

**COMMISSION FOR THE CONSERVATION OF
ANTARCTIC MARINE LIVING RESOURCES**

**REPORT OF THE FORTY-FOURTH MEETING
OF THE COMMISSION**

HOBART, AUSTRALIA
20 – 31 OCTOBER 2025

CCAMLR
181 Macquarie Street
Hobart 7000
Tasmania AUSTRALIA

Telephone: 61 3 6210 1111
Facsimile: 61 3 6224 8744
Email: ccamlr@ccamlr.org
Website: www.ccamlr.org



Chair of the Commission
October 2025

Abstract

This document is the adopted record of the Forty-fourth Meeting of the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources held in Hobart, Australia, from 20 to 31 October 2025. Major topics discussed at this meeting included: compliance with conservation measures in force and illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing in the Convention Area; the Report of the Forty-fourth meeting of CCAMLR's Scientific Committee; research proposals, the management of toothfish, icefish and krill fisheries and the impact of fishing activities on non-target species; spatial management; climate change; budget and administrative matters; and cooperation with other international organisations, including within the Antarctic Treaty System.

Contents

	Page
Opening of the meeting	1
Organisation of the meeting	6
Adoption of the Agenda	6
Status of the Convention	6
Chair's report	7
Proposals for new measures	7
Headquarters agreement	10
Implementation of Convention objectives	10
Objectives of the Convention	10
Performance reviews	13
Management of marine resources	14
Advice from the Scientific Committee	14
Krill resources	14
Krill in Statistical Area 58	29
Fish resources	30
Statistical Area 48	30
Statistical Area 58	32
Statistical Area 88	33
Non-target species	34
Ecosystem monitoring	34
Spatial management	35
Review of existing Marine Protected Areas (MPAs)	35
Proposals for new Marine Protected Areas	35
Other spatial management issues	42
Impacts of climate change on the conservation of Antarctic marine living resources	43
Implementation and compliance	46
Advice from SCIC	46
CDS Fund expenditure	46
Implementation of the CDS	46
Vessel inspections	47
Vessel monitoring system (VMS)	47
Promotion of compliance	48
Transhipment	48
Non-contracting Party engagement strategy	48
Proposals for new and revised conservation measures	49
Conservation Measure 10-03	49
Conservation Measure 10-04	49
Conservation Measure 10-09	49
Conservation Measure 10-10	50
Conservation Measures 21-01 and 21-02	50

Conservation Measure 31-02	51
Conservation Measure 32-XX	51
Conservation Measure 51-06	51
CCAMLR Compliance Report	51
Illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing in the Convention Area	55
Fishery notifications	56
Advice from the Scientific Committee to SCIC	60
Other business	61
CCAMLR Scheme of International Scientific Observation	61
Conservation measures	61
Review of existing measures	62
Implementation and Compliance	62
General fishery matters	63
Toothfish catch limits	63
Icefish catch limits	64
Other fishery matters	64
Administration and finance	64
Review of the 2025 budget, the 2026 budget and forecast budget for 2027	65
Cooperation with the Antarctic Treaty System and international organisations	67
Cooperation with the Antarctic Treaty System	67
Cooperation with international organisations	67
Reports of observers from international organisations	68
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	69
Administrative matters	70
Appointment of the Executive Secretary	70
Election of officers	70
Invitation of Observers	70
Next meeting	71
Other business	71
Report of the Forty-fourth Meeting of the Commission	74
Close of the meeting	75
Tables	76
Annex 1: List of Registered Participants	77
Annex 2: List of Documents	107

Annex 3: Opening Address by the Governor of Tasmania, Her Excellency the Honourable Barbara Baker AC 117

Annex 4: Agenda 121

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)

**Report of the Forty-fourth
Meeting of the Commission**
(Hobart, Australia, 20 to 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, Poland, the Russian Federation (Russia), 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), the 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 N. 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 Pshenichnov in Crimea and called for his immediate release from Russian imprisonment.

1.18 Uruguay made the following statement:

‘Mr Chair,

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 Russia 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 II. It affirmed that the aforementioned matters were outside of the mandate of the Commission under Article IX, and that, moreover, such matters were not presented in line with the CCAMLR 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 CCAMLR 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 L. 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 J. 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 Brierley as Vice-Chair of the Commission and Ms 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 (CM) 51-01 was first 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 II 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 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 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, paragraphs 2.25 to 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 CM 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 US-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.

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

4.35 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.

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

4.37 Most Members reiterated that the DIMPA was ready for adoption, and while recalling that the harmonisation of the KFMA and the DIMPA 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 DIMPA.

4.38 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.

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

4.40 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.

4.41 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.

4.42 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.

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

4.44 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.

4.45 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.

4.46 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.

4.47 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.’

4.48 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.’

4.49 The UK agreed fully with both the Australian and the USA statements.

4.50 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 D1MPA, 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 D1MPA and KFMA toward decisions next year that provide precautionary management arrangements consistent with the objective of the Convention.

4.51 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.

4.52 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 Members.

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 D1MPA

Having said this, we are encouraged by the efforts made by Members 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 Members over the intersessional period to ensure that the Commission is well placed to reach consensus on this matter at next year's meeting.'

4.53 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.'

4.54 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 DIMPA.

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 DIMPA. 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.'

4.55 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.’

4.56 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.’

4.57 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.’

4.58 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 CM 51-07 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.’

4.59 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.’

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

4.61 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.

4.62 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.

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

4.64 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 DIMPA 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

4.65 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).

4.66 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.'

4.67 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.

4.68 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.

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

Fish resources

4.70 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 to 3.10), toothfish aging (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraphs 3.11 and 3.12) and capacity building for toothfish stock assessments (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraphs 3.21 to 3.23).

4.71 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

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

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

4.74 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.

4.75 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).

4.76 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.

4.77 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.

4.78 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).

4.79 The Commission noted the discussions on a research proposal for *D. eleginoides* in Subarea 48.3, management Area A (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraphs 3.45 to 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).

4.80 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).

4.81 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.

4.82 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 to 7.51).

4.83 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).

4.84 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).

4.85 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

4.86 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).

4.87 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 to 3.68).

4.88 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).

4.89 Russia noted that in accordance with CM 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.

4.90 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 CM 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 Annex 24-01/A, Format 2, paragraph 3(a) of CM 24-01 (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 3.63).

4.91 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 24-01/A, Format 2, paragraph 3(a) of CM 24-01 (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 3.66).

4.92 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 CM 24-01, Annex A, as fishing in this Area operates under CM 21-02, paragraph 6(iii).

4.93 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, paragraphs 3.60 to 3.62).

4.94 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.

4.95 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.

4.96 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.

4.97 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

4.98 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).

4.99 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 to 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.

4.100 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).

4.101 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.

4.102 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).

4.103 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 to 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).

4.104 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.

4.105 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.

4.106 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

4.107 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, paragraphs 4.8 to 4.21) and on bottom fishing and vulnerable marine ecosystems (SC-CAMLR-44, paragraphs 4.22 to 4.33).

Ecosystem monitoring

4.108 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).

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

4.110 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.

4.111 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 an RMP to an 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 an 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 4.37). 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, on the initial implementation of the revised krill fishery management approach.

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.

We are concerned about the tone with which our opinions regarding ocean conservation have been treated.

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.

We should point out that contradictions have been observed in the negotiations.

The General Protection Zone (GPZ) in 48.2 should also be taken into account. We believe this should be an immediate commitment to advance the negotiations.

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 krill fishery management approach 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 to 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 to 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' (<https://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 K. Bamford (UK), INTERPOL and Joint Analytical Cell representatives, and Japan, through vessel master Mr F. Kojima and agent Mr M. 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 11 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 Fuentelba* 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 to 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 to 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 Annex 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 to 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 to 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 to 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 Measures 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 CMs 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 to 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 UK 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 IX 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 legalising 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 to 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 UK 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 to 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 UK 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 UK 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 and 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 CM 10-05 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 CM 21-02, paragraph 8.

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 to 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 to 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 Annex 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 Annex 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 M. 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 to 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 to 36).

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

10.7 Four nominations for the Management Panel of the MPA Special 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 and 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, Appendices 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 S. McGuire (USA) as SCAF Chair and Mr J. 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 to 3 July 2025.

Cooperation with international organisations

11.2 The Executive Secretary presented CCAMLR-44/10, 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 CCAMLR-44/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-CAMLR-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, CCAMLR-44/BG/02, CCAMLR-44/BG/05, CCAMLR-44/BG/06, CCAMLR-44/BG/22, CCAMLR-44/BG/32 and CCAMLR-44/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 J.-R. Kim (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 McGuire be elected as SCAF Chair, and Mr Fosbery 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, SEAFDEC, SEAFO, SIOFA, SPRFMO, UNDOALOS, UNEP and WCPFC.

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

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 UK made the following statement:

‘The UK rejects Argentina’s statement.

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

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

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

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.’

13.6 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.’

13.8 Chile presented SC-CAMLR-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.

13.9 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 the proponents to consider concerns of fundamental and scientific nature. Russia suggested a substantive discussion to be held at the ATCM.

13.10 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.

13.11 The Chair presented Dr D. 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 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: Nominated representatives to international meetings in 2025/2026.

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)	5 to 8 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)	2 to 6 March 2026	Switzerland	
The International Whaling Commission (IWC)	28 September to 3 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)	1 to 3 July 2026	Seychelles	
The South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation (SPRFMO)	2 to 6 March 2026	Panama	European Union
The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)	2 to 5 December 2025	Egypt	
The Commission for the Conservation and Management of the Highly Migratory Fish Stocks of the Western and Central Pacific Ocean (WCPFC)	1 to 5 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 Seunggwon 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 Kyeong 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 Kremenyuk Federal Agency for Fisheries
	Alternate Representatives:	Dr Svetlana Kasatkina AtlantNIRO
		Ms Yulia Zhuzhginova Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation
	Advisers:	Mr Evgeny Kim Orion Co. Ltd
		Mr German Lifanov Vodoley LLC
		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 Pesquerias Georgia, S.L
		Mr Roberto Sarralde Vizuet 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 Erdiñç 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 Kanyilmaz 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 Yilmaz 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
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-II 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.
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

SOOS

Adviser: Mrs Agnes Ganichaud
Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research

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

Dr Steve Parker

Fisheries and Observer Reporting Coordinator

Isaac Forster

Science Data Officer

Daphnis De Pooter

Fisheries and Ecosystems Analyst

Dr Stéphane Thanassekos

Fishery Monitoring and Compliance

Fisheries Monitoring and Compliance Manager

Todd Dubois

Compliance Officer

Eldene O'Shea

Fisheries Monitoring and Compliance Data Officer

Henrique Anatole

Research, Monitoring and Compliance Analyst

Claire van Werven

Data Administration Officer

Rachel James

Intern

Molly Claassen

Finance and Administration

Finance, Administration and HR Manager

Alexandra Seager

Accountant

Jade Brinsmead

Human Resources Officer

Angie McMahon

Administrative Services Officer

Amelia Stoneham

Administration Assistant

Nicki Squibb

Communications

Communications Manager

Catherine Stubberfield

Communications Officer

Mariana Cordeiro

Senior Translator (French)

Karine Bachelier

Senior Translator (Russian)

Anton Klevansky

Russian Translator

Elena Mikhailik

Russian Translator

Nick Lenyashin

Senior Translator (Spanish)

Jesús Martínez

Spanish Translator

Facundo Alvarez

Spanish Translator

Alejandra Sycz

Print Production

Bowen Zhang

Data and Information Systems

Data and Information Systems Manager

Gary Dewhurst

Systems Analyst

Ian Meredith

Software Developer

Mingyun Qie

Technical Business Analyst

Mitchell John

Interpreters

Ms Cecilia Alal
Ms Patricia Avila
Ms Lyubov Bezkrovna
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

