noted that the proposal had no period of designation and used modelling to derive indicators without sufficient field observations. They suggested that the RMP needed to be reviewed by the Scientific Committee to evaluate if the objectives could be achieved.

5.39 Many Members noted that the priority elements of the RMP were well developed and that the science supporting the WSMPA Phase 2 proposal was well developed and comprised the best scientific evidence available (SC-CAMLR-43, paragraph 6.24), and that this area included ecologically important species and habitats and that the proposal was complementary with the WSMPA Phase 1 proposal. They commended the proponents on the continuing inclusive approach to development of the RMP including workshops open to all Members.

5.40 Most Members considered the proposal ready for adoption by the Commission.

5.41 ASOC noted its appreciation of the inclusive and transparent approach of the proponents and further noted that the tools developed to support the proposal were very useful. ASOC considered that the proposal was ready for adoption.

5.42 The Commission noted CCAMLR-44/24, presented by Argentina and Chile which proposed a Conservation Measure for the D1MPA. Further discussion on a harmonised approach is reported under 'krill resources' (see paragraph 4.47). The proponents noted that the proposal demonstrated sustained work over time, involving significant cooperation with many Members and now included the development of an RMP. It has also been modified to account for fishing interests in the region and demonstrated that conservation and rational use can progress at the same time.

5.43 Most Members noted that the Antarctic Peninsula was one of the fastest warming regions on the planet and that there was an urgent need to deliver on both conservation and fisheries management through adoption of the D1MPA in a harmonised way with the KFMA. They noted that the current situation was neither sustainable nor precautionary and urged dialogue and collaboration.

5.44 Most Members expressed concern that, to date, there had been systemic failure of CCAMLR to progress the harmonised approach, including the KFMA and the D1MPA, which had been endorsed by the Commission (CCAMLR-42, paragraphs 4.32 to 4.36), and that in their view, the only way to move forward with increasing the trigger level was with approval of the D1MPA, including linkages with other Subareas.

5.45 Some Members noted that the KFMA and the proposed D1MPA, including the linkage to Subarea 88.3, were related but remained separate issues. They noted that the CEMP program was designed to monitor penguin populations rather than to support assessing the achievement of proposed D1MPA objectives, and that the data obtained from CEMP or other monitoring activities should be used to analyse and assess the level of achievement of the proposed D1MPA conservation objectives.

5.46 Russia noted that the selection of penguins as the baseline indicator for the research and monitoring plan does not meet the proposed objectives of the MPA proposals which are aimed at achieving specific objectives for the conservation of Antarctic marine living resources and biodiversity, such as pelagic, benthic, and other communities, seabirds and mammal populations. They further noted that there is a lack of scientific evidence to justify the selection of penguins as the baseline indicator.

5.47 Most Members noted that the developing RMP framework used penguins as a case study, and that the RMP already included the detail requested in CCAMLR-44/28, including a data collection plan that would include data to support both the proposed D1MPA and the KFMA. They noted that if the RMP was considered deficient to support the D1MPA objectives, it would also be deficient to support the KFMA. They further noted that Subarea 88.3 was an integral part of the RMP as it contained critical habitat for whales, seals, toothfish, and krill productivity (WG-EMM-2024/27) and was part of the balance between conservation and rationale use in Domain 1.

5.48 Chile made the following statement:

‘We would like to thank the debate that took place yesterday under Agenda Item 4.2, which allowed us to hear the proposal presented by a distinguished delegation on the initial implementation of the revised KFMA.

We would also like to thank the discussion that followed the presentation of the proposal by Argentina and Chile on the Marine Protected Area in Domain 1.

In this regard, we wish to speak with absolute clarity and sincerity. We are aware of the pressure and the urgency to move beyond the current situation. Some wish to increase the critical level of krill catch. I must state firmly: the only way Chile will move in that direction is through the approval of the Marine Protected Area in Domain 1.

We are concerned about the systematic disregard of our views in the discussions of this process. Last week, my delegation, together with Argentina, repeatedly submitted our preferences in the Google Drive shared by a distinguished delegation, including the full and immediate incorporation of the MPA—preferences that were not included.

The five-year plan proposed by a distinguished delegation could be a very useful tool, but only if it considers the full adoption of the D1MPA. Chile has called for flexibility and has shown flexibility. Since 2019, the proposal has reduced protection zones in Subarea 48.1 to accommodate the availability of areas for the development of the fishery. We have also remained open to dialogue throughout last week, and we continue to be.

But let us be frank: we do not see a clear willingness to move forward toward a harmonised approach. And let me say this seriously: if this process does not include that path, Chile will not support any increase in catches.

We must also point out an evident contradiction. The plan proposed a distinguished delegation contemplates a gradual increase in catches in Subarea 48.1, which we could accept. Yet at the same time, in Subarea 48.2, it proposes a limit of 500 000 tonnes starting in year three. Then, how can we be told to focus solely on 48.1, when catch limits are already being defined in 48.2? Moreover, how will catch distribution be addressed across Subareas 48.2, 48.3, and 48.4? Will the percentage distribution established under the now-expired CM 51-07 be taken into account? I understand that

this latter point was added by a distinguished delegation to its proposal last night, after 9 p.m. We appreciate that addition, but we need to review it.

The General Protection Zone (GPZ) in 48.2 must also be considered. We understand that this was also added to the Drive last night, after 9 p.m., subject to the outcome of the Symposium on the Harmonisation of the D1MPA and the KFMA for Subarea 48.2. However, we believe this should be an immediate commitment, not one subject to the outcome of that Symposium.

We reiterate that my country is a fishing nation. Chile ranks among the top ten countries contributing the most to global fisheries and aquaculture, which demonstrates our clear vocation for the development of the fishing industry. As I mentioned yesterday, alongside this fishing vocation, Chile has placed 43% of its jurisdictional waters under some form of conservation. This is clear evidence that our country firmly believes that conservation and rational use are entirely compatible. Without conservation, there will be no fisheries resources for industry, or for future generations.

Therefore, we remain open to dialogue. But this is not merely about increasing catches: it is about harmonising the new KFMA with the D1MPA, advancing jointly in both fishery development and the protection of ecosystems and krill-dependent predators.'

5.49 Colombia noted its support of Argentina and Chile in the establishment of the D1MPA as a significant conservation effort in the region.

5.50 ASOC noted that the Peninsula was facing conservation challenges such as climate change and concentrated fishing, but also there was a strong recovery of baleen whales. ASOC encouraged CCAMLR to cement its leadership in conservation through adopting the D1MPA proposal.

Other spatial management issues

5.51 The Commission noted the Scientific Committee discussion of SC-CAMLR-44/07 (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraphs 6.36 to 6.44) regarding the Pelagic High Seas Ocean eCoregionalisation of the Indian Subantarctic project (PHOCIS), which aims to use systematic conservation planning to design a representative system of MPAs in the pelagic high seas of the sub-Antarctic Indian Ocean. As developed during the 2025 workshop in Cape Town (South

Africa), the project will be progressed during 2026. The Scientific Committee welcomed the structured approach of the project.

5.52 Many Members appreciated that the Scientific Committee (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 6.38) noted that a representative MPA system in CCAMLR should include the sub-Antarctic area.

5.53 Many Members welcomed the future development of the systematic conservation planning that will be developed during the Paris (France) workshop in 2026. They noted that the effort would complement conservation efforts in sub-Antarctic areas within national jurisdictions and that one of the 2025 CCAMLR Scholarship recipients (Dr. T. Carpenter-Kling from South Africa) would be working on this project (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 11.11). They further noted the importance of integrating data from various initiatives and the challenges of data collection across such a large area, parts of which lie outside the Convention Area.

5.54 ASOC congratulated the organisers on the science-based, comprehensive approach of the 2025 project, encouraged engagement at the next 2026 workshop in Paris and looked forward to progress on this topic.

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

6.1 The Commission considered the Scientific Committee's discussions related to climate change (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraphs 7.1—7.7). The Commission welcomed the integration of issues related to the effects of climate change in the Scientific Committee's work, as well as the development of SOAE reports (SC-CAMLR-44/BG/31) and looked forward to further collaborative progress.

6.2 The Commission noted that future reports from the Scientific Committee to the Commission would start with the effects of climate change on the Antarctic environment as doing so would provide important context for subsequent discussions.

6.3 The Commission noted SC-CAMLR-44/BG/13, submitted by SCAR, which presented information on recent climate change research, building on the SCAR Antarctic Climate Change and the Environment (ACCE) Reports.

6.4 Many Members welcomed SCAR's report and noted that it includes information on how abrupt changes are either already underway in the Antarctic region or are on the verge of taking

place. This includes an ongoing regime shift that has reduced Antarctic sea-ice extent below its natural variability of past centuries and regime shifts are also occurring in marine systems compounding risk to species survival. Those Members also noted the effect of the melting of the Antarctic Ice Sheet (AIS) on the Atlantic Meridional Overturning Circulation (AMOC), ecosystem impacts of ocean warming and acidification, heatwaves caused by atmospheric rivers and sea-level rise due to AIS melting.

6.5 The EU and its Member States made the following statement:

‘We wish to reaffirm our profound commitment to upholding the objective of the CAMLR Convention and to addressing the existential global challenges posed by climate change. CCAMLR has an essential role to play in safeguarding the Southern Ocean and its biodiversity against these rapidly accelerating threats.

We welcome the update on progress and next steps with SOAE reporting to the Commission.

We are gravely alarmed by the scientific conclusions presented in the 2025 Update of SCAR’s ACCE report, which details not just incremental warming, but the growing evidence for abrupt changes and regime shifts in the Antarctic environment. The message is clear: the Antarctic is nearing and, in some cases, has crossed critical tipping points. We thank SCAR for clearly conveying this message, based - as always - on the best available science.

This clear message should urge us to take all necessary management decisions to protect Southern Ocean ecosystems and biodiversity, in line with the precautionary principle, taking into account the complex and deepening effects of climate change on the Southern Ocean ecosystem.

Addressing these impacts requires international cooperation and effective management strategies. Organisations like CCAMLR and SCAR are crucial in facilitating research, incorporating climate science into conservation, and promoting resilience-building actions to protect the Antarctic environment. Comprehensive protection of all Antarctic ecosystems also requires collaboration throughout the whole of the Antarctic Treaty System. In this light, we very much look forward to the upcoming joint CEP/SC-CAMLR workshop on climate change.

Finally, we highlight the central role of MPAs for building ecosystem resilience and addressing climate change impacts within the Convention Area. We must overcome outstanding political hurdles and establish a representative system of MPAs without further delay. As the Governor of Tasmania, Her Excellency the Honourable Barbara Baker, said in her opening address to this Commission last week: the eyes of the world are on us. It is up to us to deliver.'

6.6 France underlined that as we celebrate the 10 years anniversary of the Paris Agreement, 2025 marked an increase of 1.4°C compared to the pre-industrial era. It was therefore crucial to continue to have the valuable contribution from SCAR in order to have a clear view of the consequences of these changes on the unique ecosystems protected by CCAMLR. France also welcomed the upcoming CEP/SC-CAMLR Joint Workshop , to which it has contributed, and encouraged all Members to participate.

6.7 The Commission thanked SCAR for their important contribution and welcomed future presentations to CCAMLR. It noted impacts of climate change, including ocean warming, acidification and sea-ice loss on the Antarctic ecosystem and its biodiversity. The Commission noted that addressing climate change impacts requires cooperation and encouraged increased collaboration between ATS Members and with other relevant organisations.

6.8 Many Members noted that MPAs are essential conservation tools to build ecosystem resilience and provide refuge to marine living resources and the ecosystems they depend upon, by removing fishing pressure from the combination of stressors to which they are subjected.

6.9 Some Members noted that the current management of Antarctic marine living resources is sustainable and incorporates climate change considerations along with other relevant elements and that climate change issues are well integrated into the Scientific Committee's work. They noted that climate change is a global rather than spatial issue and further observations and measures should be discussed through the established international channel of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). They further argued that the link between MPAs and climate change is not direct and cautioned against attempts to politicise climate change in the establishment of MPAs. They further argued that the MPAs do not necessarily serve as a unique instrument to mitigate or facilitate adaptation to climate change.

6.10 The Commission noted the upcoming CEP/SC-CAMLR Joint Workshop on climate change and monitoring to be held in Hiroshima, Japan on 8–9 May 2026 (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraphs 10.10 – 10.13) and encouraged involvement from all CCAMLR Members to ensure

progress and common understanding. Japan, as host, drew the Commission's attention to the Seventeenth round of Informal Consultations of States Parties to the UN Fish Stock Agreement (ICSP17), where discussions emphasised that sustainable fisheries management and climate change issues are closely linked (CCAMLR-43, paragraph 6.10). Further, the Commission looked forward to the upcoming 30th UNFCCC Conference (COP30) which will take place from 10–21 November 2025 in Belém, Brazil.

6.11 The Commission noted SC-CAMLR-44/BG/11 Rev. 1, submitted by Oceanites, which presented the annual report of the organisation's activities.

6.12 Some Members thanked Oceanites for its report and noted the details on the upcoming field season, the status of data holdings, the latest State of Antarctic Penguins Report, summary of coordination efforts with ARK and IAATO, and an exploration of the various factors that may explain ongoing penguin population changes.

6.13 IUCN also welcomed the SCAR ACCE report and drew the Commission's attention to an IUCN July 2025 publication, entitled "Establishing Marine Protected Areas in a Changing Climate" (doi.org/10.2305/KQCA8125) which provides guidance on the consideration of climate change in MPA planning. IUCN joined the Commission in looking forward to the upcoming CEP/SC-CAMLR Joint Workshop.

6.14 ASOC stated that they strongly supported SC-CAMLR's efforts to integrate climate change into its work and that of its Working Groups. ASOC urged the Commission to also take action, including through the implementation of MPAs and the establishment of a subsidiary body to provide annual policy advice to CCAMLR on climate change. ASOC also suggested that Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting (ATCM) Resolution 8 (2021) could provide a useful approach for CCAMLR, as it outlined ways that climate change impacts on Antarctica could be taken into account within and outside the Antarctic Treaty System.