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

**Report of the Standing Committee on
Implementation and Compliance (SCIC-2025)**

Contents

	Page
Opening of the meeting	1
Organisation of the meeting	1
Review of compliance and implementation-related measures and systems	1
Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS)	1
CDS Fund Review Proposal	1
Implementation of the CDS	2
Vessel Inspection	4
VMS and Vessel Movement Activity within the Convention Area	5
Promotion of Compliance in CCAMLR	5
Transshipment	7
Implementation of the Scheme of International Scientific Observation (SISO)	7
NCP Engagement Strategy	7
Proposals for new and revised compliance-related conservation measures	8
Conservation Measure 10-03	8
Conservation Measure 10-04	9
Conservation Measure 10-09	10
Conservation Measure 10-10	10
Conservation Measures 21-01 and 21-02	11
Conservation Measure 31-02	11
Conservation Measure 51-06	11
Fish nest areas	12
CCAMLR Compliance Evaluation Procedure (CCEP)	12
Provisional Compliance Report	14
Provisional Compliance Report – Part A	15
Conservation Measure 10-03	15
Conservation Measure 10-04	15
Conservation Measure 10-05	16
Conservation Measure 10-09	16
Conservation Measure 22-08	17
Conservation Measure 26-01	17
Conservation Measure 31-01	17
Conservation Measure 91-05	18
Provisional Compliance Report – Part B	18
Review of CM 10-10	19
IUU fishing in the Convention Area	19
Current level of IUU fishing	19
IUU Vessel Lists	20
CP-IUU Vessel List	20
NCP-IUU Vessel List	24
Fishery notifications	24

Advice from the Scientific Committee to SCIC	26
Delayed fishing gear retrieval	26
Catch overruns	27
Notified gear descriptions.....	27
Early arrival of vessels to Ross Sea region toothfish fishery (Subareas 88.1 and 88.2)	27
Defining calibration and standardisation	28
Fish nests	28
Consideration of the Second Performance Review	29
Other business	29
Secretariat tasking	32
Close of the meeting	32
Appendix I: Compliance Issues 2024/25	33
Appendix II: Proposed Non-Contracting Party IUU Vessel List 2025/26	108
Appendix III: Proposed Contracting Party IUU Vessel List 2025/26	109
Appendix IV: Secretariat Tasking	110

**Report of the Meeting of the Standing Committee
on Implementation and Compliance (SCIC-2025)**
(Hobart, Australia, 20 to 24 October 2025)

Opening of the meeting

1. The Meeting of the Standing Committee on Implementation and Compliance (SCIC) was held in Hobart, Australia, from 20 to 24 October 2025.
2. The Chair of SCIC, Mr A. Berry (New Zealand), opened the meeting by welcoming Members and Observers, and thanked the Secretariat for its support. The Chair further expressed thanks to Members for their intersessional work in preparation for a productive and efficient meeting.
3. While all parts of this report provide important information for the Commission, paragraphs of the report summarising SCIC's advice to the Commission have been highlighted in grey.

Organisation of the meeting

4. SCIC considered the SCIC Agenda as adopted by the Commission.

Review of compliance and implementation-related measures and systems

Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS)

CDS Fund Review Proposal

5. SCIC considered CCAMLR-44/12, which provided an update on the expenditure from the Catch Documentation Scheme for *Dissostichus* spp. (CDS) Fund in 2025 and three proposals to be considered for approval by the CDS Fund Review Panel.
6. SCIC recalled several proposals approved at CCAMLR-43, which had been successfully implemented for e-CDS enhancements and for in-person CDS training for Singapore. SCIC recalled the approval at CCAMLR-42 (paragraph 18) of funds to support online CDS training in 2024 and 2025 and noted that two online workshops were held in December 2024 and further workshops are scheduled for late 2025. SCIC further recalled that no requests for training had been received from Contracting Parties or cooperating non-Contracting Parties (NCPs).
7. SCIC noted that no funds have been expended to support the implementation of the NCP Strategy and Action Plan (2025–26) in relation to cooperation through participation in the CDS, further noting that it is anticipated that this funding will be spent in late 2025 and 2026.
8. SCIC considered the update on the outcomes and expenditure of the CDS and Port Inspection Workshop held in Cape Town, South Africa in May 2025 (CCAMLR-44/BG/07). SCIC congratulated South Africa on the successful workshop, noting the attendance covered 44

participants from 9 Contracting Parties and 1 cooperating non-Contracting Party (NCP) and that feedback was positive. SCIC noted that the workshop participants made 24 recommendations across a number of subject areas which are under consideration by SCIC in the respective agenda item.

9. Noting the requirement of CM 10-05, Annex 10-05/B, for the designation of a Review Panel to consider the CDS Fund expenditure proposal and make recommendations to the Commission, SCIC convened the CDS Fund Review Panel which comprised representatives from Australia, France, the Republic of Korea (Korea), New Zealand, the United Kingdom (UK) and the United States of America (USA).

10. The CDS Fund Review Panel thanked the Secretariat for the detailed proposal and recommended the expenditure from the e-CDS fund in support of the following proposals:

- (i) online CDS training workshops, with a value of A\$10 000 for 2026 and 2027. The Panel recalled SCIC's deliberations on developing e-learning CDS modules and requested the Secretariat continue the further development of e-learning CDS modules in 2026 and 2027. The Panel noted the current staffing constraints are prohibiting further development of e-learning modules and requested that the Secretariat develop a workplan in the intersessional period on how this could be implemented in 2027
- (ii) in-person CDS training on request, with a value of A\$60 000 for use in 2026 and 2027 for two in-person CDS training workshops requested by Contracting Parties or cooperating non-Contracting Parties (NCPs)
- (iii) a regional CDS/NCP Engagement Workshop in the Middle East, with a value of A\$120 000 for 2026 or 2027. The panel noted the need for including Contracting Parties attendance, specifically those with regional trade connections. The Panel noted that the proposal noted Contracting Parties travel support (CCAMLR-44/12, paragraph 15). Additionally, the Panel recommended that Contracting Parties that wish to attend the CDS workshop could make an application for the use of the A\$60 000 approved for the in-person CDS training workshops.

11. SCIC thanked the CDS Fund Review Panel for its work and endorsed the expenditure proposal for the consideration of the Commission.

Implementation of the CDS

12. SCIC noted the implementation report of the Catch Documentation Scheme for *Dissostichus* spp. (CCAMLR-44/13) and noted that no Specially Validated *Dissostichus* Catch Documents (SVDCDs) have been issued, or fraudulent documents identified.

13. SCIC noted the following recommendations by the participants of the CDS and Port Inspection workshop held in Cape Town:

- (i) enhance e-CDS data summaries and extraction;

- (ii) strengthen logic controls for product codes and conversion factors – this will require consideration by the Commission or its Working Groups to agree to standardised Conversion Factors;
- (iii) introduce an optional or mandatory field in the *Dissostichus* Export Document (DED)/ *Dissostichus* Re-Export Document (DRED) template for recording weight verification at point of import;
- (iv) add a field for the number of product units to the templates;
- (v) allow for users to close documents or a senior officer to block a document from being used for export/re-export;
- (vi) reconsider the current annual user account expiry setting (1 March);
- (vii) provide automated reminders for incomplete documents; and
- (viii) add a comment field to CDS documents.

14. SCIC noted in respect of recommendation (ii) ‘to strengthen logic controls for product codes and conversion factors,’ that an intersessional working group which included subject matter experts will need to be convened. SCIC further noted that conversion factors are also discussed by the Scientific Committee and encourages Members to work with their scientific colleagues on the matter.

15. SCIC recommended that an intersessional discussion group be created to consult with subject-matter experts to consider the abovementioned recommendations of the Cape Town workshop that pertain to CDS issues and tasked the Secretariat with making the necessary arrangements and reporting back on the implementation of the CDS-related recommendations at SCIC-2026.

16. As per CM 10-05, Annex 10-05/C, paragraph C9, SCIC considered the current cooperating status granted to Colombia, Mexico, Singapore and Thailand.

17. SCIC noted with concern that the Secretariat has been trying to get a Mexican point of contact assigned to arrange for CDS training for the previous four years. SCIC reflected on the revocation of the CCAMLR cooperative status of Seychelles in 2017 and Singapore in 2011. SCIC recommended the Commission task the Secretariat with writing to Mexico requesting they fulfil their obligations in respect of CM 10-05 and undertake CDS training in the 2025–2026 intersessional period, noting failure to do so would be grounds for revoking their cooperative status at CCAMLR-45.

18. COLTO noted with great concern that a known IUU actor has resumed fishing for toothfish in the international waters north of the Convention Area and has notified for participation in the Ross Sea fishery. COLTO further noted the Ecuadorian-flagged vessel *Altar 11* has been fishing in the south-west Atlantic targeting toothfish since March 2025 using gillnets, as noted in the Secretariat’s CDS implementation paper CCAMLR-44/13. COLTO urged that robust due diligence is applied by SCIC to any notifications involving these vessels or operators and further encouraged the Flag State to demonstrate full transparency around vessel ownership, licensing, and operational oversight.

19. SCIC thanked COLTO for bringing this information to its attention and reminded Members that the management of vessels is the responsibility of the respective Flag State.

Vessel Inspection

20. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-03 and the System of Inspection in 2024/25 in CCAMLR-44/15 which noted that 124 port inspections and 24 at-sea inspections were undertaken.

21. SCIC endorsed the Secretariat's proposal to convene an intersessional panel on inspection resources. The panel will prioritise the development of resources based on the results of the inspector survey (CCAMLR-44/15, Annex 1) and the provision of technical guidance and support to the Secretariat during their preparation. SCIC noted that the intersessional panel will conduct its work through a dedicated online discussion group and virtual meetings with participation from subject matter experts. SCIC tasked the Secretariat with making the necessary arrangements to facilitate and support the work of the panel.

22. SCIC also considered the recommendations of the CDS and Port Inspection workshop (CCAMLR-44/BG/07) undertaken in South Africa and recommended that the intersessional panel on inspection resources consider the following recommendations of the workshop that pertain to inspection activities:

- (i) development of a standardised inspector tool kit list
- (ii) improvements to inspection report templates/form
- (iii) improved clarity on transmission of port inspection and at-sea inspection reports to the inspected vessel
- (iv) development of an electronic CCAMLR ID card for inspectors under SOI and provision of the ID numbers on the CCAMLR website
- (v) standardised risk assessment for evaluating vessels entering port.

23. SCIC noted the progress achieved in the development of the electronic reporting project and endorsed its continued implementation. SCIC requested that further development take into account integration with internal CCAMLR data holdings, the need for offline data entry capability and consideration of interoperability with relevant external data systems, including the GIES under the PSMA.

24. SCIC affirmed that, in respect to the responsibilities of the provision of Part A of the Inspection Report, this part has to be completed by the vessel's master when providing the 48-hours' notice before entering a port.

25. SCIC considered the Secretariat's reconciliation of AIS data with CCAMLR's port inspection data holdings (CCAMLR-44/BG/13), noting that the analysis served as a proxy for assessing inspection rates by Contracting Parties in accordance with the requirements of CM 10-03. SCIC recognised the usefulness of this analysis and recommended that the Secretariat undertake it on an annual basis. SCIC further noted that future analyses should

acknowledge the limitations in the accuracy of AIS data and confirmed that such analyses are not to be used for compliance purposes.

VMS and Vessel Movement Activity within the Convention Area

26. SCIC considered the vessel monitoring system (VMS) implementation report submitted by the Secretariat (CCAMLR-44/17) and noted the implementation of CM 10-04 by Contracting Parties. The paper also reports on the Secretariat tests to prototype a system for automatic movement notifications.

27. SCIC reminded vessels and Members to ensure vessel movement reports are submitted to the Secretariat in the format specified in Annex 10-04/A.

28. SCIC endorsed the Secretariat's proposed changes to 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 and to improve submissions of data.

29. SCIC endorsed the Secretariat's continued work to develop an automated VMS movement notification functionality and highlighted its potential benefits. SCIC urged the Secretariat to prioritise this project. Some Members expressed interest in participating in any trials of the new system and requested a timeline to move the project forward.

30. SCIC endorsed the Secretariat's recommendation to discontinue paying for Inmarsat position reports from the 2025/2026 season forward and have Contracting Parties with vessels continuing to report to CCAMLR via the Inmarsat email address to ensure that these positions are redirected, or that vessel operators are instructed to undertake this action.

Promotion of Compliance in CCAMLR

31. SCIC welcomed Chile's submission (CCAMLR-44/01) on monitoring control and surveillance (MCS) activities undertaken by Chile in Subarea 48.1 during the 2024/25 fishing season. 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.

32. SCIC thanked Chile for their extensive operations in Subarea 48.1 under challenging Antarctic conditions. SCIC reiterated the importance of operational leadership and shared efforts among Parties, noting that consistency and fairness in implementation strengthen collective confidence in vessel compliance across the CCAMLR fleet.

33. SCIC noted CCAMLR-44/BG/15 which provided an update on the intersessional work undertaken by Chile as lead for the Development of Electronic Monitoring Systems (EMS) Guidelines Discussion Group.

34. SCIC noted that many Members already implement EMS through domestic regimes, further noting that vessels within the Ross Sea MSC client group and all COLTO member vessels implement some level of EMS aboard. SCIC emphasised the importance for CCAMLR in complementing established MCS practices and supporting scientific observations through the implementation of EMS.

35. SCIC encouraged all Members to complete the EMS survey to inform future discussions, with the ambition that a phased implementation approach guided by a clear roadmap that considers the views of different Members and stakeholders will come from the survey results.

36. SCIC thanked New Zealand for their aerial surveillance patrols undertaken during the 2024/25 season as reported in CCAMLR-44/BG/21 and for their commitment to conducting regular patrols of the Ross Sea region into the future. No IUU vessels or activity were detected, and no potential compliance issues were identified amongst the 13 vessels observed.

37. SCIC welcomed Argentina's report (CCAMLR-44/BG/25) on MCS activities undertaken by Argentina during the 2024/25 fishing season in Subarea 48.2. SCIC noted that 10 vessels engaged in krill fishing activities were identified, with full compliance with CCAMLR conservation measures reported. Additionally, SCIC noted that CCAMLR inspectors deployed upon the icebreaker *Almirante Irizar* were unable to undertake at-sea inspections due to the extreme weather conditions and therefore undertook radio communication with four CCAMLR-licensed fishing vessels obtaining information on the vessels fishing operations which was verified with CCAMLR's data holdings.

38. SCIC noted its appreciation to Argentina for its efforts to undertake surveillance patrols and inspection activities on behalf of CCAMLR.

39. SCIC acknowledged the value of additional compliance monitoring that could enhance the existing compliance toolbox and support Members in their efforts to monitor adherence to conservation measures, particularly in circumstances where at-sea inspections may be constrained by adverse weather conditions. SCIC recalled document CCAMLR-43/BG/25 Rev. 1, which outlined the development of radio inspection protocols. The Committee expressed appreciation for the UK's offer to collaborate with interested Parties during the intersessional period to advance these mechanisms.

40. Some Members recalled that although CM 10-04 establishes that, for krill fishing, vessels have up to 10 working days from the time of departure from the Convention Area to submit VMS data to the Secretariat, the majority of the fishing vessels observed were transmitting VMS data in real time.

41. SCIC noted the update provided by the USA on the surveillance patrol mission undertaken by the United States Coast Guard icebreaker *Polar Star* during the 2024/25 season, noting that the mission had provided information on vessel sightings within the Convention Area while transiting to and from McMurdo Station. SCIC further noted that, in light of the success of this initial mission, the USA intends to continue such efforts this season.

Transshipment

42. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-09 (CCAMLR-44/16) noting that 314 transshipments occurred from 1 December 2024 to 1 August 2025, of which 160 were of krill products.

43. SCIC considered the declining compliance with CM 10-09 but noted the overall compliance rate remains relatively high at 92%. SCIC further noted with concern that some Contracting Party vessels have made enquiries to the Secretariat regarding reflagging to non-Contracting Parties, which might be a way to avoid implementing CCAMLR Conservation Measures. SCIC noted that additional measures might be needed to address this.

44. SCIC considered the application of CM 10-09 in relation to the transshipment of crew, observers and other personnel, including their personal gear. SCIC noted that differing interpretations existed regarding the application of CM 10-09 and agreed that the measure does not clearly specify whether such activities are covered.

45. SCIC noted the extended period that transshipments were being notified for and considered the application of the requirement of CM 10-09, paragraph 2, to provide a notification 72 hours before a transshipment was intended to occur. SCIC considered that there are a number of operational and environmental factors that vessel operators contend with while operating in the Convention Area and noted that these could be contributing to Contracting Parties requesting extended notification periods.

46. SCIC agreed that CM 10-09 is due for comprehensive revision, including clarifying and addressing existing issues with the applicable monitoring requirements and associated operational challenges.

Implementation of the Scheme of International Scientific Observation (SISO)

47. SCIC noted WG-FSA-2025/02 which provided an update on the implementation of the CCAMLR Scheme of International Scientific Observation (SISO) during 2024/25. Recalling its discussion from SCIC-2024 (paragraph 88), SCIC noted that no specific actions were identified as requiring consideration by SCIC at this time and emphasised the continuing importance of the SISO.

NCP Engagement Strategy

48. SCIC noted the review of the implementation of the current NCP Engagement Strategy and Action Plan for 2025–26 (CCAMLR-44/BG/11), which was endorsed by the Commission at CCAMLR-43 (paragraph 7.30).

49. SCIC acknowledged the importance of the Secretariat's continued efforts to develop relationships with non-Contracting Parties (NCPs) in order to promote their cooperation with CCAMLR and encouraged continuation of these efforts.

50. SCIC expressed concern over the lack of engagement by many NCPs, noting the failure to respond to the letters from the Executive Secretary, which limits the effectiveness of the Strategy, and encouraged all Contracting Parties to actively support these engagement efforts through diplomatic channels and trade relationships.

51. SCIC noted the positive engagement from 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, SCIC endorsed the continued engagement with NCPs in the Southeast Asia region.

52. SCIC 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.

53. SCIC further noted that a mechanism to apply a cooperating status to extend to transshipment vessels flagged to NCPs could be considered and that this would require further discussion (paragraph 43).

Proposals for new and revised compliance-related conservation measures

Conservation Measure 10-03

54. SCIC considered the proposal by Australia, Korea, New Zealand and the USA to amend CM 10-03 (CCAMLR-44/02 Rev. 1) to require Contracting Parties to inspect all vessels carrying any Antarctic marine living resources, including krill or krill products that were harvested in the Convention Area, and propose updates to Annex 10-03/B. The proponents noted that these amendments would improve CCAMLR's understanding of which flag states are landing krill and krill products and improve CCAMLR's ability to monitor trade and evaluate compliance with relevant conservation measures.

55. SCIC did not reach consensus to increase the rate of port inspections of all vessels entering ports carrying species other than *Dissostichus* spp. China noted that it supported the sustainable management strategies but was concerned that this proposal was overstating risk. China stated that the catch in Subareas 48.1, 48.2 and 48.3 is reasonable, below the catch limit and aligns with predators' low-demand period. China also emphasised that some Contracting Parties were not meeting their compliance requirements with port inspections of *Dissostichus* spp. and was concerned that increasing the rate of port inspections of krill vessels would create an additional burden to port states and possible risk of IUU *Dissostichus* spp. opportunities. China stressed that port inspections for marine mammal exclusion devices on trawl gear and measures to mitigate seabird mortality are unnecessary – on-board inspections already cover these devices, and port checks cannot verify their sea use.

56. SCIC considered the inclusion of additional product codes to the Port Inspection Report in Annex 10-03/B, noting that these new codes represented the different types of products on inspected vessels and increased the transparency of the fishing activities. The proposed amendments were endorsed by SCIC and referred to the Commission for adoption. SCIC did not reach consensus on the remaining amendments of the proposal and it was referred to the Commission for further discussion.

57. SCIC also considered a proposal to amend CM 10-03, led by Australia, to improve the Secretariat's knowledge of port landings by requiring vessels simultaneously submit the information required in CM 10-03/Annex A to both the Contracting Party and the Secretariat. Australia noted the proposal would lead to increased transparency and a clearer understanding of the number of port visits by vessels and would assist in determining the number and location of landings. SCIC noted the discussion on this proposal and that Members would continue to develop the proposal during the intersessional period.

Conservation Measure 10-04

58. SCIC considered 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. The proponents noted that such an amendment would make the VMS reporting requirement for krill and other CCAMLR fisheries consistent with the reporting requirement for CCAMLR exploratory longline fisheries, which in conjunction with the development of the Catch Documentation Scheme has been effective at preventing trade in illegal, unreported, and unregulated (IUU) harvested toothfish. They also noted that expanding this requirement to all CCAMLR fisheries would ensure the integrity and legality of all CCAMLR-harvested products and improve the ability to monitor and manage CCAMLR's krill fishery.

59. Korea emphasised the importance of real-time transmission of VMS data for the effective monitoring of fishing activities, noting that most vessels already transmit such data directly to the Secretariat. Korea further highlighted that ensuring real-time transmission from all vessels is critical from a safety perspective.

60. Some Members considered that the proposal presented an invalid causality between the transmission frequency and improvements in krill management outcomes. These Members further noted that there is no identified IUU risk that would justify the proposed change, and that existing practices already ensure an adequate level of safety and oversight for vessels operating in the Convention Area.

61. SCIC noted Secretariat advice that real-time reporting would not increase financial costs and would not result in an increased workload for the Secretariat.

62. SCIC could not reach consensus to amend CM 10-04 with this proposal and it was referred to the Commission for further discussion.

63. SCIC recalled its discussion on improving vessel movement report submissions (paragraphs 27 and 28), noting 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. The proposed amendments were endorsed by SCIC and referred to the Commission for adoption.

Conservation Measure 10-09

64. SCIC considered the proposal by Korea to amend CM 10-09 (CCAMLR-44/29) to encourage both Contracting Parties and non-Contracting Parties to provide, to the extent possible, the information specified in CM 10-02, paragraph 2, for carrier vessels under their flag that engage in transshipment activities in the CAMLR Convention Area and the creation of a CCAMLR record of carrier vessels.

65. Reflecting SCICs deliberation on the CCEP report (paragraphs 100 and 116 to 122), SCIC also gave consideration to:

- (i) the application of the 72-hour notification period required for transshipments of harvested marine living resources, bait and fuel;
- (ii) the notification to the Secretariat of the transshipment of crew, observer or personnel together with, as applicable, their personal gear; and
- (iii) the application of a force majeure, distress, or a medical emergency clause.

66. SCIC endorsed the revision of CM 10-09 and referred it to the Commission for adoption.

Conservation Measure 10-10

67. 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.' This category would apply when SCIC cannot reach agreement on a compliance designation despite all reasonable efforts being exhausted. In such cases, the compliance issue would be forwarded to the Commission, with the associated discussions reflected in the SCIC report. This approach ensures that SCIC can accurately record its deliberations, assign compliance designations where agreement exists, and still adopt a Provisional CCAMLR Compliance Report.

68. Many Members expressed their support for the proposed revisions, noting that this is an issue of efficiency and would be a better use of SCIC's time. These Members reflected with disappointment being unable to adopt a compliance report in previous years.

69. China noted that they respect the aim of the proposal but had concerns that it would not address the root cause of compliance and could lead to Contracting Parties avoiding accountability. China was also concerned about Contracting Parties refusing to acknowledge their obligations.

70. Russia recognised the intention to improve compliance process and procedure but was concerned that the additional category would not address previous challenges of not adopting a CCAMLR Compliance Report. Russia noted the role of the Chair of SCIC to decide if an issue is unresolvable or not and reiterated the rule of consensus in the CCEP.

71. SCIC did not reach consensus on this proposal, and it was referred to the Commission for further discussion.

Conservation Measures 21-01 and 21-02

72. SCIC considered the proposal by the European Union (EU) to amend CMs 21-01 and 21-02 (CCAMLR-44/18). The proposed changes were to specify in CM 21-01 that the presence of a scientific observer on board is required for new fisheries, and to specify in CM 21-02 that the scientific observers should be appointed in accordance with SISO.

73. Many Members expressed their support for the proposed revisions, but some Members recalled that no notifications for new fisheries were submitted this year, that these fisheries have more of a scientific nature and that the requirement of an extra observer would increase costs when it comes their implementation.

74. The EU explained that it would be desirable to put in place the requirement to have a SISO observer onboard for new fisheries before any notifications for such a fishery are received, noting that SISO observer coverage is a relevant element to be considered by the Scientific Committee in its review of the Fisheries Operations Plan and the development of the data collection plan. The EU noted that having a SISO observer onboard is essential to ensure the collection of objective and high-quality data and other information in respect of new fisheries.

75. SCIC could not reach consensus on revisions to CM 21-01 and CM 21-02. The proposal was referred to the Commission for further consideration.

Conservation Measure 31-02

76. SCIC considered the proposals by the 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. Some Members recalled this was considered during SCIC-2023 and SCIC-2024, further noting that drafting suggestions previously provided on this matter should be incorporated into any future proposals.

77. SCIC could not reach consensus on the revision of CM 31-02 and the proposal was referred to the Commission for further consideration.

Conservation Measure 51-06

78. SCIC considered 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 proponents noted that requiring data collection that is standardised across the fishing fleet is necessary to ensure robust and consistent data collection across the krill fishery. In addition, the text of SISO includes provisions to ensure the safety of SISO observers.

79. China expressed the view that the proposal discriminates against national observers and recalled that a Chinese national observer won a SISO award at CCAMLR-43. Additionally, Russia noted that observer tasks differ between the krill and toothfish fisheries, and noted that there was no advantage in deploying a SISO observer instead of a national observer.