Implementation and compliance

Advice from SCIC

7.1 The Chair of SCIC, Mr Adam Berry (New Zealand), presented the SCIC-2025 report (Annex 5).

CDS Fund expenditure

7.2 The Commission noted that the Catch Documentation Scheme for *Dissostichus* spp. (CDS) Fund Review Panel, comprising representatives from Australia, France, Korea, New Zealand, the UK and the USA, was convened to consider three proposals from the Secretariat (CCAMLR-44/12).

7.3 The Commission endorsed the recommendation of SCIC to adopt the three proposals with an expenditure of A\$190 000 from the CDS Fund, covering online training and materials, in-person CDS training upon request, and the CDS/non-Contracting Party (NCP) Engagement Workshop in the Middle East. The Commission thanked the Secretariat and Members involved for their continued efforts to strengthen CDS capacity and engagement.

Implementation of the CDS

7.4 The Commission noted the implementation report of the Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS) for *Dissostichus* spp. (CCAMLR-44/13), including the successful in-person CDS and Port Inspection Training Workshop held in Cape Town, South Africa, and the recommendations arising from it. The Commission endorsed SCIC's recommendation to establish an intersessional Discussion Group to consider these recommendations and tasked the Secretariat with coordinating the Discussion Group, with progress on the implementation of the CDS-related recommendations to be reported to SCIC-2026.

7.5 South Africa thanked the Secretariat for coordinating the workshop, as well as Ms Kylie Bamford (UK), INTERPOL and Joint Analytical Cell representatives, and Japan, through vessel master Mr. Fuminori Kojima and agent Mr. Michael Yau, for facilitating the practical inspection aboard *Shinsei Maru No. 8*. Noting the participation of 44 individuals from nine Contracting Parties and one cooperating NCP, and the support of the CDS Fund for eleven participants, South Africa highlighted how the sharing of diverse experiences contributed to the workshop's success. South Africa emphasised the value of such initiatives in strengthening capacity, improving compliance and inspection practices, and fostering collaboration, and encouraged the Commission to continue providing and expanding these training opportunities.

7.6 The Commission noted the participating Members' commendation of the workshop's success, recognised the importance of continuing to provide such workshops, including supporting Member attendance in the future, and thanked South Africa for their hosting of this workshop.

7.7 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-2025, paragraph 16). 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.

7.8 The Commission noted SCIC's deliberations on the cooperative status of Mexico (SCIC-2025, paragraph 17) and tasked the Secretariat to write to Mexico requesting they fulfil their obligations in respect of CM 10-05 and undertake CDS training in the 2025-26 intersessional period, noting failure to do so would be grounds for revoking their cooperative status at CCAMLR-45.

Vessel inspections

7.9 The Commission noted the report on the implementation of CM 10-03 and the System of Inspection during the 2024/25 fishing season (CCAMLR-44/15). The Commission endorsed SCIC's recommendation to convene an intersessional panel on inspection resources and activities via the Discussion Group platform alongside virtual meetings (SCIC-2025, paragraph 21) and tasked the Secretariat with making the necessary arrangements to facilitate and support the panel's work.

7.10 The Commission noted the Secretariat's reconciliation of AIS data with CCAMLR's port inspection data holdings (CCAMLR-44/BG/13) and endorsed SCIC's recommendation that the Secretariat undertake it on an annual basis (SCIC-2025, paragraph 25).

Vessel monitoring system (VMS)

7.11 The Commission considered the report on the implementation of the VMS (CCAMLR-44/17) and noted the implementation of CM 10-04 by Contracting Parties.

7.12 The Commission endorsed SCIC's recommendation on the proposed changes to CM 10-04 (CCAMLR-44/17, Annex 1) which clarify the requirement to use the format of Annex 10-04/A for vessel movement reports and aim to improve the submission of data.

7.13 The Commission considered the ongoing development of an automated VMS movement notification functionality and endorsed SCIC's recommendation to continue this work, noting it was identified as a high-priority task for the Secretariat (SCIC-2025, paragraph 29). The Commission highlighted that this functionality is expected to significantly contribute to decreasing compliance issues and reducing the administrative burden on both Flag States and the Secretariat, further noting that necessary funding should be secured to support its prioritised development.

7.14 The Commission endorsed SCIC's recommendation to discontinue payment for Inmarsat position reports from the 2025/26 season and requested that Contracting Parties take necessary steps per SCIC-2025, paragraph 30.

Promotion of compliance

7.15 The Commission noted the reports from Chile (CCAMLR-44/01), New Zealand (CCAMLR-44/BG/21) and Argentina (CCAMLR-44/BG/25) on monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) activities undertaken during the 2024/2025 fishing season. It was also noted that the USA conducted a surveillance mission while transiting to and from McMurdo Station and their intent to continue such efforts this season.

7.16 The Commission acknowledged and thanked Argentina, Chile and New Zealand for their at-sea inspections and aerial surveillance activities as well as all Members who undertook port inspections and MCS activities in support of CCAMLR during the 2024/25 season.

7.17 Chile reported on their MCS activities undertaken in Subarea 48.1 during the 2024/25 fishing season (CCAMLR-44/01). At sea, the naval vessel *ATF-60 Lientur* inspected one vessel in January, and the *OPV-83 Marinero Fuentealba* inspected ten foreign-flagged vessels in April–May, all fully complying with CCAMLR conservation measures. In addition, two research flights carried out MCS activities from the air, during which no fishing vessels or abandoned fishing gear were detected.

7.18 The Commission noted CCAMLR-44/BG/15, which provided an update on the intersessional work by Chile as lead of the Development of Electronic Monitoring Systems (EMS) Guidelines Discussion Group, including the EMS survey circulated to Members. The Commission thanked Chile, encouraged all Members to complete the survey, and noted that the results will inform a phased implementation approach, taking into account the perspectives of Members and stakeholders.

Transshipment

7.19 The Commission considered the transshipment implementation report (CCAMLR-44/16), where 314 transshipments occurred from 1 December 2024 to 1 August 2025, of which 160 were of krill products, and noted the declining compliance with CM 10-09. The Commission considered the various operational challenges (SCIC-2025, paragraphs 42-46) associated with transshipment and noted a proposal to address some of these issues.

Non-contracting Party engagement strategy

7.20 The Commission noted the report on the implementation of the NCP Engagement Strategy action plan for 2023-24 (CCAMLR-44/BG/11) and the SCIC discussions (SCIC-2025, paragraphs 48-53) related to NCP engagement.

7.21 The Commission noted the positive engagement of Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates (UAE) and tasked the Secretariat with continuing to foster these dialogues and others with interested NCPs in the Middle East region. Additionally, the Commission endorsed continued engagement with NCPs in the Southeast Asia region.

7.22 The Commission noted the importance of transshipment in the context of NCP engagement and requested the Secretariat to engage with NCPs that provide transshipment services in the Convention Area to support their understanding of and compliance with CCAMLR conservation measures.

Proposals for new and revised conservation measures

Conservation Measure 10-03

7.23 The Commission noted that SCIC discussed the need to improve monitoring of krill fisheries, including port inspection requirements, and endorsed the component of the proposal put forward by Australia, Korea, New Zealand, and the USA to amend CM 10-03 (CCAMLR-44/02 Rev. 1) to require the inclusion of product codes for boiled, peeled, and oil-processed krill products.

7.24 The Commission recalled that SCIC discussed the remaining components of the proposals to amend CM 10-03, but was unable to endorse the proposals 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; and
- (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.

7.25 The Commission also noted that SCIC discussed a proposal to amend CM 10-03, led by Australia, to improve the Secretariat's knowledge of port landings. The Commission noted that Members would continue to develop the proposal during the intersessional period.

Conservation Measure 10-04

7.26 The Commission noted SCIC's discussion on improving vessel movement report submissions (SCIC-2025, paragraphs 27 and 28) and endorsed the proposal to modify CM 10-04 (CCAMLR-44/17, Annex 1) to clarify the requirement to use the format of Annex 10-04/A for vessel movement reports.

7.27 The Commission noted that SCIC considered, but did not reach consensus on, the proposal by the delegations of Australia, New Zealand, Norway, Korea, the United Kingdom, and the USA to amend CM 10-04 (CCAMLR-44/19 Rev. 2) to require all Contracting Parties whose fishing vessels operate in the Convention Area to submit VMS data to the CCAMLR Secretariat no later than one hour after receipt.

Conservation Measure 10-09

7.28 The Commission considered the proposal by Korea to amend CM 10-09 (CCAMLR-44/29) (SCIC-2025, paragraph 64). The Commission endorsed the amendment of CM 10-09 which includes the establishment of a CCAMLR record of carrier vessels.

7.29 The Commission further noted SCIC's deliberation on the CCAMLR Compliance Evaluation Procedure (CCEP) report (paragraphs 100 and 116-122), and endorsed SCIC's recommendation:

- (i) the application of the 48-hour notification period required for transshipments of harvested marine living resources, bait and fuel;
- (ii) the notification of the Secretariat of the transshipment of crew, observer or personnel together with, as applicable, their personal gear, and should be done within three working days from the completion of such a transfer;
- (iii) the application of a *force majeure*, distress, or a medical emergency clause.

7.30 The Commission agreed that, at CCAMLR-45, if any barriers to providing the information in CM 10-09 paragraphs 13-15 are identified, the Commission will review these paragraphs in particular.

7.31 ASOC welcomed the proposed revisions to CM 10-09, recalling that Performance Review 2 (PR2) identified transshipment as a significant gap in CCAMLR's compliance regime. ASOC further noted that these revisions will help address this gap and align CM 10-09 with the FAO Voluntary Guidelines for Transshipment.

Conservation Measure 10-10

7.32 The Commission recalled the discussions of SCIC-2025 (SCIC-2025, paragraphs 67-71) and the proposal submitted by Korea to amend the table in CM 10-10, Annex 10-10/B (CCAMLR-44/30) to include a new category, 'Differing Views Unresolved.' This category would apply when SCIC cannot reach agreement on a compliance designation despite all reasonable efforts being exhausted.

7.33 The Commission noted that, at this time, no alternative formulation of CM 10-10 was agreeable to all Members. Recognising broad support for further refinement of the CCEP to improve consistency, Korea withdrew its proposal, indicating its openness to continued dialogue on practical ways to enhance the efficiency of the CCEP in future years.

Conservation Measure 21-01 and 21-02

7.34 The Commission noted that SCIC considered, and did not reach consensus, on the proposal by the EU to amend CM 21-01 and 21-02 (CCAMLR-44/18) 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.

Conservation Measure 31-02

7.35 The Commission considered the proposal by Russia (CCAMLR-44/31) 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. No consensus was reached to amend CM 31-02.

7.36 Russia noted that the proposal had been modified compared to the 2023/24 version to address some concerns, further noting that the issue remains urgent due to the potential risk of compromised scientific data and instances of gear being retrieved after fishery closures. Russia encouraged continued technical refinement of the proposal and expressed its willingness to engage in future dialogue to progress this matter.

Conservation Measure 32-XX

7.37 The Commission considered the proposal from the EU (CCAMLR-44/21) for a new conservation measure (CM 32-XX) on the protection of notothenioid fish nest areas in the Convention Area, by closing such areas to fishing. The Commission noted consensus could not be reached on the proposal and noted the EU's intentions to bring the proposal to CCAMLR-45 for further consideration.

Conservation Measure 51-06

7.38 The Commission noted that SCIC had considered, and did not reach consensus on, the proposal by the delegations of Australia, New Zealand, Norway, the UK and the USA to amend CM 51-06 (CCAMLR-44/20 Rev. 2) to require at least one observer on every vessel be appointed under SISO. The Commission noted consensus could not be reached.

CCAMLR Compliance Report

7.39 The Commission considered the Provisional CCAMLR Compliance Report as per CM 10-10, paragraph 3, as presented in SCIC-2025, Appendix I, noting that consensus on a compliance status was reached for all but two compliance issues relating to CM 31-01 (SCIC-2025, paragraphs 125-130). The Commission noted the high compliance rates of greater than 95% across the majority of compliance measures analysed.

7.40 The Commission considered SCIC's discussion on the use of fireworks on fishing vessels operating within the Convention Area (SCIC-2025, paragraph 86). The Commission noted the broad support for prohibiting the use of explosives and fireworks within the Area and encouraged interested Members to continue developing this matter intersessionally.

7.41 Ukraine reaffirmed its previous position on fishing in Subarea 48.3, noting that the conservation measure has recently failed to meet fish stock needs, largely due to politically driven obstruction by Russia, and expressed regret that such circumstances remain possible within the Commission.

7.42 Argentina made the following statement:

‘Unfortunately, this is an irregular situation that has been on the agenda for several years and that we have discussed at length in SCIC and in the Commission as well. We regret that in a forum guided by consensus, only one party, in this case the Russian Federation, is not supporting the approval of a conservation measure that would allow fishing for toothfish in Subarea 48.3. As there is no conservation measure that allows fishing in Subarea 48.3, no one should be fishing. Only one party, the United Kingdom, is illegally fishing toothfish in Subarea 48.3. The vast majority of those who had been fishing are not fishing, and those who had been importing this catch are not importing it. So, we are somewhat surprised that Ukraine is talking about a bilateral issue. This is a multilateral issue that goes to the very essence of the Convention. If we do not have a conservation measure that would allow fishing, as clearly established in 31-01, fishing cannot take place. And on that, almost all of us agree, except one. And unfortunately, regarding conservation measure 41-02, we also all agree except one. So, we urge all parties to work together to overcome this situation, which undermines the proper multilateral functioning of CCAMLR. If we cannot re-adopt conservation measure 41-02, it is very clear that fishing is prohibited, and anyone who fishes there will be fishing illegally.’