80. SCIC could not reach consensus on the revision of CM 51-06. The proposal was referred to the Commission for further consideration.

Fish nest areas

81. SCIC considered the proposal from the EU and its Member States (CCAMLR 44/21) for a new CM 32-XX to provide protection to fish nest areas and promote non-destructive research to understand their importance in the CAMLR Convention Area.

82. The EU recalled that the proposal had been developed following the discovery of Jonah's icefish (*Neopagetopsis ionah*) fish nest areas in the southern Weddell Sea, and noted that the proposal takes a circumpolar approach, as recommended by the Scientific Committee.

83. Many Members welcomed the proposal, recalling that this topic had been discussed in-depth in previous years, highlighted the need for protection of essential habitats and reiterated that protecting these nests is a crucial measure for conservation. Noting that the matter was considered further by the Scientific Committee Chair (paragraph 212), some Members stated that they could not support the proposal at this time, noting that further work was needed.

84. SCIC could not reach consensus on this proposal and referred it to the Commission for further consideration.

CCAMLR Compliance Evaluation Procedure (CCEP)

85. SCIC considered the Secretariat's report and analysis of the CCEP (CCAMLR-44/11 Rev. 2), noting that compliance rates exceeded 95% for the majority of assessed obligations. SCIC further noted that a comparative analysis of recent CCEP reports indicates overall stability in compliance with CMs 10-04, 10-05, 26-01 and 91-05. However, SCIC observed an increase in instances of non-compliance with CM 10-09 over the period 2023 to 2025.

86. SCIC noted that the use of fireworks by a CCAMLR Member vessel in December 2024 in the Ross Sea region had been reported to the Secretariat. Some Members considered that such use within the Convention Area could constitute a potential breach of CM 26-01 and CM 91-05. Accordingly, SCIC recommended that the Commission review its mandate on this matter and, in doing so, consideration be given to developing a conservation measure to regulate the use of fireworks and explosives.

87. SCIC recalled COMM CIRCs 24/138, 25/01 and 25/12 regarding several gear conflict incidents and noted that the Secretariat's review of the Conservation Measures did not identify that a breach had occurred. SCIC further noted Ukraine's concern on the issue and its emphasis on building relationships as a national priority, whilst noting that no gear was removed in the incident and that Ukraine will continue to closely monitor its vessels' activities into the future.

88. SCIC noted that the development of a protocol on inter-vessel conduct within CCAMLR would be beneficial in such circumstances and requested that COLTO and ARK consider leading an industry initiative on this matter. COLTO recalled that approximately 90% of toothfish operators are COLTO members with well-established working relationships and

indicated that it would consider ways to extend this standard of cooperation to non-COLTO members.

89. SCIC considered a request from the Secretariat to provide advice on the pre-season entry of seven licensed vessels that entered Subareas 88.1 and 88.2 between 16 October and 4 November 2024. SCIC noted that some vessels entered the area up to 46 days prior to the start of the fishing season, further noting that such entry is not currently prohibited by Conservation Measures (see also paragraphs 201 to 208).

90. Some Members observed that domestic definitions of ‘fishing’, and those used by regional fisheries management organisations, may include searching for fish or other preparatory activities.

91. Many Members expressed concern over the pre-season entry and noted that this is a significant change from past practice. They also requested additional information to gain an understanding of the reasons behind such early entries.

92. China expressed concern that such early entry could not reasonably be considered preparation for the season and may constitute entry into a closed area, which in other fisheries management organisations could be regarded as indicative of IUU activity.

93. Many Members expressed the potential need for an amendment to a relevant conservation measure to address the issue in limiting pre-season entry to the fishing grounds and recommended further intersessional discussion.

94. South Africa noted that any such amendment should ensure vessels are not required to leave an open fishery only to return on the new opening date.

95. COLTO expressed support for the development of a measure addressing this issue.

96. SCIC noted the Secretariat’s request for clarification on how fishing gear deployed on a vessel, where such gear differs from that specified in the fishery notification or fishing licence, should be addressed within the compliance evaluation procedure.

97. Some Members considered that a certain level of flexibility should be secured in terms of operational necessity while at the same time recognising that such change should be minimal, without causing negative impacts to the environment and ecosystem.

98. SCIC considered the matter to be technical in nature and sought further advice from the Chair of the Scientific Committee (see paragraphs 198 to 200).

99. SCIC considered a request from the Secretariat seeking clarification on whether the role of CCEP Contact may be assigned to industry representatives, noting that CCAMLR users holding this role are contacted by the Secretariat throughout the year regarding compliance-related matters. SCIC reaffirmed that it remains the prerogative of each Member to determine who is assigned this role. However, SCIC also noted that responses to draft compliance reports shall only be provided by government officials holding the CCEP Contact role.

100. SCIC considered the request from the Secretariat to clarify how the transshipment of sick and injured crew shall be treated in the compliance evaluation procedure, noting previous discussions of SCIC on the priority of safety of life at sea above administering reports. In

relation to the transshipment of crew, observers and other personnel, including their personal gear, SCIC noted that differing interpretations existed regarding the application of CM 10-09. SCIC further noted that CM 10-09 does not cover the transshipment of crew, observers, personnel and their personal gear.

101. Some Members noted that not adequately monitored transshipment activity is broadly acknowledged to facilitate IUU fishing and associated activities and highlighted the importance of receiving notification any time two vessels come together in the Convention Area, whether for transshipment of fish, supplies, or crew.

102. SCIC considered the following recommendations from the CDS and Port Inspection workshop held in Cape Town, South Africa which related to the CCEP:

- (i) development of a mechanism in CM 10-10 which facilitates bilateral resolution between CCAMLR parties through the draft report on the CCAMLR portal before draft reports are returned,
- (ii) permit the use of open-source data by the Secretariat in the CCEP, and
- (iii) recognise the differences of a scientific observer and compliance observer.

103. In respect of the development of a mechanism to facilitate bilateral resolution, SCIC did not agree that facilitation of bilateral discussions through the online CCEP CCAMLR portal was appropriate and did not endorse the recommendation.

104. In relation to the use of open-source data by the Secretariat within the CCEP, SCIC noted that such data should be objective and reliable before being used for compliance analysis. SCIC requested that the Secretariat further explore this option with caution and provide additional information to SCIC in 2026.

105. In relation to the distinction between scientific and compliance observers, SCIC noted that CCAMLR deploys only SISO observers. SCIC reiterated that SISO observers, as scientific observers, are focused on the collection of scientific data. SCIC further noted that they should not be tasked with assessing compliance matters, though their information can be more broadly relevant, and recalled that there are no designated compliance observers within CCAMLR.

Provisional Compliance Report

106. In accordance with CM 10-10, paragraph 3(i), SCIC considered the 73 potential compliance incidents across nine different conservation measures in the CCEP Summary Report (CCAMLR-44/11 Rev. 2). Following consultation, SCIC adopted, for further consideration by the Commission, its annual Provisional Compliance Report (Appendix I) in accordance with CM 10-10, noting that consensus on a compliance status was not achieved on two compliance issues. For most issues, SCIC agreed to assess the preliminary status provided by the relevant Contracting Party.

107. The Provisional Compliance Report contains two parts. Part A contains compliance issues identified in the CCEP for the period 1 July 2024 to 30 June 2025. Part B contains the

issues noted by the Commission as requiring additional information from a Contracting Party in the previous year's CCAMLR Compliance Report (CCAMLR-43).

Provisional Compliance Report – Part A

Conservation Measure 10-03

108. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-03, paragraph 4, by New Zealand regarding the requirement for vessels seeking entry to port to provide 48 hours' notice. SCIC agreed to the suggested compliant status of minor non-compliant (Level 1) for the issue.

109. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-03, paragraph 5, regarding the requirement for a port inspection to be conducted within 48 hours of port entry by Chile, France, Namibia, South Africa for one issue each; New Zealand for two issues; and Uruguay for three issues. SCIC agreed to the suggested compliance status of compliant for the issues regarding France and Namibia, and to the suggested compliance status of minor non-compliant (Level 1) for the issues regarding Chile, New Zealand, South Africa and Uruguay.

110. In respect of the three issues concerning Uruguay, SCIC noted that the Port of Montevideo can experience congestion due to the volume of incoming vessels. Uruguay advised that, due to personnel constraints, it applies a risk-based approach to determine inspection priorities. Uruguay further noted that, as a signatory to the Port State Measures Agreement (PSMA), it implements a number of pre-arrival requirements, including the submission of cargo declarations, crew lists, and permits. These documents, together with the vessel's past compliance history and recent activity, are assessed to determine the level of compliance risk associated with each vessel. SCIC thanked Uruguay for providing context on the application of its risk assessment approach, and the UK noted that it did not share the view that one of the vessels inspected represented a 'low risk'.

111. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-03, paragraph 8, regarding the transmission of a port inspection report to the Secretariat more than 30 days after the inspection date by Chile, Namibia and the United Kingdom, for one issue each, South Africa for two issues, and Uruguay for three issues. SCIC agreed to the suggested compliance status of minor non-compliant (Level 1) for all issues.

Conservation Measure 10-04

112. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-04, regarding the requirement for Flag States to notify the Secretariat within 24 hours of each entry to, exit from, and movement between subareas of the Convention Area by France, Korea and South Africa for three issues each. SCIC agreed to the suggested compliance status of minor non-compliant (Level 1) for all issues for France and South Africa. For the issues for Korea, SCIC agreed to the suggested compliance status of compliant in two issues, noted the additional information provided in COMM CIRC 25/98 and revised the suggested remaining compliance status to compliant.

Conservation Measure 10-05

113. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-05, paragraph 6, regarding the prohibition on exporting or re-exporting toothfish without an accompanying *Dissostichus* Export Document (DED) or *Dissostichus* Re-Export Document (DRED) by Argentina, Chile, France, Japan, New Zealand, South Africa, Spain and Uruguay.

114. SCIC agreed to the suggested compliance status of Compliant for Argentina, France (in relation to one of its issues) and New Zealand. SCIC also agreed to the suggested compliance status of Minor Non-Compliant (Level 1) for Chile, France (in relation to its remaining issue) Japan, South Africa, and Uruguay.

115. Uruguay noted the significant progress achieved over time in improving compliance with CM 10-05, while highlighting the need for additional personnel to further strengthen its capacity. Uruguay also recalled the participation of new staff members in the recent CDS Port Inspection Workshop held in South Africa and expressed appreciation to the Secretariat for facilitating this opportunity.

Conservation Measure 10-09

116. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-09, paragraph 2, regarding that each Contracting Party as a Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance if any of its vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area for Ukraine and Vanuatu for one issue each, Panama for two issues, Russia for three issues, Norway for five issues and the Netherlands for six issues.

117. SCIC agreed to the suggested compliance status of compliant for Panama for one issue. SCIC agreed to the suggested compliance status of minor non-compliant (Level 1) for all the issues for the Netherlands, Russia and Ukraine, and for the remaining Panamanian issue.

118. SCIC noted that for consistency across all issues of non-compliance with CM 10-09, paragraph 2, it revised the suggested compliance status to minor non-compliant (Level 1) for all Norwegian issues. SCIC noted that whilst an explanation was provided by Vanuatu, no suggested compliance status was provided for the issue of non-compliance and agreed to assign the compliance status of minor non-compliant (Level 1).

119. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-09, paragraph 3, by China, which requires each Contracting Party to notify the Secretariat at least two hours in advance of the transshipment if any of its vessels propose to tranship items other than harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel within the Convention Area. SCIC agreed to the suggested compliance status of compliant.

120. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-09, paragraph 5, regarding that each Flag State shall confirm the information provided in a transshipment notification within 3 working days of having transhipped, for China and the Netherlands for one issue each, and Korea, Norway and Russia for two issues each.

121. SCIC agreed to the suggested compliance status of compliant for Korea, and to the suggested compliance status of minor non-compliant (Level 1) for China, the Netherlands and

Russia. SCIC noted that for consistency across similar issues of non-compliance with CM 10-09, paragraph 5, it revised the suggested compliance status to minor non-compliant (Level 1) for all Norwegian issues.

122. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-09, paragraph 8, by Panama, Russia and Vanuatu, which states that no vessel may conduct transshipment within the Convention Area for which prior notification, pursuant to CM 10-09, paragraphs 2, 3 and 4, has not been given. SCIC agreed to the suggested compliance status of compliant. SCIC noted that whilst an explanation was provided by Vanuatu, no suggested compliance status was provided for the issue of non-compliance and agreed to assign the compliance status of compliant.