7.43 China noted that fishing in Subarea 48.3 without a quota is contrary to the objectives of CCAMLR, expressed deep concern over its repeated occurrence, and stressed that such actions should be classified as serious non-compliance and IUU fishing to safeguard the long-term health of the Antarctic ecosystem.

7.44 Some Members stated that without a conservation measure, fishing is prohibited and called upon all Members to work towards a solution.

7.45 Russia noted that catch limits in Subarea 48.3 under CM 41-02 are established by the Commission based on the advice of the Scientific Committee. Russia stated that as no recommendation was provided by the Scientific Committee this year, no fishing is permitted. Russia further stated that the UK-flagged vessels *Argos Helena* and *Nordic Prince* had violated CM 31-01, providing grounds for their potential IUU listing. Russia expressed concern regarding assessment of sustainability of fishing in Subarea 48.3 made by the Marine Stewardship Council. It emphasised that decisions regarding conservation measures cannot be replaced by a unilateral national regulation and from this perspective it stressed the inconsistency of UK's position with respect to the toothfish fishery on one side and icefish and krill fishery management in the same area on the other side.

7.46 New Zealand recalled that during CCAMLR-43, the Scientific Committee provided advice regarding the establishment of a catch limit in Subarea 48.3. They recalled CCAMLR-43 paragraph 4.72 which notes that many Members agreed there was no scientific basis to oppose a catch limit for Subarea 48.3. This aligns with SC-CAMLR-43 paragraph 3.39 which confirmed that there was no scientific justification to block the adoption of a catch limit and urged progress to reinstating it. New Zealand also confirmed that SCIC had not proposed any changes to the CP-IUU Vessel List.

7.47 Norway observed that it is the Commission as a whole, rather than any single Member, that has not acted as required. Norway further emphasised that prohibitions cannot be presumed without explicit language.

7.48 The United Kingdom made the following statement:

‘With respect to the toothfish fishery in 48.3, the UK has set out its consistent position in SCIC (see paragraphs 129, 151, 154 and 224 of SCIC-2025), in COMM CIRCs and at previous CCAMLR meetings. In addition to the UK's position in respect to the status of this fishery we reiterate that CM 31-01 requires CCAMLR to “establish such limitations or other measures, as necessary” for fishing in Subarea 48.3, but does not

provide, or imply, that if CCAMLR does not adopt such a measure, any limitation on fishing will come into existence. The UK therefore rejects any suggestion that the UK vessels should be marked as non-compliant with CM 31-01 or cited as fishing illegally. Like others, we note that this situation is caused by the blocking of consensus on the most recent scientifically derived 2-year catch limit by Russia and like others, we would like to see the readoption of CM 41-02 as soon as possible.’

7.49 Argentina made the following statement:

‘We were concerned about the UK's interpretation of CM 31-01, and now we're even more concerned because Norway is saying the same thing. CCAMLR is a conservation organisation, and conservation should take precedence over economic interests. We adopted CM 31-01 in 1986. That CM 31-01 establishes that if a specific fishery is permitted under 48.3, it must necessarily have catch limits adopted by the Commission through a Conservation Measure. And this, historically, is because 31-01 was and is intended to prevent fishing in 48.3 without a maximum catch limit determined by the Commission. Since its adoption in 1986, we have always fished under a conservation measure that enables this fishing. Through mechanisms of cooperation and negotiation and especially taking into account the provisions of Article 9 of the Convention, the Commission has been able to agree on catch limits for the species permitted in 48.3. Even when deep differences arose among Members, agreements were reached on the understanding that the letter and spirit of CM 31-01 mandated that the conditions for fishing for *Dissostichus eleginoides* under 48.3 should be determined by the Commission, by all of us, based on the best available science and by consensus. This reasoning also applies to all other fisheries in other areas under the Convention. This is why the reasoning of the United Kingdom and Norway is so damaging, as it undermines the implicit consensus on the need to fish within the Convention Area to a CCAMLR-set catch limit. We are deeply concerned about this interpretation because, based on this interpretation, where we lack consensus in any area or Subarea, on any species, anyone will interpret it as meaning they can do whatever they want unilaterally, and this would be the beginning of the end of the Convention. This is very worrying, and I also want to emphasise again what most parties have done since CM 41-02 was not readopted. Those who fished there, except for the United Kingdom, have stopped fishing because their legal services told them that fishing is not allowed without a conservation measure. The main importer stopped importing. A company also tried to introduce this species into that country, and there is a ruling by a judge in that country stating that fishing that is not authorised by a conservation measure cannot be imported. We want to once again call on everyone to seek solutions that satisfy everyone, to seek solutions through

consensus, and to remember why and how we established CM 31-01, and to avoid relativizing the very essence of CCAMLR with these interpretations.’

7.50 The Commission recalled that discussions on a catch limit in Subarea 48.3 had not occurred during this year’s meeting of the Scientific Committee because the catch limits for 48.3 that were discussed at SC-CAMLR-43 covered two seasons.

7.51 Many Members expressed the opinion that Members’ differences should not stop CCAMLR from adopting a conservation measure, setting catch limits, by-catch limits, mitigation measures, data collection and reporting, and other requirements in Subarea 48.3 for the upcoming fishing season, further noting that these should be based on the recommendations of the Scientific Committee relying upon the best available science. These Members further expressed their frustration at the repeated refusal of one Member to adopt such a conservation measure and questioned the lack of scientific basis for such refusal.

7.52 The Commission noted the pre-season entry of seven vessels that entered Subareas 88.1 and 88.2 between 16 October and 4 November 2024, noting that one vessel was detected to be currently within Area 88 and that such entry is not currently explicitly prohibited by conservation measures.

7.53 Some Members noted their view that such vessels should be included on the IUU Vessel List on the basis that they entered a closed area and engaged in fishing activities. China referred to the Agreement on Fisheries Subsidies, which defines “fishing” as activities reasonably expected to result in the catching or harvesting of fish, and such a definition can be found in the conservation measures of various RFMOs. China noted that the fishing season begins on 1 December and that early entry into the area may be common practice, however it does not mean that it is a legal activity. China further noted that when formulating new measures or amending existing ones, the Commission must strictly prohibit the so-called "pre-season entry" in such measures, rather than legalizing such practice.

7.54 The Commission asked the Secretariat to provide updated information as requested by SCIC on whether one vessel was currently located in Area 88.

7.55 Ukraine noted Secretariat data showing 24 vessels entered the Convention Area pre-season, which was not considered IUU fishing, and expressed support for measures to strengthen the relevant conservation measure and apply a precautionary management approach.

7.56 Ukraine further acknowledged that a Ukrainian vessel is in the Convention Area during the meeting of CCAMLR-44, positioning itself for the season, and noted this practice is not unique.

7.57 The Commission noted that some Members gave consideration to the prohibition of pre-season entry until 2 weeks before the start of the season, while other Members noted that this may be ineffective, citing operational and safety considerations, and supported strengthened MCS and further intersessional work to determine appropriate timeframes. The Commission encouraged interested Members to work on the matter further in the intersessional period and bring forward proposals for consideration at the next meeting.

7.58 The Commission adopted the Final CCAMLR Compliance Report for 2024/25 as proposed by SCIC.

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

7.59 The Commission considered the report on IUU fishing activity and trends in 2024/25 in the Convention Area (CCAMLR-44/14).

7.60 The Commission recalled SCIC's consideration of the report on the implementation of CM 10-08 (SCIC-2025, paragraph 146), and noted the increasing importance of understanding beneficial ownership, referencing related work by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the Financial Action Task Force (FATF), and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). The Commission expressed its support for the ongoing analytical work conducted by the Secretariat in collaboration with the Joint Analytical Cell (JAC) and INTERPOL (CCAMLR-44/BG/09) and requested that the Secretariat continue undertaking due diligence checks to assist Members.

7.61 The Commission considered SCIC's deliberations on the Proposed CP-IUU Vessel List for 2025/26 (SCIC-2025, paragraphs 149-168) and noted there were no changes to the CP-IUU Vessel List adopted at CCAMLR-43.

7.62 Russia expressed its disappointment that there was no consensus for the inclusion of the UK-flagged vessels *Argos Helena* and *Nordic Prince* on the CP-IUU Vessel List, stating that they were also included in the CCAMLR Compliance Report for alleged non-compliance with CM 31-01.

7.63 The United Kingdom reiterated its position on this matter, noting that it had consistently set out its position, which it had also restated under the discussion relating to the CCAMLR Compliance Report this year (see paragraph 7.48). The United Kingdom categorically rejected any suggestion that vessels operating under its flag within Subarea 48.3 were engaged in illegal, unreported, or unregulated (IUU) fishing activities. The United Kingdom noted that these vessels participated in a fishery under lawful domestic regulation, operated in compliance with the Convention. The United Kingdom agreed with others that there was no consensus on the inclusion of these vessels on the final CP-IUU Vessel List.

7.64 Argentina made the following statement:

‘This is a long-standing discussion; it's been going on for years. Clearly, there is illegal fishing taking place, and these vessels should clearly be on the list of vessels engaged in IUU fishing; that is Argentina's position. We would like everything we pointed out in the previous section to be referenced here: Argentina declared that this fishing is clearly illegal, it regrets that these vessels are not included on this list once again when they should be, and the Argentine delegation's full explanation is detailed in the specific paragraphs concerning the discussion in SCIC and in the Agenda Item regarding the CCEP report’ (see also SCIC-2025 paragraphs 150, 152, 153, 155 and CCAMLR-44 paragraphs 7.42 and 7.49).

7.65 The Commission noted the discussion of SCIC regarding information provided in COMM CIRC 25/113 concerning the ongoing investigation into the Netherlands-flagged *Fortunagracht* and the Norwegian-flagged *Saga Sea* in relation to allegations of potentially unauthorised activities during a scheduled port visit to Puerto Williams, Chile. Chile noted that the investigation is still ongoing. The Commission encouraged the parties concerned to cooperate and report the outcomes to CCAMLR-45.

7.66 The Commission adopted the CP-IUU Vessels List for 2025/26 with no changes to the CP-IUU Vessel List adopted at CCAMLR-43.

7.67 The Commission considered the Provisional NCP-IUU Vessel List for 2025/26 (CCAMLR-44/14 and COMM CIRC 25/104), noting the request from the Islamic Republic of Iran for the removal of the *Koosha 4* from the NCP-IUU Vessel List for 2025/26.

7.68 The Commission considered SCIC’s deliberations on the request to delist the *Koosha 4* (SCIC-2025, paragraphs 169–173) and endorsed the recommendation that the vessel remain on the NCP-IUU Vessel List until independent confirmation of the vessel’s removal from service

is received. The Commission noted that an intersessional delisting of the *Koosha 4* under the Rule 7 procedure will be available to the Islamic Republic of Iran should additional, independent, corroboration that the vessel is no longer in service be provided prior to CCAMLR-45.

7.69 The Commission adopted the NCP-IUU Vessels List for 2025/26 with no changes to the NCP-IUU Vessel List adopted at CCAMLR-43.

Fishery notifications

7.70 The Commission considered the summary of fishery notifications submitted for the 2024/25 season (CCAMLR-44/BG/08 Rev. 1), noting SCIC's discussion on the matter and the concerns raised by some Members regarding the notifications submitted by Ecuador, Russia and the United Kingdom which were referred to the Commission for further consideration (SCIC-2025, paragraphs 177 to 192).

7.71 The Commission noted that all fisheries notifications, except that submitted by Ecuador, met the requirements of CM 21-02 and CM 21-03.

7.72 Russia expressed its concern that notifications were submitted for the UK-flagged vessels *Argos Helena*, and *Nordic Prince*, noting the vessels' inclusion on the Draft CP-IUU Vessel List for 2025/26 and the CCAMLR Compliance Report.

7.73 The United Kingdom confirmed that both notifications were submitted in full compliance with all relevant conservation measures, including CM 21-02, and emphasised that there was no basis for their inclusion in either the Draft CP-IUU Vessel List or the CCAMLR Compliance Report.

7.74 Some Members recalled their previous concerns regarding the notifications submitted by Russia (CCAMLR-42, paragraph 7.37 and SCIC-2025, paragraphs 188-189), noting that they could not support the Russian notifications for the *Alpha Crux* and *Yantar 31* due to continuing concerns that Russia is not exercising adequate Flag State control over its vessels.

7.75 Russia noted that the notifications for the two Russian-flagged vessels were submitted in full compliance with relevant CCAMLR conservation measure requirements and that there were no grounds to exclude them from participation in the Ross Sea exploratory toothfish fishery.

7.76 Many Members noted the critical importance of CCAMLR's compliance processes and ensuring that compliance issues are addressed appropriately, consistently and transparently with the collective goal of continuous improvement. Many Members requested that the Russian Federation provide outstanding information in relation to the several issues identified in the 2024 Summary Compliance Report regarding the *Alpha Crux*, and requested a thorough investigation be conducted in accordance with all relevant international obligations, and that the results of this investigation are promptly provided to the Commission.

7.77 Ecuador made the following statement:

'We would like to refer to the SCIC report, in which a formal statement and inquiries from Observers and Members of this Commission were addressed to Ecuador. We would like to remind the Members that this is the first fishery notification that Ecuador has ever submitted, and that understanding and implementing the decisions adopted by this Commission, particularly regarding to implementation timelines, has been a true challenge. We fully understand the concerns regarding the late submission of the assessment of the potential for proposed bottom fishing activities to have significant adverse impacts on vulnerable marine ecosystems (VMEs). Nevertheless, we can assure the Members that the observations have been well received and that, as a developing Member State, Ecuador is fully committed to the proper implementation of all conservation and management measures. We consider that it would be useful to develop a manual that would enable Ecuador, and other Members and non-Members in similar circumstances, to fully comply with and implement the required procedures.

We also wish to address the request that relates to that notification. Ecuador is fully committed to fulfilling its international obligations under the various multilateral bodies of which it is a party. Despite certain challenges, Ecuador has demonstrated to have developed a robust internal monitoring and traceability system, which plays an important role in the fight against IUU fishing, thereby contributing to the strengthening of the international fisheries management framework.

We wish to emphasise that similarities in vessel names do not indicate that any two vessels operate under similar licensing arrangements. Each vessel operates under a Ministerial Agreement that establishes the scope and limits of its authorised activities. We can confirm that no vessel has been authorised to fish for *Dissostichus* spp. within the Convention Area using gillnet gear. The licenses issued by Ecuador are fully consistent with international fisheries law and the laws of the sea (UN Convention on

the Law of the Sea and UN Fish Stocks Agreement) to which Ecuador is a Contracting Party.

This is supported by national procedures for the licensing of all vessels operating under the Ecuadorian flag. The monitoring system allows us to identify potential illegal activities, verify compliance with national and international regulations, and take appropriate action to prevent the landing or entry of IUU catches into global markets.

As to the requests raised at SCIC regarding the fishery notification in the Convention Area, Ecuador would like to inform that, prior to submitting the exploratory fishery application, it was verified that the fishing company had no links to illegal fishing activities, including in terms of ownership and ultimate beneficiaries. It is a family-owned, Ecuadorian-capital company, with more than 30 years of activity and no record of illegal fishing activities.

In line with its commitment to the conservation, sustainability, and rational use of marine living resources, Ecuador launched a public-private research project in 2017 aimed at identifying the main biological and ecological characteristics of Patagonian toothfish (*Dissostichus eleginoides*) in Ecuadorian waters, which was extended up to 2022. The information gathered has been shared annually with the Commission since the project started. In this context, Ecuador's interest in conducting exploratory fishing within the Convention Area stems from its intention to contribute to the collection of scientific data that can inform conservation measures based on the most reliable scientific evidence.

Finally, Ecuador reaffirms its commitment to cooperating with the Members of this Commission in identifying any IUU fishing activities that may contravene the measures of this organisation and the shared spirit of ocean protection and conservation. We thank all Members of the Commission for their interest and support and invite them to share information that will enable us all to identify actors operating outside the international regulatory framework.'

7.78 Some Members noted the importance of providing accurate and timely information when completing fishery notifications, particularly in respect of International Maritime Organization (IMO) numbers and other vessel particulars. These Members noted some vessel particulars, including the IMO number, were not consistent with the information provided in Ecuador's notification for the *Altar 45*. They further noted that, in accordance with CM 21-02, paragraph 8, notifications that do not contain all the required information or that are submitted

after the deadline, should not be included in fisheries notifications to be considered by the Commission.

7.79 Ecuador presented the following official documents concerning the vessel Altar 45, emphasising that these constitute the official information provided by the Flag State. The submission included: (1) Ecuador's declaration on the monitoring and traceability procedures; (2) the Navigation License and Authorisation for the Change of Name of the Ecuadorian-flagged vessel Altar 45, both issued by the Maritime Authority of Ecuador in the exercise of its responsibilities as Flag State; (3) the vessel's Call Sign and MMSI registration, issued by the same authority; and (4) a Certificate of the Vessel's Position confirming that Altar 45 is currently located in the Port of Manta. Ecuador further explained that the discrepancies identified by some Members are due to the recent change of the vessel's name, which has been requested to be updated in the IMO Vessel Register.

7.80 COLTO made the following statement:

'Over many, many years, CCAMLR has worked hard to turn its toothfish fisheries from being plagued by IUU fishing into a best practice model of international cooperation and sustainable management.

For those in this room who might not know any fishermen. Fishermen talk. Sometimes fishermen cannot help themselves and they talk too much. This has allowed us to gain information from multiple sources which links this vessel to an individual well known to CCAMLR with a well-documented history of IUU activity in the Convention Area.

Chair, we see this as a clear signal of elevated risk. Risk that we have not seen in many years.

We also wish to remind the Commission of the obligations of all Contracting Parties under: Article IX – to conserve Antarctic marine living resources through effective regulation and management; Article X – to prevent activities that undermine CCAMLR conservation measures; Article XI – to cooperate in the detection and elimination of IUU fishing; Resolution 10/XII – which calls for enhanced transparency in vessel licensing and beneficial ownership; and Resolution 18/XXI – which reinforces the duty of flag States to exercise effective control over vessels, particularly where IUU risks exist.

Chair, COLTO urges that robust due diligence is applied to all notifications, and we encourage flag States to also demonstrate transparency around operational oversight and potential hidden beneficiaries.

We all must ensure that the hard-fought gains against IUU fishing are not lost to opportunistic re-entry by those who have undermined the system in the past.’

7.81 Korea made the following statement:

‘Korea notes with serious concern the information presented by COLTO regarding the use of gillnets by the Ecuadorian-flagged vessel Altar 11 targeting toothfish in the south-west Atlantic. We strongly echo COLTO’s call for robust due diligence in the consideration of any notifications involving these vessels or related operators.

Korean-flagged vessels operating in the FAO Area 41 are subject to stringent controls — including 100 percent observer coverage, continuous VMS tracking on an hourly basis, daily electronic reporting, and strict transshipment regulations — ensuring full traceability and compliance. Korea believes that all vessels targeting toothfish in this region should be held to equivalent standards. Any discrepancy in the level of regulatory control should be addressed through appropriate market-based or cooperative measures to prevent unfair or unsafe practices. One example is amending CM10-05 to prohibit trade of toothfish harvested by gillnets. Korea also encourages that those Contracting Parties that target toothfish in the FAO Area 41 share with the Commission their domestic regulatory framework that governs such fisheries to ensure that toothfish traded globally are harvested in a sustainable manner with a robust MCS mechanism.’

7.82 ASOC urged the Commission not to be complacent on issues related to IUU fishing, noting that it is difficult to detect and that continued vigilance by the Commission is essential.

7.83 The Commission thanked Ecuador for providing additional information regarding the fishery notification for the Altar 45 and reiterated the importance of fishery notifications containing complete and accurate details, including up-to-date vessel particulars, to enable the Commission to make informed decisions and ensure the effective operation of the CAMLR Convention. The Commission further noted that CM 21-02 requires Members to ensure that their notified vessels meet all necessary requirements, and recalling CCAMLR-44/BG/08 Rev. 1 further noted that not all relevant information had been provided by Ecuador in a timely manner, and expressed the view that the notification did not meet the requirements of CM 21-02.

7.84 Ecuador noted that, in its opinion, the notification complied with CM 21-02, explaining that the submission of 3 June was an update to vessel information and that the original notification had been submitted to the Secretariat by the 1 June deadline in accordance with CM 21-02. Ecuador further recalled that CM 21-02, paragraph 3, does not exempt Members from providing timely updates of information.

7.85 The Commission noted the Secretariat's clarification that the Ecuadorian notification submitted on 1 June 2025 contained an incorrect vessel and that the associated VME form had been missing at this time. The Secretariat further advised that the missing documentation was subsequently provided on 3 June 2025.

7.86 The Commission noted that CM 21-02 provides a clear framework for the notification process and reaffirmed that the consideration of notifications is the responsibility of the Commission and is undertaken on a case-by-case basis, consistent with past practice. The Commission further noted that Ecuador's notification for the Altar 45 was submitted in contravention of CM 21-02 and was therefore withdrawn for the 2025/26 fishing season.

7.87 Some Members suggested that the Secretariat should not include notifications which do not contain all relevant information in the annual report of fisheries notifications, in accordance with paragraph 8 of CM 21-02.

7.88 The Commission reflected on the submission of late notifications, noting that the Secretariat provides relevant documents, circulars, and procedural guidance beginning in April, well in advance of the 1 June deadline, and encouraged Members to contact the Secretariat earlier in the year should they require assistance in this process. Russia noted that the Secretariat should not exclude late notifications from inclusion in meeting papers but should inform the Commission when notification deadlines have been breached for the relevant bodies to consider. The Commission did not reach consensus on changing the current procedure for considering notifications.

Advice from the Scientific Committee to SCIC

7.89 The Commission noted that SCIC received advice from the Chair of the Scientific Committee in respect to delayed gear retrieval in Subarea 88.1, the notification details of fishing gear, early vessel entry, the definitions of calibration and standardisation, and fish nests and referred to SCIC-2025, paragraphs 193-212.

7.90 Russia recalled SCIC-2025 (paragraph 195) and sought clarification from the Chair of the Scientific Committee on the impacts and extent of overfishing resulting from delayed retrieval and vessel departures in Subarea 88.1, and how these factors may affect the quality of data received after the season's closure is assessed.

7.91 The Commission noted the Scientific Committee's recommendation for further research to account for these factors in future analyses (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraphs 3.76-3.79).

7.92 The EU sought clarification from the Chair of the Scientific Committee as to whether the trigger level in the krill fishery had been exceeded in the 2024/25 fishing season. The Scientific Committee Chair made reference to SC-CAMLR-44 (paragraph 2.13) and confirmed that the trigger level had been exceeded by 4 917 tonnes in the 2024/25 fishing season.

Other business

7.93 The Commission noted SCIC's discussion on inspection report issues related to System of Inspection (SoI) of vessels in Subarea 48.3 and endorsed SCIC's proposed solution (SCIC-2025, paragraph 230) which would provide an explanatory note for the CCAMLR webpage reporting SoI inspection reports.

7.94 The Commission noted SCIC's review of the tasking assigned to the Secretariat, highlighting the high priority of ongoing electronic reporting and automated VMS movement notification projects, and endorsed retaining the item as a standing Agenda Item for SCIC-2026.

CCAMLR Scheme of International Scientific Observation

8.1 The Commission noted the Scientific Committee's endorsement to implement a revised conversion factor sampling protocol by SISO observers, with its effectiveness to be assessed periodically (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 9.9).

8.2 The Commission endorsed the Scientific Committee's recommendation to include an additional requirement in fisheries operation plans submitted under CM 21-02, paragraph 6(ii), to specify the conversion factors used by vessels and the methods by which they are derived (WG-FSA-2025, Appendix F; SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 9.10). The Commission amended CM 21-02 to require the specification of conversion factors.

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-44 will be published in the Schedule of Conservation Measures in Force 2025/26.

9.2 The Commission noted that the following conservation measures and resolutions will remain in force for 2025/26:

Measures on compliance

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

Measures on general fishery matters

21-01 (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), 23-01 (2024), 23-02 (2016), 23-03 (2016), 23-04 (2016), 23-06 (2022), 23-07 (2016), 24-01 (2023), 24-02 (2014), 24-04 (2017), 25-02 (2024), 25-03 (2024) 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), 41-08 (2024), 51-01 (2024), 51-02 (2024), 51-03 (2024) and 51-06 (2019).

Measures on protected area

91-01 (2004), 91-02 (2024), 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 (2025), 10-04 (2025), 10-09 (2025)

Revised measures on general fishery matters

21-02 (2025), 24-05 (2025)

Revised measures on fishery regulation

32-09 (2025), 33-02 (2025), 33-03 (2025), 41-01 (2025), 41-03 (2025), 41-04 (2025), 41-05 (2025), 41-06 (2025), 41-07 (2025), 41-09 (2025), 41-10 (2025), 41-11 (2025), 42-01 (2025), 42-02 (2025), and 51-04 (2025).

Implementation and Compliance

9.4 The Commission adopted a revised version of CM 10-03 by Australia, New Zealand, the Republic of Korea and the United States (CCAMLR-44/02 Rev. 1) to include in Appendix 10-03/B product codes for boiled, peeled and oil for krill products.

9.5 The Commission noted that there was no consensus on other aspects of the proposal (CCAMLR-44/02 Rev. 1) regarding the inclusion in Appendix 10-03/B references to the recording and inspection of marine mammal and bird exclusion devices on trawl gear. Additionally, the Commission noted that there was no consensus for the proposal to amend CM 10-03, led by Australia, requiring 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.

9.6 The Commission adopted a revised version of CM 10-04 proposed by the Secretariat to clarify the requirement to use the format of Annex 10-04/A for vessel movement reports.

9.7 The Commission noted that there was no consensus on the proposal by the delegations of Australia, New Zealand, Norway Korea, the UK and the USA to amend CM 10-04

(CCAMLR-44/19 Rev. 2) to require all Contracting Parties whose fishing vessels are operating in the Convention Area to submit VMS data to the CCAMLR Secretariat no later than one hour after receipt.

9.8 The Commission considered the proposal by Korea to amend CM 10-09 (CCAMLR-44/29) (SCIC-2025, paragraph 64). The Commission endorsed the amendment of CM 10-09 which includes the establishment of a CCAMLR record of carrier vessels.

9.9 Additionally, the Commission endorsed the proposed changes by SCIC to CM 10-09 following its deliberations of the CCEP which reduced the 72-hour notification period required for transshipments of harvested marine living resources, bait and fuel; and the requirement to notify the transshipment of crew, observer or personnel together with, as applicable, their personal gear; and the addition of a force majeure, distress, or a medical emergency clause.

9.10 SCIC considered the proposal by Korea to amend the table in CM 10-10, Annex 10-10/B, (CCAMLR-44/30) to include a new category, 'Differing Views Unresolved'.

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

General fishery matters

9.12 The Commission considered the proposed revision to CM 21-02, requested by the Scientific Committee, to include a description of the conversion factors used by vessels (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 9.10), and adopted CM 21-02.

9.13 The Commission considered the proposal by the Russian Federation to revise CM 31-02 (CCAMLR-44/31) to clarify the management procedures regarding the delayed retrieval of longline gear after the closure of fisheries.

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

9.15 The Commission considered the proposal by the EU 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-44/21), recalling its consideration at SCIC-2025 (paragraphs 81 to 84).

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

Toothfish catch limits

9.17 The Commission endorsed the advice of the Scientific Committee on catch limits in the fisheries for *D. mawsoni* and *D. eleginoides* in Subarea 48.4 and adopted CM 41-03 (2025).