Conservation Measure 22-08

123. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 22-08, paragraph 1, by Korea regarding the prohibition of fishing in exploratory fisheries for *Dissostichus* spp. in depths shallower than 550 meters. SCIC agreed to the suggested compliance status of compliant.

Conservation Measure 26-01

124. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 26-01, paragraph 8, by Namibia and Norway, regarding the prohibition of the dumping or discharging of offal or discard south of 60°S. SCIC agreed to the suggested compliance statuses of compliant for Namibia, and minor non-compliant (Level 1) for Norway.

Conservation Measure 31-01

125. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 31-01, which states that for each fishing season the Commission shall establish such limitations or other measures, as necessary, around South Georgia (Subarea 48.3) in connection with the fishing activities of the UK vessels *Argos Helena* (Appendix I, item 69) and *Nordic Prince* (Appendix I, item 70).

126. Argentina, in the interests of saving time, recalled its clear position on the matter, made during discussions in the agenda item on IUU fishing (paragraph 150).

127. The USA made the following statement:

‘Members’ differences should not prevent us from working together toward our common goal of setting toothfish catch limits and other necessary measures for Subarea 48.3, based on the recommendations of the Scientific Committee and relying upon the best scientific evidence available, as prescribed in Article IX 1. (f) of the CAMLR Convention. We have been frustrated in previous years by one Member’s refusal to adopt such a Conservation Measure, and hope that we can get past that this year. Like other Members, we believe that CCAMLR should adopt a Conservation Measure establishing catch limits, bycatch limits, mitigation measures, data collection and reporting, and other requirements for toothfish fishing in 48.3. The United States

holds the same position regarding this matter for this season that we have had in previous years.’

128. Russia reiterated its positions that the absence of the relevant Conservation Measure does not permit fishing to occur in Subarea 48.3 in violation of CM 31-01 and recommended this being considered as seriously, frequently or persistently non-compliant (Level 3).

129. The UK recalled its previous stated position on the matter (see paragraphs 151 and 154) and reaffirmed that the UK does not accept that the UK-flagged vessels were non-compliant with CM 31-01 and cannot accept any status other than compliant.

130. SCIC noted that there was no consensus on the compliance status for these issues.

Conservation Measure 91-05

131. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 91-05, paragraph 24, by Russia regarding the requirement for Flag States to notify the Secretariat prior to entry of their fishing vessels into the MPA. SCIC noted that the vessel was unable to transmit the movement notification from the vessel due to the service provider terminating the contract without prior notification to the vessel and the operators. SCIC agreed to revise the compliance status to minor non-compliant (Level 1).

Provisional Compliance Report – Part B

132. SCIC recalled its request to Peru for additional information in SCIC-2024 (paragraph 180) in relation to the implementation of CM 10-05, paragraph 6, regarding the prohibition on exporting or re-exporting toothfish without an accompanying *Dissostichus* Export Document (DED) or *Dissostichus* Re-Export Document (DRED), as Peru did not provide a response to the compliance report.

133. SCIC noted the additional information submitted by Peru in COMM CIRC 24/118 and agreed to assign a compliance status of minor non-compliant (Level 1).

134. SCIC recalled its request to Vanuatu for additional information in SCIC-2024 (paragraphs 205 to 207) in relation to the implementation of CM 10-09, paragraph 8, which states that no vessel may conduct transshipment within the Convention Area for which prior notification, pursuant to CM 10-09, paragraphs 2, 3 and 4, has not been given. SCIC sought clarification on the date the notification was transmitted, as noted by Vanuatu in their Draft Compliance Report response.

135. SCIC noted Vanuatu had provided the additional information requested and the Secretariat could identify the email containing the transshipment notification. SCIC agreed to assign the compliance status of compliant.

136. Many members emphasised 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. They requested that Russia

provide the outstanding information and investigations detailed in CCAMLR-40/BG/21. They also noted several issues in the 2024 Summary Compliance Report relating to the *Alpha Crux* requiring additional information from Russia and sought an update on the findings of Russia's investigations.

137. Russia stated that accusations raised by some Members go beyond the scope of the Provisional CCAMLR Compliance Report and do not reflect objectively outcomes of previous discussions on this matter. Russia recalled its request to New Zealand for the original photo materials with metadata, noting that this had not been received.

138. New Zealand reiterated that comprehensive data and images had been supplied.

139. Russia reiterated that the EXIF metadata of the photographs provided by New Zealand through the Secretariat was changed before being handed over to Russia and the submission of primary photographs with the original (raw) metadata is still necessary.

Review of CM 10-10

140. SCIC considered the operation of CM 10-10 and had no recommendation for the Commission at this time.

IUU fishing in the Convention Area

141. SCIC considered IUU fishing activity and trends in 2024/25 in the Convention Area and IUU Vessel lists as reported in CCAMLR-44/14. SCIC noted that no vessels included on the Contracting Party (CP) or the non-Contracting Party (NCP)-IUU Vessel Lists were reported as sighted by Members inside the Convention Area in 2024/25.

Current level of IUU fishing

142. SCIC considered CCAMLR-44/BG/09 and CCAMLR-44/BG/10, which outlined CCAMLR's ongoing cooperation with international organisations to combat IUU fishing. Discussion particularly highlighted collaboration with INTERPOL and the Joint Analytical Cell (JAC) throughout 2024 and 2025 to identify and deter illegal, unreported, and unregulated (IUU) fishing activities, supported through a grant provided by the EU.

143. SCIC thanked the EU for providing this funding and welcomed this collaboration with INTERPOL and the JAC. SCIC also thanked the Secretariat for these ongoing efforts with INTERPOL, JAC and others to combat IUU fishing in the Convention Area and endorsed continuing these efforts.

144. SCIC noted INTERPOL's ongoing collaboration with CCAMLR and the tools and resources made available to CCAMLR Members through this collaboration. INTERPOL highlighted their recent activities in combatting IUU fishing activities globally, noting the

benefits to accessing INTERPOL’s global police network to address IUU fishing and crimes associated with IUU fishing.

145. SCIC noted that INTERPOL had developed a Vessel Boarding Guide intended for operational vessel inspectors and this would be released later in the year. SCIC also noted that INTERPOL, in collaboration with the USA’s National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries, will be conducting webinars on CCAMLR-related fisheries inspections during the week of 17 November 2025 with further information soon to be shared with all Contracting Parties via Commission Circular.

146. SCIC considered the report on the implementation of CM 10-08 (CCAMLR-44/BG/12), including the initial reporting of efforts by the JAC to identify ultimate beneficial ownership and any linkages to past, known IUU fishing activity. SCIC noted that no direct links of interest to CCAMLR were identified by this initial review.

147. The EU provided an update on an investigation into activities of a Spanish national involved with the previously IUU listed vessel *El Shaddai*. The investigation was initiated and initially reported at SCIC-2024, but the case was ultimately time barred under domestic legislation before further formal action could be taken. SCIC thanked the EU for this update.

148. SCIC considered the update provided by the Secretariat on the workplan to address unidentified fishing gear in the Convention Area. SCIC acknowledged the progress made in this area and endorsed the extension of the workplan for 2026–2027.

IUU Vessel Lists

CP-IUU Vessel List

149. SCIC considered the Provisional Contracting Party IUU Vessels for 2025/26 noting the proposed inclusion of two UK-flagged vessels: *Argos Helena* and *Nordic Prince*.

150. Argentina made the following statement:

‘We have once again included these two vessels, the *Argos Helena* and the *Nordic Prince*, on the list of vessels engaged in illegal fishing, given a situation that has been ongoing for years. Unfortunately, we were unable to reach a consensus at the 2021 meeting because only one party, in this case the Russian Federation, opposed the decision. From that point on, we did not have a conservation measure, 41-02, which sets, among other things, the catch limits for Patagonian toothfish in Subarea 48.3. From that point on, we no longer have a conservation measure due to the opposition of one party. However, since we did not have one, the vast majority, if not almost all, of the Commission members clearly understood that without a conservation measure, we cannot fish. Conservation Measure 31-01 clearly establishes this. It's objective; it's not Argentina's opinion. Unfortunately, only one country continued fishing despite not having a conservation measure authorizing it. I also want to highlight the conduct of the countries that previously fished in Subarea 48.3, which realised that without a conservation measure, fishing was impossible, and they stopped fishing. I also want to highlight the conduct of the main country that imported this toothfish. Seeing that there was no conservation measure making this fishing legal, that country also stopped

importing toothfish because it's not a fishing activity supported by a conservation measure. So, once again, we call for consideration of including these two vessels, the *Nordic Prince* and the *Argos Helena*, on the list of illegal vessels for fishing that is objectively illegal and outside the scope of the Commission's conservation measures. The United Kingdom itself claims that its fishing is 'consistent' with CCAMLR. When something is consistent with something else, it is something else; in other words, it is not CCAMLR fishing, despite attempts to disguise it with so-called inspections or other measures. So let's hope that this time these vessels are included on this list. We urge everyone, first, to agree on a conservation measure in 48.3, and second, that until we have one, we should do what most Members do, which is refrain from fishing because we are not authorised and this cannot be done.'

151. The UK made the following statement:

'The UK has previously articulated its position on this matter, most recently in COMM CIRC 25/71 and COMM CIRC 25/100, including our position in relation to Conservation Measure 31-01. The issue has also been the subject of extensive discussion in prior meetings of both SCIC and the Commission.

The UK rejects any suggestion that the vessels operating under its flag within Subarea 48.3 could be characterised as engaging in illegal, unreported, or unregulated fishing activities, including under the provisions of Conservation Measure (CM) 10-06. There is no basis on which any of these vessels might be said to have engaged in any of the activities described in paragraph 5 of CM 10-06 and they should not therefore have been included on the draft CP-IUU list.

The UK does not agree to the inclusion of these vessels on the final CP-IUU Vessel List on the basis of their participation in a fishery under lawful domestic regulation which is operated in compliance with all relevant conservation measures and with the UK's obligations under the Convention.'

152. Argentina made the following statement:

'We truly regret that the United Kingdom has once again rejected the inclusion of the *Nordic Prince* and the *Argos Helena* on this list of illegal fishing vessels, even though it is clear and objective that these vessels fished in violation of the legal framework of this Convention and thus contributed to undermining the effectiveness of our organization's conservation measures. These vessels are not complying with current conservation measures and are violating Conservation Measure 31-01. We regret that once again a party opposes including these vessels on this list.'

153. Argentina also made the following statement:

'There are many parties that, understanding what the Convention establishes, have voluntarily stopped fishing. There are other parties that have stopped importing this product. There are parties that are making a great effort in all of this, and if the only result that emerges from this is an empty list where nothing is achieved, it seems to me that there is a very unfair situation with respect to all those countries that are doing what they have to do, even if it comes at a cost, and there is only one country that is benefiting from illegal fishing not authorized by the Commission. So, beyond the final result of a

list or no list, I think it must be clear the efforts that each and every one of us is making to ensure the functioning of the Commission, and that it must be clearly stated what each of the Parties is doing. Otherwise, it seems to me that the mere adoption of an empty list is very unfair to the vast majority of the Parties to this Convention.'

154. The UK referred to COMM CIRCs 22/39, 22/51, 22/69, 23/39, 24/69, 25/71 and 25/100 regarding the UK's consistent position in regard to the Patagonian toothfish fishery within statistical Subarea 48.3 (South Georgia).

155. Argentina made the following statement:

'All these circulars cited by the United Kingdom are intended in some way to justify a fishery that they themselves claim is not CCAMLR-related; it is, according to them, a domestic fishery outside of CCAMLR. First, the 1980 Statement by the Chair has a point 5 that states that for domestic measures to be taken, there must be State sovereignty recognised by all of us. Unfortunately, in Subarea 48.3, there is no State sovereignty recognized by all, because at least we do not recognize British sovereignty, and the British do not recognize ours. Therefore, fishing is not allowed according to the Statement by the Chair, based on point 5, which clearly states that it is not possible. Second, there is a sovereignty dispute over these islands, and the Parties are under an obligation not to take unilateral actions that would aggravate the issue. This is an international law obligation that the United Kingdom is also violating. Therefore, neither under the Convention nor under the law of the sea can the United Kingdom take the type of measures it is taking. All of this is contained in all the notes Argentina has submitted on this issue, but it's very clear that neither the Convention nor the law of the sea can allow them to do what they're doing.'