9.18 The Commission endorsed the Scientific Committee's advice on catch limits (SC-CAMLR-44, Table 1). 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 41-09 – exploratory fishery for *D. mawsoni* in Subarea 88.1

CM 41-10 – exploratory fishery for *D. mawsoni* in Subarea 88.2

9.19 The Commission considered CM 41-11 and endorsed the Conservation Measure containing only the access paragraph, noting that directed fishing for *D. mawsoni* shall not take place in 2025/26 in Division 58.4.1. Proponents of the research plan for Division 58.4.1 under CM 41-11 noted they will continue to demonstrate their dedication in formulating a research plan in accordance with the relevant conservation measures.

Icefish catch limits

9.20 The Commission endorsed the Scientific Committee's advice on the limits for the fishery for *C. gunnari* in Subarea 48.3 and adopted CM 42-01 (2025).

9.21 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 (2025).

Other fishery matters

9.22 Australia made the following statement:

‘Australia advised 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. The Australian EEZ extends up to 200 nautical miles from the Territory. 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.’

Administration and finance

10.1 Ambassador Máximo Gowland (Argentina), the Chair of SCAF, presented the report of SCAF-2025 (Annex 6).

10.2 The Commission endorsed the advice of SCAF and accepted the Audited Financial Statements for 2024 (SCAF-2025, paragraph 5).

10.3 The Commission endorsed the advice of SCAF and reappointed the Australian National Audit Office for the audit of financial statements for the 2025 and 2026 financial years. (SCAF-2025, paragraph 6).

10.4 The Commission noted the report of the Executive Secretary (CCAMLR-44/05) including the Secretariat’s intent in 2026 to review the current Strategic Plan and accompanying Staffing and Salary Strategy (2023–26) and propose strategies for the next 4-year period

(2027-2030). The Commission endorsed the proposals in CCAMLR-44/05 paragraphs 14 and 15.

10.5 The Commission noted the activities of the General Capacity Building Fund (GCBF) (SCAF-2025, paragraphs 27 - 29) and endorsed the decisions of the General Capacity Building Fund Panel and the recommendations from SCAF regarding the Fund Guidelines in CCAMLR-44/07 Rev 1, Annex 1, including a new sub-paragraph 23 (v) (SCAF-2025, paragraphs 33 - 36).

10.6 The Commission noted that there was no consensus in SCAF to change the Terms of Reference or modify the MPA Fund.

10.7 Four nominations for the Management Panel of the MPA fund were received, Dr D. Deregibus (Argentina), Dr A. Van de Putte (Belgium), Prof P. Koubbi (France) and Dr A. Titmus (USA).

Review of the 2025 budget, the 2026 budget and forecast budget for 2027

10.8 The SCAF Chair introduced SCAF-2025, paragraphs 37–38, 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. As requested by SCAF at CCAMLR-43 (paragraph 10.19), the Secretariat worked to find operational efficiencies and cost reductions during the intersessional period and was able to reduce the budgetary deficit anticipated in 2025.

10.9 The Commission endorsed SCAF's creation of an intersessional group on budgetary matters (SCAF-2025, paragraph 80).

10.10 The Commission noted that in response to its request in CCAMLR-43 paragraph 10.19, the Secretariat had developed proposals for potential efficiencies at meetings (CCAMLR-44/08 Rev.1) and further noted a range of Member positions were presented during discussions at SCAF. Many Members supported the proposals presented by the Secretariat. Some Members did not support the proposals for efficiencies and cost reductions in translation by slightly changing the timing of delivery of translated documents and emphasis was placed on the maintenance of the four official languages, with Russia stating that any absence of translation represented violation of the Convention and Rules of Procedure. The Secretariat noted that this was not the intention of the proposal. Some Members supported the use of AI to supplement

current translational capabilities, although caution was recommended with regards to consideration of any use of AI.

10.11 The Commission noted that some Members had proposed other budgetary savings, including reductions in meeting catering, and that these options should be explored further in the intersessional period.

10.12 The Chair of SCAF emphasised that the budgetary deficit could be improved by Members paying their membership contributions by the due date, which would allow these funds to be invested earlier in the year. The increased interest earned on these investments is estimated to be of similar magnitude as the translation savings outlined in CCAMLR-44/08 Rev.1.

10.13 The Chair of SCAF noted that some Members have a domestic policy of zero nominal growth in Member contributions.

10.14 The SCAF Chair presented to the Commission the issue of whether the attendance of the Science Manager at meetings of the IWC and IUCN could be replaced by a Member representative. The Scientific Committee Chair stated that these requests had been approved by the Scientific Committee (SC-CAMLR-42, paragraph 8.4; SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 10.46, respectively). Russia considered it relevant to follow the common practice of the Commission and to ask a Member representative to attend relevant meetings of other organisations. Some Members supported the reinstatement of the A\$12,000 of budget required to support this travel but consensus was not achieved.

10.15 The Commission noted the SCAF Chair's report that the Equipment budget endorsed by SCAF included a reduction of the amount budgeted in CCAMLR-44/04, allowing for no more than a CPI increase. The Commission noted that this lower spend would incur additional risks associated with not supporting the purchase of some software to support increased needs, for instance science and cybersecurity.

10.16 The Commission adopted the revised 2025 budget, the 2026 budget and the forecast budget for 2027 (SCAF-2025 report, Appendix 1 and 2).

10.17 Russia stated its position that the increase in travel costs for the Secretariat is agreed for the year 2026 due to the election of the new Executive Secretary.

10.18 The Commission endorsed SCAF's acceptance of the amendments requested by Russia in SCAF-2025 paragraph 72 and endorsed the placement of the PR2 outcomes on the CCAMLR website.

10.19 The SCAF Chair informed the Commission that he would not seek re-election and noted that SCAF appointed Ms. Suzanne McGuire (USA) as SCAF Chair and Mr. James Fosbury (UK) as Vice-Chair for next year.

10.20 The SCAF Chair stated the importance of requesting consideration by the Scientific Committee and the Secretariat of budgetary implications of KFMA and/or MPA plans, which should be conveyed to SCAF for review as soon as possible. The Commission noted that consensus was not achieved by SCAF on the matter (SCAF-2025, paragraph 78).

10.21 The Commission expressed its appreciation to the SCAF Chair for his excellent service and guidance during his two-year term as Chair.

Cooperation with the Antarctic Treaty System and international organisations

Cooperation with the Antarctic Treaty System

11.1 The Commission noted CCAMLR-44/BG/04, submitted by the Executive Secretary, which presented a summary report of the Forty-seventh Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties Meeting (ATCM 47) held in Milan, Italy from 24 June – 3 July 2025.

Cooperation with international organisations

11.2 The Executive Secretary presented CCAMLR-44/10 (Cooperation with other organisations), noting the proposals under paragraph 11 (i), (ii) and (iii).

11.3 The Commission thanked the Secretariat for this paper and endorsed the renewal of cooperation agreements with CCSBT (CCAMLR-44/10 paragraph 11 (i)) for another 3 years, as well as for tagging data exchange formats to be provided as companion documents to the existing arrangements with SIOFA, SEAFO and SPRFMO on the CCAMLR website (CCAMLR-44/10 paragraph 11 (ii)).

11.4 The Commission considered the request of the Secretariat for guidance on interactions with the BBNJ Agreement and a proposal that CCAMLR designate an observer to future BBNJ meetings (CCAMLR-44/10 paragraph 11 (iii)).

11.5 Most Members supported this proposal, noting the importance and value of active engagement between CCAMLR and the BBNJ with the objective of communicating the work of the Commission and affirming the competence of CCAMLR and of the Antarctic Treaty System in respect to CAMLR Convention Area, ensuring that their competence would not be undermined by BBNJ. Many Members expressed their preference that the appropriate observer would be the Secretariat. Russia expressed its disagreement with an option for an observer to speak on behalf of the Commission, and the USA suggested that the practice of designating Member State representatives to be CCAMLR observers to various meetings is outdated.

11.6 Russia noted that the BBNJ Agreement has not yet entered into force and that in the absence of a Commission position regarding the potential engagement between CCAMLR and BBNJ, it believed that it would be premature to designate an observer.

11.7 The Commission did not nominate an observer to attend BBNJ meetings in 2026 and agreed that substantive discussion on engagement between BBNJ and CCAMLR should be further discussed by the Commission.

11.8 France noted that they would be willing to present an informal report on the BBNJ at CCAMLR-45. The Commission welcomed this offer.

11.9 ASOC congratulated China on their ratification of the BBNJ and thanked Members for their interest in establishing a positive relationship between the BBNJ and CCAMLR. ASOC noted a relationship between CCAMLR and BBNJ would enhance the capacities of both organisations.

11.10 The IWC presented CCAMLR-44/BG/19, a draft Memorandum of Understanding between the IWC and CCAMLR. The IWC invited the Commission to note the adoption of IWC Resolution 2024-1 and the rationale for formalising cooperation; review and endorse the draft Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) provided in BG/19; and authorise the Executive Secretary or CCAMLR Chair to sign the MoU on behalf of CCAMLR, subject to any final adjustments agreed by the IWC at its IWC70 meeting in September 2026.

11.11 The Commission thanked the IWC for their presentation and the proposals outlined in CCAMLR-44/BG/19.

11.12 Many Members expressed their support for the draft MoU and its signature, noting the importance and urgency of further collaboration between CCAMLR and the IWC, particularly with respect to whale by-catch associated with the krill fishery and the development of the Krill Fisheries Management Approach.

11.13 Russia noted that it had some concern with respect to both the procedure and the content of the MoU. It noted that procedurally, the MoU should be signed in all four official languages of the Commission. With regard to the MoU's content, Russia indicated the scope should coincide with the overlap in mandates between CCAMLR and the IWC and indicated that the current draft should be refined in the intersessional period for possible future signature.

11.14 The Commission agreed to initiate an Intersessional Correspondence Group to further develop the draft MoU with the intention to forward a proposed revision to the IWC in 2026 and welcomed the offer from Australia to convene the ICG.

Reports of observers from international organisations

11.15 The Commission thanked SCAR for its annual report (SC-CAMLR-44/BG/18). SCAR thanked the Commission for their increased collaboration, noting the SCAR Krill Expert Group (SKEG)'s development of the Krill Stock Hypothesis, the SCARFISH Action Group which was now contributing expertise on fish species present in the Convention Area and SCAR's many groups focused on climate change which have also contributed to the work of CCAMLR.

11.16 Many Members underlined SCAR's role as an essential source of independent scientific advice.

11.17 ACAP thanked the Commission for the invitation to observe the Forty-fourth meetings and for the ongoing cooperation between CCAMLR and ACAP through the recently renewed MoU. They noted they were looking forward to further cooperation with CCAMLR colleagues, particularly through the work of WG-IMAF and the Scientific Committee.

11.18 The Commission noted CCAMLR-44/BG/30, submitted by ASOC, which presented its annual report to CCAMLR. ASOC thanked the Commission for the welcome invitation to observe the Forty-fourth meetings, encouraging Members to refer to CCAMLR-44/BG/30 Appendix A for an outline of ASOC's engagement in several key international fora and Appendix B for a list of ASOC-funded research that has contributed to the work of SC-CAMLR.

11.19 The Commission noted SC-CAMLR-44/BG/11 Rev.1, submitted by Oceanites, Inc. Oceanites, Inc. expressed their gratitude to the Commission for their invitation to observe the Forty-fourth meetings, highlighting this as the thirty-second consecutive year of the Antarctic Site Inventory project (ASI) which has counted 3.5 million penguins since its inception. They noted that the 2025/26 season will be the most active data collection exercise since the program began, with 19 counting teams conducting over 100 site visits.

11.20 The Commission noted CCAMLR-44/BG/18, submitted by IAATO. IAATO thanked the Commission for their warm welcome, noting IAATO is a member organisation that advocates and promotes the practice of safe, environmentally responsible private-sector travel to the Antarctic. IAATO reaffirmed its support of MPAs and highlighted the new collaboration between IAATO and conservation charity ORCA to record observations of marine mammals, as well as ongoing development of Highly Pathogenic Avian influenza protocols and support of research in close collaboration with SCAR, CCAMLR and COMNAP. IAATO noted they continue to include CCAMLR e-forms for reporting of marine debris and wildlife entanglements in their Field Operations Manual. They thanked CCAMLR for the opportunity to engage with the Antarctic community in various fora and discussions throughout the year.

11.21 The Commission noted SC-CCAMLR-44/BG/19, submitted by ARK. ARK reiterated their strong commitment to precautionary management, despite challenging environmental and managerial conditions. ARK noted that despite the lapse of CM 51-07, their Members upheld their long-standing fishing pattern and compliance with the Voluntary Restricted Zones (VRZs), resulting in a balanced distribution of catch between Subareas 48.1 and 48.2 and protection of penguin foraging habitat during breeding. ARK noted their commitment to advancing CCAMLR objectives through collaborative acoustic surveys in Subareas 48.1 and 48.2, active participation in WG-ASAM, and support for whale-interaction research.

11.22 The Commission thanked ACAP, ASOC, ARK, IAATO, Oceanites and SCAR for their valuable 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

11.23 The Commission noted with gratitude the reports of CCAMLR Observers to international meetings that took place in the 2024/25 intersessional period (CCAMLR-44/BG/01, BG/02, BG/05, BG/06, BG/22, BG/32 and BG/34).

11.24 The Commission considered the calendar of 2025/26 meetings of organisations and nominated observers for the Commission (Table 1)

Administrative matters

Appointment of the Executive Secretary

12.1 The Chair reported to the Commission that a selection committee comprising the Heads of Delegations of Commission Members had selected Mr Nathan Walker (New Zealand) to take over from the present Executive Secretary and that Mr Walker had accepted the appointment. The Commission congratulated Mr Walker on his appointment and looked forward to welcoming him to his new role on 9 March 2026. Mr Walker thanked the Commission for placing their trust in him to lead the Secretariat in its support of the important work of CCAMLR.

Election of officers

12.2 The Commission elected Ms Jung-re Riley Kim (Republic of Korea) to the position of Vice-Chair for 2026 and 2027.

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

12.4 The Commission endorsed the recommendation from SCAF that Ms Suzanne McGuire (USA) be elected as SCAF Chair, and Mr James Fosbery (UK) as Vice-Chair of SCAF for 2026 and 2027.

Invitation of Observers

12.5 The Commission agreed to invite the following to attend the Forty-fifth 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, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Trinidad and Tobago, Türkiye, UAE and Viet Nam;
- (v) NCP Flag States of vessels listed on CCAMLR NCP-IUU Vessel List – Republic of Angola, Islamic Republic of Iran and Nigeria.

12.6 The following inter-governmental organisations will be invited to attend CCAMLR-45 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.

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

Next meeting

12.8 The Commission confirmed that CCAMLR-45 will take place in person at the CCAMLR Headquarters building (181 Macquarie Street) in Hobart, Australia, from 19 to 30 October 2026.

12.9 In agreeing the date and place of CCAMLR-45 the Commission recognised that all Members have the equal right of representation in accordance with the Convention and the Headquarters Agreement.

Other business

13.1 Argentina made the following statement:

‘Argentina notes that the Assembly of the International Hydrographic Organization in 2023 adopted a resolution recognising the Southern Ocean as the global marine area surrounding the Antarctic Continent and considers the northern geographical boundary of the Southern Ocean to be 60° south latitude. This Resolution is not recognised by Argentina. Given that the Convention Area extends in several locations north of 60° south latitude, Argentina requests to avoid using the term "Southern Ocean" in official CCAMLR documents and to replace it with the expression used in the Convention's preamble, which is "seas surrounding Antarctica," thereby avoiding any questions or confusion.’

13.2 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 CAMLR 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.

13.3 The United Kingdom 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.

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

13.4 Argentina made the following statement:

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

13.5 France made the following statement:

'France expresses its disappointment at the failure to reach an agreement on the MPAs presented under the Agenda Items at this 44th meeting of the Commission. It is particularly disappointing that a lack of consensus has resulted from some Members once again refusing to adopt these four projects, including the one in East Antarctica, despite them having reached scientific maturity.

At a time when the climate emergency is putting increasing pressure on the Southern Ocean, which could lead to the disappearance of unique ecosystems, we hope that a dialogue can be initiated between now and the 45th meeting of the Commission with the countries involved to find a satisfactory solution to our differing views.

We would also like to thank the Commission for its positive response to the presentation of the PHOCIS project, which aims to establish MPAs on the high seas in the pelagic area of the Indian sub-Antarctic. We encourage Members to collaborate in establishing similar projects in planning areas where such studies are currently lacking.

In 2008, the Commission committed to establishing a representative system of MPAs in the Convention Area to strengthen the protection and conservation of marine biodiversity. This system will make ecosystems more resilient and increase the chances of survival of species already weakened by human pressures and other global changes. As Members of CCAMLR, it is our collective responsibility to make progress on these

essential issues and achieve the objective of conserving Antarctic marine living resources in accordance with Article II of the Convention.'

13.9 Ukraine made the following statement:

'We would like to confirm Ukraine's commitment to the conservation of Antarctic marine living resources. An important step towards this would be the development of a system of MPAs. We also believe it is necessary to introduce management of the Antarctic krill fishery that evenly distributes fishing effort and thereby reduces pressure on Antarctic marine ecosystems.

On behalf of the Ukrainian delegation, we express our gratitude to CCAMLR Executive Secretary Dr. David Agnew for his outstanding contribution to the work of the Commission. It has been a pleasure working with him over these years.'

13.7 Uruguay made the following statement:

'Uruguay remains strongly committed to multilateralism as the essential way forward in addressing the global climate crisis. Climate change is one of the main threats facing humanity in the 21st century, with the Antarctic region—a key regulator of global climate—being among the most affected areas.

The 30th UN Climate Change Conference of the Parties (COP30) to be held soon in Brazil represents an opportunity for Uruguay to achieve greater harmonisation of positions among the different subregional groups participating in issues of common interest. For this reason, we would like to welcome the inclusion of climate change as a permanent and cross-cutting item on the Agenda of this Commission.

Uruguay would like to reiterate its support for the creation of a network of MPAs as a fundamental tool for the conservation of the Antarctic ecosystem. In this regard, Uruguay co-sponsors the creation of MPAs in East Antarctica and in the Weddell Sea, as well as the proposal for the Domain 1 MPA, submitted by Argentina and Chile.

Uruguay notes that the efforts made to improve the definitions of MPAs and the adoption of new strategies, variables, and sets of indicators contrast with the current status of the proposals, as apparently none of the submitted proposals meet the requirements to be incorporated to complement the conservation measures.

Regarding the toothfish fishery in Subarea 48.3, Uruguay regrets that differences persist—a situation ongoing since 2022—and that this lack of definition benefits neither the management nor the operations of the Commission. Considering that this area has long been a shared space and a focus for activities, knowledge generation and fishing operations, Uruguay aspires to progress towards the adoption of a conservation measure.

Distinguished delegates, we must be aware that the decisions we make—be they by Commission or by omission—determine the actions we take. For better or worse, these decisions will have consequences for the future—a future that many of us here may not see, but which will affect generations to come.

It is for their sake that we should join efforts to achieve the objective of protecting marine living resources—the very purpose for which CCAMLR was established—so as to continue regulating the actions of each Member country represented in this Commission.’

13.5 Chile presented SC-CCAMLR-44/BG/04 reporting on a feasibility study on the Antarctic Cable Project, aiming to deploy a fibre-optic submarine cable between continental Chile and some places located along South Shetland Islands and the northern Antarctic Peninsula.

13.6 Russia noted that the “Chile - Antarctic Cable Project” is the first cable project to connect Antarctica with other regions which raises legal issues and strategic implications regarding the uses of Antarctica. Russia invited to consider concerns of fundamental and scientific nature. Russia suggested a substantive discussion to be held at the ATCM.

13.7 Chile responded to Russia’s comment confirming that this was only a feasibility study and that Chile was following all relevant procedures and informing ATCM and CCAMLR in the spirit of transparency.

13.8 The Chair presented Dr David Agnew (Executive Secretary) with a Wombat Award, in recognition of his thirty years of involvement in the work of the Commission.

Report of the Forty-fourth Meeting of the Commission

14.1 The report of the Forty-fourth 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 hard work and cooperation during the Commission meeting. He further thanked the Chairs of SCIC, SCAF and the Scientific Committee, the interpreters, the Executive Secretary and the Secretariat team and the Congress and other support staff for ensuring the meeting logistics and organisation ran smoothly.

15.2 The Commission congratulated the Chair and thanked him for his professional and efficient chairing the meetings in this his first year as Chair.

15.3 The Commission and the Chair thanked Dr Agnew for his significant contribution to CCAMLR during his 8-year term as Executive Secretary, expressing their deep appreciation for his leadership of the Secretariat, dedication to the work of the Commission, professionalism and support of all Members and Contracting Parties. The Commission presented Dr Agnew with a map of the Convention Area signed by delegates.

15.4 The Chair closed the 44th meeting of the Commission.

Table 1

Entity	Dates (where available)	Venue (where available)	Observer
The Agreement for the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP) MoP	2028	Peru	New Zealand
The Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting (ATCM)	11 to 21 May 2026	Japan	Secretariat
The FAO Committee on Fisheries (COFI)	2026	Italy	Secretariat
The Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna (CCSBT)	05 to 08 October 2026	Belgium	
The Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC)	2026	TBD	
The International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT)	17 to 24 November 2025	Spain	United States of America
The Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC)	11 to 15 May 2026	Maldives	Australia
The International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)	02 to 06 March 2026	Switzerland	
The International Whaling Commission (IWC)	28 September to 03 October 2026	Australia	Australia
The Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO)	21 to 25 September 2026	Lithuania	Japan
The North East Atlantic Fisheries Commission (NEAFC)	10 to 14 November 2025	London	
The South East Atlantic Fisheries Organisation (SEAFO)	18 to 27 November 2025	Namibia	European Union
The Southern Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement (SIOFA)	01 to 03 July 2026	Seychelles	
The South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation (SPRFMO)	02 to 06 March 2026	Panama	European Union
The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)	02 to 05 December 2025	Egypt	
The Commission for the Conservation and Management of the Highly Migratory Fish Stocks of the Western and Central Pacific Ocean (WCPFC)	01 to 05 December 2025	Philippines	

List of Registered Participants

List of Registered Participants

Chair		Mr Robbie Bulloch Overseas Territories and Polar Directorate
Argentina	Head of Delegation:	Mr Fausto Lopez Crozet Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Worship
	Alternate Representative:	Mr Darío Polski Ministry of Foreign Affairs, International Trade and Worship
	Advisers:	Mr Eduardo Raúl Cavallero Ministry of Foreign Affairs, International Trade and Worship
		Dr Dolores Deregibus Instituto Antártico Argentino/CONICET
		Ms Carolina Dones Ministry of Foreign Affairs, International Trade and Worship
		Ambassador Máximo Gowland Ministry of Foreign Affairs, International Trade and Worship
		Mrs Paola Gucioni Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores, Comercio Internacional y Culto
		Dr Enrique Marschoff Instituto Antártico Argentino
		Ms Maria Isabel Molina Carranza Subsecretaría de Pesca y Acuicultura
		Mr Fabrizio Resera 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 Emma Campbell Australian Antarctic Division
	Alternate Representatives:	Ms Kelly Buchanan Australian Antarctic Division, Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water
		Mr Ewan McIvor Australian Antarctic Division, Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water
		Mr Russell Miles Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
	Advisers:	Ms Bailey Bourke Australian Antarctic Division, Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water
		Dr Liz Brierley 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
		Mr Andrew Field Australian Fisheries Management Authority
		Ms Stephanie Goetz Attorney General's Department
		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

Ms Melissa Kingston
Australian Antarctic Division

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

Dr Tara Martin
Department of State Growth

Ms Elissa Mastroianni
Australian Fisheries Management Authority

Mr Fraser McEachan
Australian Fisheries Management Authority

Professor Jeffrey McGee
University of Tasmania

Mr Malcolm McNeill
Australian Longline Pty Ltd

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

Ms Selina Stoute
Australian Fisheries Management Authority

Mr Rohan Tepper
Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade

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

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:	Mr Nils Vanstappen FPS Public Health, Safety of the Food Chain and Environment
	Alternate Representative:	Dr Anton Van de Putte Royal Belgian Institute for Natural Sciences
	Adviser:	Dr Zephyr Sylvester University of Colorado Boulder
Brazil	Head of Delegation:	Ms Clara Stefanello Sakis Division of the Sea, Antarctica and Outer Space
	Adviser:	Mr Daniel de Quadros dos Santos Ministry of Environment and Climate Change
Chile	Head of Delegation:	Mr Juan Enrique Loyer Greene Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Chile
	Alternate Representative:	Mr Renato Segura División de Asuntos Antárticos - Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores
	Advisers:	Mr Maximiliano Bello Fundación Patagonia azul
		Dr César Cárdenas Instituto Antártico Chileno (INACH)
		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
		Dr Carlos Montenegro Silva Instituto de Fomento Pesquero de Chile
		Mr Pablo Ortiz

SERNAPESCA

Ms Karen Rauch
Asoc

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

Head of Delegation: Mr Xiangfeng Li
MFA, China

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

Mr Ming Zhao
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs

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

Mr Xu Gao
Zhongyu Global Seafood Corp.

Mr Longwen Ge
Chinese Arctic and Antarctic
Administration

Mr Yin Feng Guo
National Marine Hazard Mitigation Service
of Ministry of Natural Resources of
China

Mr Haifeng Hua
Jiangsu Sunline Deep Sea Fishery Co., Ltd

Dr Yan Yan Vivian LAM

Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation
Department

Dr On On Joanne Lee
Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation
Department

Mr Ling Zhi Li
East China Sea Fisheries Research Institute

Dr Honglei LI
Chinese Arctic and Antarctic
Administration

Mr Xing Jun Li
LIAONING PELAGIC FISHERIES CO.,
LTD

Mr Mindong Li
Rongcheng East China Fisheries Co., LTD

Mr Yaopeng Li
Zhongyu Global Seafood Corp.

Mr Rundong Lin
Fujian Zhengguan Fishery Development
Company, Ltd

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

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

Dr Lei Xing
Polar Research Institute of China

Professor Liu Xiong Xu
Shanghai Ocean University

Dr Yi-Ping Ying
Yellow Sea Fisheries Research Institute

Dr Guangtao Zhang
Institute of Oceanology, Chinese Academy
of Sciences

Mr Wei Zhang

LIAOYU GROUP CO., LTD

Ms Wenting Zhao
MFA, China

Mr Yue Zheng
MFA, China

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

Professor Guoping Zhu
Shanghai Ocean University

Ecuador

Head of Delegation: Mrs Rebeca Espinoza Bernal
Ministerio de Agricultura, Ganadería y
Pesca

Advisers: Mr Jorge Costain
Transmarina S.A.