156. The Russian Federation made the following statement:

'The UK's flagged vessels *Argos Helena* and *Nordic Prince* engaged in prohibited activities according to subsections (iii) and (viii) of paragraph 5 of CM 10-06, as they fished in closed area in contravention of CM 31-01. In this regard, Russia recommends to include mentioned UK-flagged vessels on the CP-IUU Vessel List taking into account information circulated to Members.

In accordance with Article XXI, paragraph 1, of the Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources, each Contracting Party shall take appropriate measures within its competence to ensure compliance with the provisions of this Convention and with conservation measures adopted by the Commission to which the Party is bound in accordance with Article IX of this Convention. In this context, we consider any claims that the Contracting Parties have grounds to unilaterally issue licences for toothfish fishing in Subarea 48.3 in the absence of CCAMLR Conservation Measures being in force to be unfounded.'

157. The UK rejected the interpretation of the Chairman's statement set out by Argentina and reiterated its position on sovereignty, known to all Members.

158. The Russian Federation recalled its previous position on this issue, expressing the view that the Provisional CP-IUU Vessel List, which includes the *Argos Helena* and *Nordic Prince*, would go forward to the Commission in the absence of consensus to exclude the vessels. Russia

further expressed the view that without consensus on adopting the Proposed List, SCIC could not adopt the CP-IUU Proposed List.

159. The Secretariat provided to SCIC clarification of the process for listing vessels under CM 10-06 and recalled that the Draft CP-IUU Vessel List is based on information submitted to, or available to, the Secretariat and circulated to all Contracting Parties for additional information. The Secretariat further noted that the Provisional List incorporates this information to assist SCIC in adopting a Proposed CP-IUU Vessel List by consensus, as is required by CM 10-06. SCIC agreed not to add or remove any vessels to or from the CP-IUU Vessel List adopted at the previous meeting.

160. SCIC noted that no consensus could be reached for the inclusion of the UK-flagged vessels *Argos Helena* and *Nordic Prince* on the Proposed CP-IUU Vessel List for 2025/26, therefore no changes were proposed to the CP-IUU Vessel List adopted at CCAMLR-43 (see Appendix II).

161. Russia enquired about the information presented in COMM CIRC 25/113 regarding an ongoing investigation of the vessels *Fortunagracht* and *Saga Sea* related to allegations of unauthorised activities during a port visit in Puerto Williams, Chile.

162. Russia expressed concern related to possible unauthorised activities of the vessels *Fortunagracht* and *Saga Sea* during a port visit in Puerto Williams, Chile.

163. Chile confirmed that it does not intend to request the inclusion of the vessels on the CP-IUU Vessel List 2025/26 this year and has circulated this information for SCIC's general awareness. Notwithstanding the above, and pending the outcome of the ongoing investigation, Chile could proceed with the corresponding actions within the timeframe established in CM 10-06.

164. Norway and the EU expressed their confusion regarding the information contained in COMM CIRC 25/113.

165. The EU noted that, from a procedural perspective, the alleged incident took place outside of the reporting period and that the circulation date was also beyond the deadlines for meeting paper submissions and for IUU listing proposals. The EU further expressed concern regarding the lack of detail provided in the Circular and that no other information had been received from Chile as regards the alleged incident, and noted that the information that was provided indicates an unrelated customs issue rather than an infringement of CCAMLR Conservation Measures. The EU indicated they have initiated an investigation and called on Chile to provide it with detailed information and evidence about the alleged incident.

166. Russia thanked Chile for the report, expressed disappointment that procedural matters have prevented those involved from clarifying allegations and undertaking the necessary investigations, and encouraged the EU and Norway to cooperate with Chile during this investigation and report any results to SCIC-2026.

167. Korea indicated that they had read the COMM CIRC 25/113 and noted that it was outside the timeframe for SCIC to effectively consider the information but respected Chile's plan to continue the investigation and report back to SCIC as appropriate.

168. Russia reiterated that the timeline was sufficient for Members to consider the information provided by Chile.

NCP-IUU Vessel List

169. SCIC considered the request from the Islamic Republic of Iran (Iran) to remove the *Koosha 4* from the CCAMLR NCP-IUU Vessel List.

170. Some Members acknowledged the information provided by Iran which indicated the vessel is in the process of scrapping but noted that independent vessel records from IHS and other independent sources still indicate the vessel is 'in service'. Some Members expressed reservations with removing the *Koosha 4* from the NCP-IUU Vessel List before there were independent verifications that the vessel is no longer in service.

171. Russia expressed that Iran had provided sufficient information to warrant delisting of the *Koosha 4*.

172. Some Members expressed willingness to consider an intersessional delisting of the *Koosha 4* through the Rule 7 procedure if additional, independent corroboration confirms the vessel is no longer in service prior to SCIC-2026.

173. SCIC did not reach consensus to remove the *Koosha 4* from the CCAMLR NCP-IUU Vessel List for 2025/26.

174. SCIC considered information submitted by the EU on the ongoing scrapping of the NCP-IUU vessel *Antony*. The EU indicated that they intend to submit a report to CCAMLR once the scrapping has been completed and verified and proposed that it is premature to remove the vessel before verification has been attained.

175. SCIC reflected on its considerations of the information of the scrapping of the *Koosha 4* and the *Antony*, and noted a need for an exhaustive list on the requirements to be met when scrapping a vessel so it can be considered for the delisting from an IUU Vessel List.

176. SCIC agreed that there were no changes to the NCP-IUU Vessel List adopted at CCAMLR-43. SCIC recommends that the Commission consider the Proposed NCP-IUU Vessel List as adopted at CCAMLR-43 (see Appendix III) and adopt the 2025/26 Final NCP-IUU Vessel List.

Fishery notifications

177. SCIC considered the Secretariat's report on fishery notifications for the 2025/26 season (CCAMLR-44/BG/08 Rev. 1).

178. SCIC noted that the vessel *More Sodruzhestva*, which was notified by two Members, will fish under the Namibian flag for the 2025/26 season.

179. SCIC noted the late submission of the VME impact assessment and eight data fields required by CM 10-02, paragraph 3, by Ecuador for the fishery notification for the *Altar 45* in Subareas 88.1 and 88.2 and referred this matter to the Commission for further consideration.

180. SCIC also noted the concerns raised by COLTO regarding the *Altar 45* which identified possible ties to known IUU fishing individuals as well as use of gillnet gear to target toothfish north of the Convention Area by the vessel's sister ship *Altar 11* (IMO 8904082).

181. The UK confirmed that the fishing vessel *Altar 11* is currently operating on the high seas in FAO Area 41 carrying gillnets and SCIC noted gillnets are prohibited within the Convention Area and in many other jurisdictions due to well-recognised concerns regarding their potential impacts on marine ecosystems and non-target species.

182. SCIC noted with concern that there is limited publicly available information on the ownership structure of Transmarina C.A. or any potential beneficial owners of the *Altar 45*.

183. SCIC requested assurances from Ecuador that they will exercise their Flag State responsibilities through implementation of the appropriate monitoring and control measures of the vessel; that the master, charterer, owner, and any beneficial owners have no association with IUU fishing; and that *Altar 45* will not carry gillnets while operating within the Convention Area. SCIC tasked the Secretariat with contacting Ecuador in this regard.

184. SCIC recommended that CM 10-05 should be amended to enable excluding trade in toothfish caught with gillnets from the CDS in order to prevent such catches entering the markets of Contracting Parties.

185. ASOC thanked COLTO for providing this information and noted that the possibility of links between a notorious fishing criminal and the *Altar 45* was a very serious issue. ASOC encouraged CCAMLR to ensure that licensed vessels do not use gillnets and do not have any links to IUU fishing.

186. SCIC noted the concerns raised by some Members and agreed to refer the matter to the Commission for further consideration.

187. Russia raised concerns related to the notification the two UK-flagged vessels, *Argos Helena* and *Nordic Prince* from all fishery notifications, noting the vessels' inclusion on the Draft CP-IUU Vessel List for 2025/26.

188. The UK made the following statement:

'The UK confirms that the notifications for the two British-registered vessels were submitted in full compliance with all relevant Conservation Measure requirements. Accordingly, there is no basis on which to exclude them from participation in the Ross Sea exploratory toothfish fishery.

The UK also remains seriously concerned about the notifications submitted by the Russian Federation for FV *Alpha Crux* and FV *Yantar 31* for the upcoming Ross Sea toothfish season.

There is a history of unresolved compliance issues involving Russian-flagged vessels. Last year SCIC considered several serious compliance issues regarding *Alpha Crux*,

many of which required further investigation to demonstrate effective Flag State control. To date, no updates or reassurances have been provided.

Yantar 31 has also been re-notified, operated by Orion Co Ltd, the same operators as the *Yantar 35*, who's data still remains quarantined after unexplained high catch rates in Subarea 48.5. By Russia's own admission in CCAMLR 35/BG/29 Rev. 1, discrepancies identified with the activities of *Yantar 35* warranted the suspension of Orion Co Ltd from all fishing activities in the Convention Area. Yet without further evidence of investigation or reassurance that the operator can conduct their operations in a compliant manner, the Russian Federation now apparently seems content to support this notification.

The UK further notes that the Russian Federation has yet to respond to previous SCIC requests for information on several other matters, including the STS-50 investigation (SCIC-2018), gear recovery in Subarea 88.1 during a fishery closure (SCIC-2019), and the conduct of the *Palmer* in 2021.

Given these ongoing concerns, the UK is unable to support the inclusion of *Alpha Crux* and *Yantar 31* in the Ross Sea toothfish fishery for the forthcoming season.'

189. Many Members agreed with the UK's concerns regarding the Russian vessel notifications and did not support the notifications for the *Alpha Crux* and *Yantar 31*.

190. China encouraged all parties to reach consensus as soon as possible to formulate a new conservation measure to manage the fishery in Subarea 48.3 and further noted that no fishing should be allowed without a catch limit established.

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

192. SCIC noted the concerns raised by some Members and agreed to refer these matters to the Commission for further consideration.

Advice from the Scientific Committee to SCIC

193. SCIC considered the advice from the Chair of the Scientific Committee (Dr C. Cárdenas (Chile)) on several topics and thanked him for his time.

Delayed fishing gear retrieval

194. Russia sought clarification from the Chair of the Scientific Committee on the impacts and extent of overfishing resulting from delayed retrieval of longline gear in the toothfish fishery and how tagging data received after the season's closure is assessed.

195. The Chair of the Scientific Committee recalled that WG-FSA-2025 and the Scientific Committee have discussed delayed gear retrieval, noting that late retrieval and vessel departures

may affect the quality of data collection. The Chair of the Scientific Committee further recalled that the Scientific Committee had made a recommendation for further research in the intersessional period to account for this factor in the analyses.

Catch overruns

196. The United States recalled the discussion from WG-FSA-2022 on catch overruns in SSRU 88.2H, which had been mitigated by delaying the start of the fishery for that area, and asked the Chair of the Scientific Committee whether the Scientific Committee could identify underlying causes to inform practical solutions to prevent catch overruns.

197. The Chair of the Scientific Committee noted overruns affect data quality in the fishery and recognised the need to explore alternatives, particularly considering delayed gear retrieval and the short fishing season in the area.

Notified gear descriptions

198. South Africa asked the Chair of the Scientific Committee whether changes to fishing gear during operations, compared with the original notifications, should be considered by the Scientific Committee and whether such changes could affect vessel catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE).

199. The Chair of the Scientific Committee noted that analyses are based on data collected by onboard observer. While there may be differences between notified gear and that reported by observers, the Chair of the Scientific Committee reassured SCIC that these do not affect the analytical outcomes.

200. China noted that how to modify fishing gear might be a matter for the Scientific Committee to consider, however, whether it can be modified and how to notify in a timely manner after modification should be addressed by SCIC.

Early arrival of vessels to Ross Sea region toothfish fishery (Subareas 88.1 and 88.2)

201. Concerning the early entry of vessels prior to the commencement of the fishing season, China asked the Chair of the Scientific Committee for their advice.

202. The UK recalled the significant overrun of toothfish in N70 Management Area and asked the Chair of the Scientific Committee whether the Scientific Committee had reviewed the CPUE of the vessels operating in this region, particularly for those vessels that entered early.

203. The Chair of the Scientific Committee recalled that this topic had been discussed during WG-FSA-2025 and the Scientific Committee, noting that this behaviour might affect the interpretation of the catch and effort data. He also noted that this may be a contributing factor in the short season in N70, and that it had been referred to the Commission for further consideration. The Chair also sought SCIC guidance on the apparent inconsistency whereby

vessels should leave immediately after the fishery closes but may re-enter before the next season.

204. Some Members noted that several vessels had entered the Convention Area before the conservation measure had been adopted by CCAMLR-43.