Mrs Pilar Proaño
Transmarina

European Union

Head of Delegation: Ms Fiona Harford
European Commission

Alternate
Representative: Mr Marco Valletta
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: Mrs Sophie COLIN
Ministère de la Transition écologique

Dr Marc Eléaume
Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle

Professor Philippe Koubbi
Sorbonne Université

Mrs Adèle Moisan
French Ministry of the Sea

Mrs Anaïd Panossian
French Ministry for Agriculture and Food /
Directorate for Sea Fisheries and
Aquaculture

Mr Mafal Thiam
French Ministry for Agriculture and Food /
Directorate for Sea Fisheries and
Aquaculture

Germany

Head of Delegation: Dr Susanne Schlaack
Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Food and
Regional Identity

Alternate
Representatives: Professor Bettina Meyer
Alfred Wegener Institute for Polar and
Marine Research

Mr Julian Wilckens
Project Management Juelich – German
Federal Ministry of Education and
Research

Advisers: Mr Dominik Bahlburg
Alfred-Wegener-Institut

Dr Flavia C Bellotto Trigo
Alfred-Wegener-Institut

Ms Patricia Brtnik
Federal Agency for Nature Conservation

Dr Katharina Teschke
Alfred Wegener Institute for Polar and
Marine Research

India

Head of Delegation: Dr RS Maheskumar
Centre for Marine Living Resources and
Ecology

Alternate
Representatives: Dr Vijay Kumar
Ministry of Earth Sciences

Dr R Sendhil Kumar

		Centre for Marine Living Resources and Ecology
Italy	Head of Delegation:	Mr Orazio Guanciaie Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation
	Alternate Representative:	Dr Anna Maria Fioretti Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	Advisers:	Dr Maurizio Azzaro Institute of Polar Sciences
		Dr Laura Ghigliotti National Research Council of Italy (CNR)
		Dr Carla Ubaldi ENEA – Antarctic Technical Unit
Japan	Head of Delegation:	Dr Joji Morishita Minister of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
	Alternate Representative:	Mr Taisuke Iwano Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
	Advisers:	Mr Koji Batori Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
		Mr Tomohiro Kondo Ministry of Foreign Affairs
		Mr Haruki Mitome Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
		Mr Masayoshi Miyahira Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry
		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

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

Mr Takeshi Shibata
Taiyo A & F Co. Ltd.

Mr Kazuya Usami
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and
Fisheries

Ms Kyo Yasuko
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Korea, Republic of Head of Delegation:

Ms Jung-re Riley Kim
Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries

Alternate
Representatives:

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

Mr Royun Kim
Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries

Advisers:

Mr Gap-Joo Bae
Hong Jin Corporation

Mr Sang-jin Choi
Korea Overseas Fisheries Association

Mr Hyun Joong Choi
TNS Industries Inc.

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 Young Jin Kim
Korea Overseas Fisheries Association

Professor Hyun Jung Kim
Yonsei University

Ms Taerin Kim
Fishery Monitoring Center

Dr Eunhee Kim
Climate Ocean Research Institute (CORI)

Mr Jeongwook Kim
HONGJIN CORPORATION

Ms Minkyung Kim
National Fishery Product Quality
Management Service of the Ministry of
Oceans and Fisheries of Korea

Ms Seung Eun "Summer" Lee
Korea Overseas Fisheries Cooperation
Center

Mr Hae Jun Lee
Hongjin Company

Mr Jeongseok Park
National Institute of Fisheries Science,
Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries

Mr Kyehong Park
Hongjin Corporation

Mr Kanghwi Park
Jeong Il Corporation

Namibia

Head of Delegation:

Mr Ueritjiua Kauaria
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries, Water
and Land Reform

Alternate
Representatives:

Mr Malcom Block
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries, Water
and Land Reform

Mr Titus Iilende
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries, Water
and Land Reform

		Ms Kashona Iita Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries, Water and Land Reform
	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 Milan Cunliffe-Post Ministry for Primary Industries
		Mr Dean Jurasovich Sanford
		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
		Dr Marine Pomarède

Ministry for Primary Industries

Mr Andy Smith
Smith Fishing Consultancy (Self employed)

Dr Smrithi Talwar
Earth Sciences New Zealand

Ms Aimee Tang
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade New
Zealand

Mr Hamish Tijssen
Talley's Ltd

Dr Ian Tuck
Ministry for Primary Industries

Mr Nathan Walker
Ministry for Primary Industries

Mr Barry Weeber
ECO Aotearoa

Norway

Head of Delegation: Mr Petter Meier
Royal Norwegian Ministry of Trade,
Industry and Fisheries

Alternate
Representative: Mr Erik Svedahl
Norwegian Embassy, Canberra

Advisers: Ms Madeleine Jakobsen
Ministry of Climate and Environment

Dr Ann-Lisbeth Agnalt
Institute of Marine Research

Mr Elling Deehr Johannessen
Norwegian Polar Institute

Ms Astrid Høgestøl
Norwegian Polar Institute

Dr Bjørn Krafft
Institute of Marine Research

Dr Andrew Lowther
Norwegian Polar Institute

		Dr Cecilie von Quillfeldt Norwegian Polar Institute
		Mr Christian Wormstrand Norwegian Ministry of Trade, Industry and Fisheries
		Ms Hanne Østgård The Directorate of Fisheries
Poland	Alternate Representative:	Mrs Jolanta Mosor Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
	Adviser:	Dr Anna Panasiuk University of Gdańsk
Russian Federation	Head of Delegation:	Mr Dmitry Kremenjuk 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
		Mr Pavel Lunev Arctic and Antarctic Research Institute
		Mr Sergey Tarasenko Arctic and Antarctic Research Institute
South Africa	Head of Delegation:	Dr Azwianewi Makhado Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment
	Alternate Representatives:	Mr Makhudu Masotla DFFE
		Mr Johannes de Goede Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment

		Dr Zoleka Filander Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment
	Adviser:	Mr Sobahle Somhlaba Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
Spain	Head of Delegation:	Mr Luis Belmonte González Ministry for Agriculture, Fisheries and Food
	Advisers:	Mr Joost Pompert Pesqueras Georgia, S.L Mr Roberto Sarralde Vizuite Instituto Español de Oceanografía-CSIC
Sweden	Adviser:	Mr Nils Hedberg Grimlund Embassy of Sweden in Australia
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:	Mr Andrii Fedchuk National Antarctic Scientific Center, Ukraine Professor Gennadii Milinevskyi Main Astronomical Observatory of National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine; National Antarctic Scientific Center of Ukraine Mr Illia Slypko SSI "Institute of Fisheries, Marine Ecology and Oceanography" (IFMEO) Mr Vitalii Tsymbaliuk Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine
United Kingdom	Head of Delegation:	Ms Jane Rumble

		Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office
Alternate Representative:		Ms Kylie Bamford Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office
Advisers:		Ms Sarah Baddeley Foreign Commonwealth Development Office
		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 Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office
		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:	Mrs Amy Anderson NOAA Office of Law Enforcement

Ms Jamie Briggs
U.S. Department of State

Mr Juan Caro
National Oceanic and Atmospheric
Administration

Ms Rachael Confair
NOAA Fisheries | U.S. Department of
Commerce

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

Ms Julia Goss
National Oceanic & Atmospheric
Administration

Mr John Hare-Grogg
National Oceanic and Atmospheric
Administration

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

Dr Christopher Jones
National Oceanographic and Atmospheric
Administration (NOAA)

Ms Suzanne McGuire
U.S. Department of State

Mr Cole Mushegan
National Oceanic and Atmospheric
Administration

Mr Philip Oh
U.S. Embassy Canberra

Mr David Pearl
NOAA Fisheries Office of Law
Enforcement

Ms Natalia Perez
National Oceanic and Atmospheric
Administration

		Dr Andrew Titmus National Science Foundation
Uruguay	Head of Delegation:	Mrs Elizabeth Moretti Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	Alternate Representative:	Mr Juan Dominici Uruguayan Antarctic Institute (UAI)
	Adviser:	Dr Yamandú Marín Dirección Nacional de Recursos Acuáticos (DINARA)
Observers – Acceding States		
Canada	Head of Delegation:	Ms Marilyne Lareau Government of Canada
	Advisers:	Ms Katharine Ferri Fisheries and Oceans Canada Ms Isabelle Morisset Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Finland	Head of Delegation:	Ms Johanna Lammi Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland
Mauritius	Head of Delegation:	Ambassador Sarojini Seeneevassen Government of Mauritius
	Alternate Representative:	Ms Prema Appadu Government of Mauritius
Panama	Head of Delegation:	Mr Mario Aguilar ARAP
Peru	Head of Delegation:	Ambassador Vitaliano Valencia Embassy of Peru
	Alternate Representatives:	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 Alessandro Aldo Molina Gomez
Ministry of Production 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 Head of Delegation: Ambassador Diego Felipe Cadena
Montenegro
Embassy of the Republic of Colombia

Singapore Head of Delegation: Ms Jannie Wan
Singapore Food Agency

Alternate
Representative: Ms Juliat Tan
Singapore Food Agency

Türkiye Head of Delegation: Dr Erdinç Güneş
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry

Advisers: Mr Hüseyin Dede
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry

Mr Melih Er
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry

Dr Mahir Kanyılmaz
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry of
Türkiye

Ms Derya Özcan
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry

Mr İlhan Üze
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry

Dr Atilla Yılmaz
TUBITAK MAM Polar Research Institute

Mr Aziz Baran Yılmaz
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry

United Arab Emirates

Advisers:

Ms Loulia Alkhatib
UAE Presidential Court

Ms Alyazia Alriyami
UAE Presidential Court

Mr Wassim Said
UAE Presidential Court

Observers – International Organisations

ACAP

Head of Delegation: Mr Jonathon Barrington
Secretariat to the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels

Alternate Representatives: Dr Mike Double
Australian Antarctic Division

Dr Wiesława Misiak
Secretariat to the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels

ATS

Head of Delegation: Mr Francisco Berguño
Antarctic Treaty Secretariat

INTERPOL

Head of Delegation: Ms Cindy Buckley
INTERPOL

IUCN

Head of Delegation: Dr Heidi Weiskel
IUCN

IWC

Head of Delegation: Dr Iain Staniland
International Whaling Commission

RPOA-IUU

Head of Delegation: Dr Dita Primaoktasa
RPOA-IUU Secretariat, Indonesian Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries

SCAR

Head of Delegation: Professor Cassandra Brooks
University of Colorado Boulder

Alternate Representatives: Professor Mary-Anne Lea
Institute for Marine and Antarctic Studies (IMAS)

Dr Chandrika Nath
Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research

Adviser: Mrs Agnes Ganichaud

Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research

SPRFMO

Head of Delegation: Mr James Brown
South Pacific Regional Fisheries
Management Organisation

Adviser: Ms Susana Delgado
South Pacific Regional Fisheries
Management Organisation

Observers – Non-Governmental Organisations

ARK

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

Alternate
Representative: Mr Pål Einar Skogrand
Aker QRILL Company

Advisers: Mrs Fernanda Breen
ARK

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

Mr Enrique Gutierrez
Pesca Chile

Mr Matts Johansen
Aker BioMarine ASA

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
School of Natural Science, Macquarie
University

Ms Holly Curry

Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition

Mr Emil Dediu
The Pew Charitable Trusts

Mr Jose Maria Figueres
Antarctica2030

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

Ms Emily Grilly
WWF-Australia

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

Dr Lauren Howe-Kerr
Minderoo Foundation

Ms Andrea Kavanagh
Brightstone Strategy

Mr Nicholas Kirkham
The Pew Charitable Trusts

Ms Mary Liesegang
Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition

Dr Susanne Lockhart
Southern Benthics

Mrs Pilar Marcos
Greenpeace International

Dr Ricardo Roura
Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition

Ms Meike Schuetzek
Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition

Ms Alissa Skelton
The Pew Charitable Trusts

Mr Matt Spencer
Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition

Mr Yiting Sun

Conservation International China

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

Mr Boyang Xun
Beijing Greenovation Institute for Public
Welfare Development

Mr Zibo Yu
WWF China

Dr Yurong Yu
Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition

Ms Wei Zhou
Greenpeace

COLTO

Head of Delegation: Mr Rhys Arangio
Coalition of Legal Toothfish Operators

Alternate
Representative: Ms Brodie Plum
Talley's Limited

Advisers: Mr Richard Ball
SA Patagonian Toothfish Industry
Association

Mr Brodie Barr
Austral Fisheries

Dr Deborah Davidson
Argos Frøyanes Ltd

Mr Diego Edwards
Nutrisco

Mr Jakob Hals
Fiskevegn AS

Mr Stig Helland
Brunvoll AS

Mr Glenn Moors
New Zealand Marine Logistics (NZML)

Mr Andrew Newman
Argos Froyanes Ltd

		Mr Marcos Osuna ESTREMAR
		Mr Ismael Pérez Lafonia Sea Foods SL
		Mr Laurent Pinault SAPMER
		Mr John Alexander Reid Polar Seafish Ltd
		Mr Laurent Virapoullé Pêche Avenir S. A
IAATO	Head of Delegation:	Ms Amanda Lynnes International Association of Antarctica Tour Operators
	Alternate Representative:	Dr Maureen Lynch International Association of Antarctica Tour Operators
	Advisers:	Ms Lisa Kelley International Association of Antarctica Tour Operators
		Ms Jill Niederberger International Association of Antarctica Tour Operators (IAATO)
Oceanites	Head of Delegations:	Dr Grant Humphries Oceanites
		Mr Ron Naveen Oceanites, Inc.
	Alternate Representatives:	Mr Steve Forrest Oceanites
		Professor Philip Trathan Oceanites Inc.
SOOS	Head of Delegation:	Dr Alyce Hancock Southern Ocean Observing System (SOOS)
	Adviser:	Mr Clément Astruc Delor EHESS - UTAS - Ecole des Ponts

Secretariat

Executive Secretary

Dr David Agnew

Science

Science Manager
Fisheries and Observer Reporting Coordinator
Science Data Officer
Fisheries and Ecosystems Analyst

Dr Steve Parker
Isaac Forster
Daphnis De Pooter
Dr Stéphane Thanassekos

Fishery Monitoring and Compliance

Fisheries Monitoring and Compliance Manager
Compliance Officer
Fisheries Monitoring and Compliance Data Officer
Research, Monitoring and Compliance Analyst
Data Administration Officer
Intern

Todd Dubois
Eldene O'Shea
Henrique Anatole
Claire van Werven
Rachel James
Molly Claassen

Finance and Administration

Finance, Administration and HR Manager
Accountant
Human Resources Officer
Administrative Services Officer
Administration Assistant

Alexandra Seager
Jade Brinsmead
Angie McMahon
Amelia Stoneham
Nicki Squibb

Communications

Communications Manager
Communications Officer
Senior Translator (French)
Senior Translator (Russian)
Russian Translator
Russian Translator
Senior Translator (Spanish)
Spanish Translator
Spanish Translator
Print Production