205. Some Members suggested a solution of amending the conservation measure to impose a time limit on entry to the fishing grounds.

206. China reiterated that these vessels' behaviours are not pre-season entry. Although the fishery has been closed, the fishing season is still ongoing, in accordance with CM 31-02, and these fishing vessels still stay in the fishing grounds instead of real departure after the fishery closure. Before the next fishing season begins, any vessel should not enter these closed fishing grounds.

207. Russia recalled the activities of Norwegian fishing vessels after a closure in the 2023/24 fishing season and noted that CM 31-02 applies to all fisheries. Russia also considered whether specifying how far in advance vessels may enter is appropriate.

208. The Chair of the Scientific Committee noted ongoing efforts to assess the impact of pre-season activity on fishing grounds and to identify measures to prevent recurrence.

Defining calibration and standardisation

209. The Chair of the Scientific Committee sought SCIC's guidance on the definition and interpretation of 'Calibration/standardisation of sampling gear' in CM 24-01, Annex 24-01/A, Format 2, 3(a).

210. Russia noted that there are global standards on fishing gear and in its view, SCIC does not have the competence to address this issue and requested the Scientific Committee to consult alternative sources of information.

211. Many Members noted the need for SCIC to provide guidance on interpreting the terms 'calibration' and 'standardisation' in Format 2, and that this issue had been raised in the past by the Scientific Committee (SC-CAMLR-41). These Members noted, in the context of the CM, 'calibration' would appear to refer to calibrating between different types of gear, while 'standardisation' could refer to using the same type of gear, and that both are distinct terms which do not prohibit the use of multiple gear types under Format 2. These Members further noted that all Members of the Scientific Committee except for Russia share this interpretation.

Fish nests

212. Some Members asked the Chair of the Scientific Committee whether depth-limited measures for active fish nests should be considered in the context of CCAMLR-44/21 (paragraphs 81 to 84). The Chair of the Scientific Committee recalled the discussions formulated in the reports of the Scientific Committee meetings in 2022 and 2023 regarding the

protection of fish nests areas in the Convention Area and noted that he would refer the question back to the Scientific Committee.

Consideration of the Second Performance Review

213. SCIC considered the summary of outcomes from the Second Performance Review (PR2) (CCAMLR-44/06) which provided an updated report on the actions taken by CCAMLR in response to PR2 recommendations. SCIC, along with the Commission and Scientific Committee, were invited to approve revisions to the text.

214. SCIC noted the outcomes and progress made regarding the SCIC relevant items and encouraged the Secretariat to consider proposals made by some Members regarding a few outstanding items in the PR2, such as Recommendations 11 (refining compliance follow up procedures), 12 (operationalising verification for transshipment) and 14 (enhance cooperation with adjacent regional fisheries bodies).

215. SCIC noted that significant time has passed since the PR2 was approved in 2017 and that the recommendations should be reviewed for their suitability. SCIC noted that a proposal for a Third Performance Review (PR3) (CCAMLR-44/25) will be considered by the Commission.

Other business

216. SCIC considered CCAMLR-44/BG/27 submitted by ASOC, which brought developments relevant to fishing vessel and environmental safety, as well as other vessel matters, to the attention of SCIC.

217. ASOC made the following statement:

‘CCAMLR-44/BG/27 draws CCAMLR’s attention to new IMO regulations on navigation and voyage planning that would be mandatory for fishing vessels in the Antarctic Area during the coming season. ASOC recommended that CCAMLR review and update Resolution 23/XXIII and Resolution 34/XXXI to be in line with the Polar Code and IMO Guidelines for safety measures for fishing vessels. ASOC further recommended that CCAMLR develop a new CCAMLR Resolution requiring CCAMLR registered fishing vessels to follow the IMO’s safety guidelines throughout the Convention Area and that the IMO Guidelines for safety measures for fishing vessels of 24 m in length be uploaded to CCAMLR’s website. Finally, ASOC urged CCAMLR to take action to reduce lost, abandoned and discarded fishing gear and other sources of marine plastics from fishing vessels, and to address the management of grey water from fishing vessels.’

218. SCIC thanked ASOC for their work and emphasised the importance of CCAMLR remaining informed of developments within the International Maritime Organization (IMO).

219. Russia recalled the outcomes of the interim report reflected in the MAIB safety bulletin 4/2024 regarding the foundering of the UK-flagged fishing vessel *Argos Georgia* in 2024 and

requested that the UK provide information regarding safety measures for the vessels built based on an identical design being exploited in the CAMLR Convention Area to prevent future loss of life at sea.

220. The UK made the following statement:

‘The UK expresses its deep sorrow over the tragic loss of the fishing vessel and crew members of the *Argos Georgia* and we extend our condolences to all those affected. The UK regrets that this incident has been raised in this manner. Given that the matter has been raised however, the UK wishes to respectfully remind delegates that the vessel was lost outside the Convention Area and is not an appropriate matter for SCIC discussions.

The UK affirms that all UK vessels notified for the exploratory Ross Sea toothfish fishery possess the required Flag and Vessel Class certifications to operate in the Southern Ocean. This includes compliance with the UK’s mandatory requirement for all vessels operating south of 60 degrees to be ice-strengthened, in accordance with CCAMLR Resolution 20/22. Something we would continue to advocate for all vessels operating in this fishery.’

221. Russia noted concern at the tragedy and indicated that vessels with similar characteristics are operating in the Convention Area and sought clarification on reviews or inquiries made by the UK that may affect other vessels facing similar risks.

222. The UK referred to their previous statement (paragraph 220) on this matter.

223. Argentina made the following statement:

‘In its note of September 10, 2025, Argentina noted that the United Kingdom, in its COMM CIRC 25/71, stated that the measures it intends to implement to authorize its vessels to fish in Subarea 48.3 are consistent with CCAMLR regulations. This demonstrates that they fall outside the framework of the Convention and the Convention’s regulations. Consequently, we are concerned that attempts are being made to use the mechanisms and instruments for certifying the legality of fisheries provided by CCAMLR, such as inspection forms and its website, to publish the reports that motivated our note, as this seeks to give illegal British fishing activities an appearance of legality that they objectively lack. In other words, the dissemination of such inspection reports through CCAMLR unlawfully seeks to give the impression that the vessels’ activities are carried out in compliance with the Convention and its regulations, and it is clearly the United Kingdom, in its own note, that says that this is a domestic measure consistent with CCAMLR but outside of CCAMLR, so what we are asking is that the Secretariat remove these British inspection reports from the CCAMLR website. What concerns us is that all parties are aware of this problem, they know what’s happening, which is why the vast majority of Parties are not fishing or importing this fishery. But perhaps a third party, in good faith, sees that this fishing is taking place anyway, even though it shouldn’t be, because conservation measure 41-02 is not in force. They see that there are inspection reports, they see that there is a catch documentation system, and perhaps in good faith they would like or understand that this is within the CCAMLR framework, but it isn’t. Therefore, we must be clear and transparent about this. Regarding the catch documentation system and the information the Secretariat receives regarding this fishery under 48.3, Argentina understands that it is important

that all fishing data in the Convention area be available, whether legal or illegal, because we need to know everything that is being caught. But it is clear, since there is a footnote that says specifically regarding fishing in 48.3, that the Secretariat received information regarding vessels fishing for *Dissostichus eleginoides* in Subarea 48.3 and that fishing for *Dissostichus* in Subarea 48.3 is being conducted in the absence of a CCAMLR conservation measure, since Conservation Measure 41-02 was not re-adopted for the 2024/25 fishing season. In closing, I want to say that we allow this catch data to be there with this explanatory footnote, but it is not appropriate in any way for a CCAMLR inspection report to be issued for a non-CCAMLR activity.’

224. The United Kingdom made the following statement:

‘The UK rejects the suggestion that the fishery in Subarea 48.3 is being operated outside the framework of Convention. We recall our previous statements about the management of the South Georgia toothfish fishery and that strict controls are implemented to ensure that fishing occurs only on a sustainable basis and in line with the best available science. The fishery is managed and operated to comply fully with the Convention and all applicable Conservation Measures.

In particular, the United Kingdom rejects any suggestion that the 48.3 toothfish fishery is being operated in contravention of Conservation Measure 31-01 or that the UK vessels engaged in the fishery are non-compliant. Our position has been set out in detail, most recently in response to the Draft CCEP summary report, COMM CIRC 25/100 and we have had an exhaustive discussion of this matter during this meeting and previous meetings.

With respect to the vessel inspection reports referenced by Argentina, these vessels were inspected under the established CCAMLR System of Inspection and found to be compliant with all relevant CCAMLR Conservation Measures. The UK is therefore firmly of the view that these inspections were CCAMLR inspections and should be recorded as such.’

225. Argentina made the following statement:

‘I believe our duty is to be responsible and not create confusion, especially in third countries, with things that aren’t true. So I think the logical thing to do, if these reports aren’t going to be removed because there’s no consensus, is to include a footnote similar to the one used when the Secretariat receives information regarding fishing of *Dissostichus* in this Subarea. There’s a footnote agreed upon by all that says that *Dissostichus* fishing in this Subarea is being carried out in the absence of a CCAMLR conservation measure, given that 41-02 wasn’t adopted for this season. Therefore, the minimum requirement we ask for, in order to be fair to the other Parties and especially to third parties, in good faith, is that these inspection reports make it clear that this fishing is being carried out without a conservation measure authorizing it, such as 41-02. A footnote like this in the inspection reports is the same as what is currently in the monthly catch reports, so I don’t think this is an inconvenience, and at least anyone who reads it will realize that in these cases there is an irregular situation.’

226. Russia noted that the inspection reports submitted were inconsistent with the provisions of the Convention and therefore should not be accessible on the website, given that there is no Conservation Measure in place for the area where fishing occurred.

227. China noted that a new conservation measure for Subarea 48.3 is required, and in the absence of catch limits, no catches are permitted.

228. The UK recalled its previous statements on this matter (paragraph 224).

229. SCIC was unable to reach consensus on whether to remove the inspection reports from the website.

230. Argentina noted that if removal was not possible, the minimum expectation would be to include a descriptive caption on the inspection report webpage as follows:

‘The Secretariat received information regarding vessels fishing for *Dissostichus eleginoides* in Subarea 48.3. Fishing for *Dissostichus eleginoides* in Subarea 48.3 in 2025 is being conducted in the absence of a CCAMLR Conservation Measure, given that CM 41-02 was not readopted for the 2024/25 fishing season.’

231. SCIC agreed to task the Secretariat with implementing the descriptive caption on the inspection report webpage as requested.

232. SCIC encouraged interested Members to consider nominations of a SCIC Vice-Chair, however noted that no nominations were received.

Secretariat tasking

233. SCIC reviewed the Secretariat tasking table prepared based on the requests made during SCIC-2025 and noted the high prioritisation of the ongoing electronic reporting and automated VMS movement notification projects (Appendix IV).

234. SCIC agreed to retain this agenda item to review Secretariat tasking by SCIC on its agenda for SCIC-2026.

Close of the meeting

235. SCIC expressed its appreciation to Mr Berry for his effective chairmanship of the meeting.

236. The Chair thanked Members for their constructive engagement and noted the significant progress achieved, as well as the ongoing work to be advanced in future years.