Catherine Stubberfield
Mariana Cordeiro
Karine Bachelier
Anton Klevansky
Elena Mikhailik
Nick Lenyashin
Jesús Martínez
Facundo Alvarez
Alejandra Sycz
Bowen Zhang

Data and Information Systems

Data and Information Systems Manager
Systems Analyst
Software Developer
Technical Business Analyst

Gary Dewhurst
Ian Meredith
Mingyun Qie
Mitchell John

Interpreters

Ms Cecilia Alal
Ms Patricia Avila
Ms Lyubov Bezkravna
Mrs Elena Bocharova-Booth
Mr Andrey Efimenko
Ms Claire Garteiser
Dr Erika Gonzalez
Ms Isabelle Guinebault
Dr Sandra Hale
Mr Nick Lenyashin
Mr Benoit Malmontet
Ms Silvia Martinez
Ms Ludmilla Mullova
Dr Marc Orlando
Mr Philippe Tanguy

PRELIMINARY

List of Documents

List of Documents

CCAMLR-44/01	Monitoring, control and surveillance undertaken by Chile during the 2024/25 season Delegation of Chile
CCAMLR-44/02 Rev. 1	Proposals for Improved Management of CCAMLR's Krill Fisheries: Port Inspections Delegations of Australia, New Zealand, Republic of Korea, and the United States
CCAMLR-44/03	Examination of the audited financial statements for 2024 Executive Secretary
CCAMLR-44/04	Review of the 2025 Budget, Draft 2026 Budget and Forecast Budget for 2027 Executive Secretary
CCAMLR-44/05	Executive Secretary's Report 2025 including an Implementation Report for the Secretariat's Strategic Plan (2023-26) Executive Secretary
CCAMLR-44/06	Performance Review 2 – summary of outcomes CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-44/07 Rev. 1	Activities of the General Capacity Building Fund (GCBF) – 2025 GCBF Panel
CCAMLR-44/08 Rev. 1	Identification of potential meeting efficiencies CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-44/09	Proposal on the approach for establishing new MPAs under the CAMLR Convention Delegation of China
CCAMLR-44/10	Cooperation with other organisations CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-44/11 Rev. 2	CCAMLR Compliance Evaluation Procedure (CCEP) Summary Report and analysis CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-44/12	CDS Fund expenditure proposal CCAMLR Secretariat

CCAMLR-44/13	CDS Implementation and Data Analysis CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-44/14	IUU fishing activity and trends in 2024/25 and IUU Vessel Lists CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-44/15	Inspection Implementation Report CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-44/16	Transshipment implementation report CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-44/17	Vessel monitoring system (VMS) implementation report CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-44/18	Proposal to amend Conservation Measures 21-01 and 21-02 Delegation of the European Union
CCAMLR-44/19 Rev. 2	Proposals for Improved Management of CCAMLR's Krill Fisheries: Vessel Monitoring Systems Delegations of Australia, New Zealand, Norway, Republic of Korea, the United Kingdom, and the United States
CCAMLR-44/20 Rev. 2	Proposals for Improved Management of CCAMLR's Krill Fisheries: SISO Observers Delegations of Australia, New Zealand, Norway, the United Kingdom, and the United States
CCAMLR-44/21	Proposal for a new Conservation Measure on fish nest areas Delegation of the European Union
CCAMLR-44/22 Rev. 1	Draft conservation measure for an East Antarctic Marine Protected Area Delegations of Australia, the European Union and its Member States, Chile, India, New Zealand, Norway, Republic of Korea, Ukraine, the United Kingdom, and Uruguay
CCAMLR-44/23 Rev. 1	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, Republic of Korea, India, Ukraine, and Chile

CCAMLR-44/24	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-44/25 Rev. 2	Proposal for a third CCAMLR performance review Delegations of the European Union and its Member States
CCAMLR-44/26	Proposal for an initial implementation of the revised Krill Fishery Management Approach in Subarea 48.1 Delegation of Norway
CCAMLR-44/27	Draft conservation measure for a Weddell Sea Marine Protected Area – Phase 2 Delegations of Norway, the United Kingdom and Australia
CCAMLR-44/28	Suggestions for establishing Marine Protected Areas in the CCAMLR Convention Area Delegation of the Russian Federation
CCAMLR-44/29	Proposal to amend CM10-09 to increase transparency of information on carrier vessels that transship within the CCAMLR Convention Area Delegation of the Republic of Korea
CCAMLR-44/30	Improving the CCAMLR Compliance Evaluation Procedure Through Proposed Amendments to Conservation Measure 10-10 Delegation of the Republic of Korea
CCAMLR-44/31	Proposals to amend CM 31-02 Delegation of the Russian Federation
CCAMLR-44/32	Report of the Forty-fourth Meeting of the Scientific Committee
CCAMLR-44/33	Report of the Meeting of the Standing Committee on Implementation and Compliance (SCIC) 2025
CCAMLR-44/34	Report of the Meeting of the Standing Committee on Administration and Finance (SCAF-2025)

CCAMLR-44/BG/01	Report from the CCAMLR Observer (Australia) to the 29th Annual Meeting of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC) Delegation of Australia

CCAMLR-44/BG/02	Report from the CCAMLR Observer (European Union) to the 13th annual meeting of the South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation (SPRFMO) Delegation of the European Union
CCAMLR-44/BG/03	Description of the Budget CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-44/BG/04	Report of the CCAMLR Observer to the Forty-seventh Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting (ATCM 47) (Milan, Italy, 24 June – 3 July 2025) Executive Secretary
CCAMLR-44/BG/05	Report from the CCAMLR Observer (United States) on the 2024 International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT) Meeting Delegation of the United States
CCAMLR-44/BG/06	Report from the CCAMLR Observer (European Union) to the 12th meeting of the parties of the Southern Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement (SIOFA) Delegation of the European Union
CCAMLR-44/BG/07	Report of the CCAMLR CDS and Port Inspection Workshop, Cape Town South Africa (May 12-16, 2025) CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-44/BG/08 Rev. 1	Fishery Notifications 2024/25 CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-44/BG/09	Support to CCAMLR to identify and deter IUU fishing activities – INTERPOL and JAC CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-44/BG/10	Cooperation to combat illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing and enhance compliance monitoring 2024/25 CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-44/BG/11	NCP Engagement Strategy review and plan CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-44/BG/12	Update on information related to Conservation Measure 10-08 CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-44/BG/13	Evaluation of the potential for reconciliation of CCAMLR Port Inspection Reports with open-source data CCAMLR Secretariat

CCAMLR-44/BG/14	Proposals for the Classification of Toothfish Fishery Nomenclature under the CCAMLR Regulatory Framework Delegation of the Russian Federation
CCAMLR-44/BG/15	Survey for the Development of Electronic Monitoring Systems (EMS) in CCAMLR Fisheries Delegation of Chile
CCAMLR-44/BG/16	Amendment of Self-Assigned Compliance Status for Southern Park — Amended to “Compliant” Delegation of the Republic of Korea
CCAMLR-44/BG/17	Summary of activities of the Commission during the 2024/25 intersessional period - Report of the Chair 2025 Chair of the Commission
CCAMLR-44/BG/18	International Association of Antarctica Tour Operators 2024-2025 Report to CCAMLR-44 IAATO
CCAMLR-44/BG/19	A draft Memorandum of Understanding between the International Whaling Commission (IWC) and the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR) IWC
CCAMLR-44/BG/20	Establishing CCAMLR Marine Protected Areas Delegation of New Zealand
CCAMLR-44/BG/21	Aerial surveillance patrols undertaken by New Zealand during the 2024/2025 Ross Sea CCAMLR Season Delegation of New Zealand
CCAMLR-44/BG/22	Report from the CCAMLR Observer (New Zealand) to the Eighth Session of the Meeting of the Parties of the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP) Delegation of New Zealand
CCAMLR-44/BG/23	Migration from e-Groups to Discussion groups CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-44/BG/24	Web Portals Update CCAMLR Secretariat

CCAMLR-44/BG/25	Monitoring and Surveillance Activities by Argentina - 2024/25 Season Delegation of Argentina
CCAMLR-44/BG/26	Securing the Future of the Krill Ecosystem: Interim Implementation of the KFMA ARK
CCAMLR-44/BG/27	New mandatory requirements on navigation and voyage planning for fishing vessels operating in polar waters and other vessel matters ASOC
CCAMLR-44/BG/28	CCAMLR and the ‘shifting baseline syndrome’: Issues of concern ASOC
CCAMLR-44/BG/29	Krill Fishery Management Approach and the D1MPA – Moving forward with the harmonisation process ASOC
CCAMLR-44/BG/30	ASOC Report to CCAMLR ASOC
CCAMLR-44/BG/31 Rev. 1	Cap-DLISA Workshop Report Delegation of South Africa
CCAMLR-44/BG/32	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-44/BG/33	Chair’s Guide to the order of business Chair of the Commission
CCAMLR-44/BG/34	Report from the CCAMLR Observer (Japan) to the 47th annual meeting of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO) Delegation of Japan
Other	
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-43/48	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
SC-CAMLR-44/02	Krill fishery management in Area 48 – options for spatial distribution of catches Delegation of the United Kingdom
SC-CAMLR-44/BG/01	Catches of target species in the Convention Area CCAMLR Secretariat
SC-CAMLR-44/BG/04	Chile–Antarctic Smart Cable Project Delegation of Chile
SC-CAMLR-44/BG/11	2025 Report by Oceanites, Inc. — Monitoring Update Oceanites
SC-CAMLR-44/BG/13	Antarctic Climate Change and the Environment: 2025 Update SCAR
SC-CAMLR-44/BG/18	The Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR) Annual Report to CCAMLR 2024/25 SCAR
SC-CAMLR-44/BG/19	ARK report 2025: Responsible Krill Harvesting amid climate and management challenges ARK
SC-CAMLR-44/BG/23	From Fixed Quotas to Adaptive Management: A Proposal for Implementing KFMA in Subarea 48.1 Delegation of Norway
SC-CAMLR-44/BG/31	Progress in developing CCAMLR State of Antarctic Environment (SOAE) reporting Delegations of the United Kingdom, New Zealand, France, Belgium, Chile and CCAMLR Secretariat
SC-CAMLR-44/BG/38	Changes in apparent fishing effort in Subareas 48.1 following the lapse of CM 51-07 ASOC

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

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

‘Distinguished Commissioners, members of the Scientific Committee, esteemed observers, colleagues, and friends,

It is both a privilege and a pleasure to welcome each and all of you to Hobart for this 44th Annual Meeting of the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources. On behalf of the people of Tasmania and our wider Australian community, I extend our warmest greetings as you gather once more in Hobart, renowned as Australia’s Antarctic gateway.

May I begin by acknowledging the Muwinina (moo-win-in-ah) people upon whose land 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, sky and waters.

For more than forty years, CCAMLR has embodied the principles of the Antarctic Treaty System: peace, science, and international cooperation. Together, you have demonstrated how shared stewardship of one of our planet’s last great wildernesses can be achieved through careful science-based management and principled diplomacy. The record high catches in the krill fishery this year have brought global attention to the need for continued vigilance in ensuring sustainable use of Antarctic resources. The eyes of the world remain on CCAMLR, and the Commission’s commitment to precautionary, ecosystem-based management has never been more important.

There are important transitions to note this year. I would like to extend thanks to Mr Tsymbaliuk of Ukraine for his leadership as Chair and to offer our warm congratulations to Mr Robbie Bulloch of the United Kingdom on assuming that role. We also look ahead to the election of a new Executive Secretary during this meeting, who will assume the role at the close of the current Secretary, David Agnew’s distinguished eight-year term. Leadership renewal, coupled with institutional continuity, will be vital as you guide CCAMLR into its fifth decade.

Here in Hobart, the Commission’s presence is interwoven with Tasmania’s identity as a global Antarctic hub. The Australian Antarctic Division, the University of Tasmania’s Institute for Marine and Antarctic Studies, the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation’s Marine Laboratories, and the CCAMLR Secretariat itself, all contribute to making this City a centre of excellence in Antarctic science and governance.

Earlier this year, in August, we also welcomed the Emerging Leaders of the Australian American Leadership Dialogue, who met here to consider the future of Antarctic affairs. While in Hobart, the emerging leaders were involved in a series of focus sessions on Antarctica hosted at Anglesea Barracks, just up the road. We also hosted them for a reception at Government House. All these things act as a reminder that Hobart is not just a host, but a place where international dialogue and innovation flourish.

I also wish to honour the memory and contribution of Sir Guy Green, a distinguished former Governor of Tasmania, who passed away in July. Sir Guy maintained a deep and knowledgeable interest in Antarctic affairs and was a long-time supporter of CCAMLR's mission. His legacy of engagement underscored the deep bond between the Office of the Governor, this State and the work of this Commission.

As you commence your deliberations, you will be inspired by the Antarctic Treaty System itself: a framework that has kept an entire continent dedicated to science and peace for over six decades. The decisions you make here about conservation, sustainable fisheries, and ecosystem health have an impact that resonates far beyond the Southern Ocean. Your decisions affirm that nations can come together, guided by science, to safeguard a shared heritage for all humanity.

May your discussions be ambitious, productive, and collaborative in their vision. Welcome once again to Hobart. I wish you every success in your important work ahead.

Thank you, and I now have the pleasure to hand over to the Chair, Mr Bulloch.'

Agenda for the Forty-fourth Meeting of the Commission

**Agenda for the Forty-fourth 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 Headquarters Agreement
3. Implementation of Convention objectives
 - 3.1 Objectives of the Convention
 - 3.2 Performance Reviews
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
 - 4.5 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 2025 budget, the draft 2026 budget and forecast budget for 2027
- 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 Appointment of Executive Secretary
 - 12.2 Election of Officers
 - 12.3 Invitation of Observers
 - 12.4 Next meeting
- 13. Other business
- 14. Report of the Forty-fourth Meeting of the Commission
- 15. Close of the meeting