Summary CCAMLR Compliance Report 2024/2025
Part A

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
CM 10-03						
44-001	New Zealand	<i>San Aspiring</i>	<p>CM 10-03, paragraph 4, requires vessels seeking entry to port to provide the information contained in Annex 10-03/A at least 48 hours in advance to allow adequate time to examine the required information.</p> <p>The inspection report for the <i>San Aspiring</i> for the inspection undertaken by New Zealand on 3 February 2025 noted that Part A of the port inspection was submitted on the same day (3 February 2025).</p>	<p>The <i>San Aspiring</i> failed to submit their Part-A port inspection form within the required timeframe specified in the CM,</p> <p>New Zealand has issued the operator of the vessel with an official warning and reminded them of the conditions under its Permit.</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required
44-002	Chile		<p>CM 10-03, paragraph 5, requires that inspections shall be conducted within 48 hours of port entry.</p> <p>The Korean-flagged vessel <i>Blue Ocean</i> entered the Chilean port of Punta Arenas at 05:00 13 Feb 2025 and was inspected at 16:15 15 Feb 2025.</p> <p>Time delay of inspection after the 48 hour deadline: 11 hours 15 minutes</p>	<p>En relación al retraso de 11 horas y 15 minutos para la inspección en puerto del buque coreano <i>Blue Ocean</i> el día 13 de febrero de 2025 en el puerto de Punta Arenas, se informa que ello se debió a un problema puntual de disponibilidad de personal durante el plazo establecido por la Medida de Conservación para su materialización. Es relevante señalar que este retraso ocurrió sólo en 1 de las 33 inspecciones realizadas por Chile durante el período analizado, lo que refleja un alto</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				<p>estándar de cumplimiento general por parte de Chile.</p> <p>Con el fin de evitar que este tipo de situaciones se repita en el futuro, se instruirán las medidas de reforzamiento en la jurisdicción respectiva, solicitando a los equipos de inspección optimizar su coordinación y disponibilidad operativa para asegurar que las inspecciones en puerto se materialicen dentro de los plazos normativos previstos.</p> <p>Regarding the 11-hour and 15-minute delay in the port inspection of the Korean vessel <i>Blue Ocean</i> on 13 February 2025 in the port of Punta Arenas, it is reported that this was due to a specific problem with staff availability during the period established by the Conservation Measure for its implementation. It is important to note that this delay occurred in only 1 of the 33 inspections carried out by Chile during the period analysed, reflecting a high standard of overall compliance by Chile.</p> <p>In order to prevent this type of situation from recurring in the future, reinforcement measures will be implemented in the respective jurisdiction, requesting inspection teams to optimize their coordination and operational availability to ensure that port inspections are carried out within the established deadlines.</p>		

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)		
44-003	France		<p>CM 10-03, paragraph 5, requires that inspections shall be conducted within 48 hours of port entry.</p> <p>The French-flagged vessel <i>Sainte Rose</i> entered the French port of Le Port, Reunion at 17:00 19 Feb 2025 and was inspected at 07:00 24 Feb 2025. The fishing activity occurred in Division 58.4.2.</p> <p>Time delay of inspection after the 48 hour deadline: 2 days 14 hours</p>	<p>The inspection has begun on the 19th of February with the check and report of the seals, and then has been continued and finalised on the 24th of February with the breaking of the seals. An error has been made reporting the date of the end of the inspection. We have joined to this answer an internal administrative report indicating that the inspection started on the 19th of February. The inspection was effectively conducted within 48h of the port entry, as required by CM 10-03, paragraph 5.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Compliant</p>	Compliant	No further action required
44-004	Namibia		<p>CM 10-03, paragraph 5, requires that inspections shall be conducted within 48 hours of port entry.</p> <p>The Namibian-flagged vessel <i>Helena Ndume</i> entered the Namibian port of Walvis Bay at 04:30 UTC 15 June 2024 and was inspected at 09:00 UTC 17 June 2024.</p> <p>Time delay of inspection after the 48 hour deadline: 4 hours 30 minutes</p>	<p>The vessel was pre-inspected on arrival in port 15 June 2024. Offloading of cargo was concluded on 17 June 2024 whereafter the full inspection report was completed and submitted to SEAFO Secretariat.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Compliant</p>	Compliant	No further action required
44-005	New Zealand		<p>CM 10-03, paragraph 5, requires that inspections shall be conducted within 48 hours of port entry.</p> <p>The New Zealand-flagged vessel <i>Janas</i> entered the New Zealand port of Nelson at</p>	<p>The <i>Janas</i> had notified that it would be coming into port on the 7th February 2025. A Fishery Officer was arranged to inspect the vessel within the 48-hour period.</p> <p>The vessel came in earlier than expected on the 5th February. The vessel manager</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>15:00 05 Feb 2025 and was inspected at 10:04 08 Feb 2025.</p> <p>Time delay of inspection after the 48 hour deadline: 19 hours 4 minutes</p>	<p>did not notify MPI of this and the Fishery Officer had not checked to see of the vessel arrival date had changed.</p> <p>New Zealand has investigated this. Relevant staff have been briefed, and training has been updated to prevent recurrence. Improved monitoring of vessel movements into Port Nelson has also been put in place.</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-006	New Zealand		<p>CM 10-03, paragraph 5, requires that inspections shall be conducted within 48 hours of port entry.</p> <p>The Australian-flagged vessel <i>Antarctic Discovery</i> entered the New Zealand port of Nelson at 09:00 01 Sep 2024 and was inspected at 12:00 05 Sep 2024.</p> <p>In submission of the inspection report New Zealand noted the following: “Unfortunately, this inspection falls outside of the 48-hour timeframe. The inspection was delayed due to miscommunication from the local office (after notification from the international team of the vessels arrival) and the inspecting fishery officer.”</p>	<p>The inspection was delayed because of miscommunication between the inspecting officers and the national team; the inspecting officers did not realise that the CCAMLR Conservation Measures applied to the vessel, which was returning from the SPRFMO area and was carrying <i>Dissostichus</i> spp.</p> <p>New Zealand has investigated this. Relevant staff have been briefed, and training has been updated to prevent recurrence</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			Time delay of inspection after the 48 hour deadline: 2 days 3 hours			
44-007	South Africa		<p>CM 10-03, paragraph 5, requires that inspections shall be conducted within 48 hours of port entry.</p> <p>The Japanese-flagged vessel <i>Shinsei Maru No 8</i> entered the South African port of Cape Town on 09:30 1 May 2025 and was inspected at 09:00 8 May 2025.</p> <p>Time delay of inspection after the 48 hour deadline: 4 days 23 hours 30 minutes.</p>	<p>Following the delay in inspecting the Japanese-flagged vessel <i>Shinsei Maru No 8</i>, the following measures have been implemented to ensure strict compliance with Port State obligations and relevant conservation measures:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Capacity Building: All Fishery Control Officers (FCOs) will continue inhouse targeted training on CCAMLR, SIOFA, and SEAFO conservation measures. A recent workshop conducted by the Secretariat will ensure that officials are fully equipped to be familiarized and cross-train other officials with the relevant regulations. 2. Dedicated Oversight: A dedicated FCO has been appointed to manage all inspections of CCAMLR, SIOFA, and SEAFO-flagged vessels. In their absence, alternate FCOs are instructed to provide immediate coverage to prevent delays. 3. Streamlined Communication & Reporting: The assigned FCO will oversee all correspondence related to inspections, under the close supervision of the Acting Director: Compliance, who will be copied on all reports to ensure no submissions are overlooked. 4. Monitoring and Continuous Improvement: Compliance monitoring will 	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				<p>be enhanced through regular reviews of inspection timelines. Lessons learned from any delays will inform ongoing training and operational adjustments, ensuring that future inspections meet all deadlines and regulatory obligations.</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-008	Uruguay		<p>CM 10-03, paragraph 5, requires that inspections shall be conducted within 48 hours of port entry.</p> <p>The Russian-flagged vessel <i>Yantar 31</i> entered the Uruguayan port of Montevideo at 18:00 28 March 2025 and was inspected at 13:30 31 March 2025.</p> <p>Time delay of inspection after the 48 hour deadline: 19 hours 30 minutes</p>	<p>La inspección se realizó con un retraso por la imposibilidad de acceso físico al barco. La inspección se puede llevar a cabo una vez que se habilita el acceso físico de los inspectores al barco, situación que provoca retrasos sistemáticos en relación a la fecha de ingreso oficial del barco a puerto.</p> <p>Durante los meses de febrero y marzo se acumulan los arribos de barcos de la CCRVMA al puerto y en consecuencia se prioriza el orden de las inspecciones: considerando los antecedentes, operaciones anteriores y revisión de documentación, el <i>Yantar 31</i> RUS fue considerado de bajo riesgo y de baja prioridad en el orden de inspección.</p> <p>The inspection was delayed because of physical impediments that blocked access to the vessel. The inspection could be carried out once the inspectors were given physical access to the vessel. The situation</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	See paragraph 110

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				<p>caused a series of delays beginning from the vessel's official port entry date.</p> <p>During February and March, there are numerous CCAMLR vessel arrivals, so a system is established to determine inspection priorities; after considering the vessel's background, past operations, and documentation, the <i>Yantar 31</i> RUS was deemed low risk and assigned low inspection priority.</p> <p>Further Action: Se continua con la mejora de los procesos de información previa de los barcos al área portuaria para mejorar los tiempos de inspección. Cabe destacar que a partir de mayo 2025, se comenzaron a ingresar las inspecciones en el sistema GIES (Global Information Echange System) mejorando la información disponible previamente a la autorización de entrada a puerto de Montevideo.</p> <p>Work is under way to improve the processes for prior vessel notification to the port authority in order to streamline inspection times. It should be noted that as of May 2025, inspections began to be entered into the GIES (Global Information Exchange System), thereby increasing the information available prior to authorisation to enter the port of Montevideo.</p>		

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)		
44-009	Uruguay		<p>CM 10-03, paragraph 5, requires that inspections shall be conducted within 48 hours of port entry.</p> <p>The Namibian-flagged vessel <i>Helena Ndume</i> entered the Uruguayan port of Montevideo at 08:00 26 Feb 2025 and was inspected at 13:00 28 Feb 2025.</p> <p>Time delay of inspection after the 48 hour deadline: 5 hours</p>	<p>La inspección de realizó con un retraso por la imposibilidad de acceso físico al barco. La inspección se puede llevar a cabo una vez que se habilita el acceso físico de los inspectores al barco, situación que provoca retrasos sistemáticos en relación a la fecha de ingreso oficial del barco a puerto.</p> <p>Durante los meses de febrero y marzo se acumulan los arribos de barcos de la CCRVMA al puerto y en consecuencia se prioriza el orden de las inspecciones: considerando los antecedentes, operaciones anteriores y revisión de documentación, el <i>Helena Ndume</i> NAM fue considerado de bajo riesgo y de baja prioridad en el orden de inspección.</p> <p>The inspection was delayed because of physical impediments that blocked access to the vessel. The inspection could be carried out once the inspectors were given physical access to the vessel. The situation caused a series of delays beginning from the vessel's official port entry date.</p> <p>During February and March, there are numerous CCAMLR vessel arrivals, so a system is established to determine inspection priorities: after considering the vessel's background, past operations, and documentation, the <i>Helena Ndume</i> NAM was deemed low risk and assigned low inspection priority.</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
44-010	Uruguay		<p data-bbox="674 1102 1111 1190">CM 10-03, paragraph 5, requires that inspections shall be conducted within 48 hours of port entry.</p> <p data-bbox="674 1225 1111 1342">The Uruguayan-flagged vessel <i>Proa Pioneer</i> entered the Uruguayan port of Montevideo at 08:00 10 Feb 2025 and was inspected at 17:30 12 Feb 2025.</p>	<p data-bbox="1167 284 1626 647">Further Action: Se continua con la mejora de los procesos de información previa de los barcos al área portuaria para mejorar los tiempos de inspección. Cabe destacar que a partir de mayo 2025, se comenzaron a ingresar las inspecciones en el sistema GIES (Global Information Echange System) mejorando la información disponible previamente a la autorización de entrada a puerto de Montevideo.</p> <p data-bbox="1167 687 1626 986">There is ongoing work to improve the processes for the vessels’ prior notification to the port authority in order to improve inspection times. It should be noted that as of May 2025, inspections began to be entered into the GIES (Global Information Exchange System), thereby increasing the information available prior to authorisation to enter the port of Montevideo.</p> <p data-bbox="1167 1026 1525 1082">Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			Time delay of inspection after the 48 hour deadline: 9 hours 30 minutes	<p data-bbox="1167 252 1615 587">En concreto, esta unidad pesquera FV <i>Proa Pioneer</i> (URY), contaba con el sistema de VMS centralizado y un Observador Científico nacional a bordo. Durante los meses de febrero y marzo se acumulan los arribos de barcos de la CCRVMA al puerto y en consecuencia se prioriza el orden de las inspecciones: el citado FV <i>Proa Pioneer</i> fue considerado de bajo riesgo y de baja prioridad en el orden de inspección.</p> <p data-bbox="1167 624 1615 831">The inspection was delayed because of physical impediments that blocked access to the vessel. The inspection could be carried out once the inspectors were given physical access to the vessel. The situation caused a series of delays beginning from the vessel's official port entry date.</p> <p data-bbox="1167 868 1615 1139">Specifically, the FV <i>Proa Pioneer</i> (URY) had a centralized VMS system and a national scientific observer on board. During February and March, there are numerous CCAMLR vessel arrivals, so a system is established to determine inspection priorities: the FV <i>Proa Pioneer</i> was deemed low risk and assigned low inspection priority.</p> <p data-bbox="1167 1176 1615 1390">Further Action: Se continua con la mejora de los procesos de información previa de los barcos al área portuaria para mejorar los tiempos de inspección. Cabe destacar que, a partir de mayo 2025, se comenzaron a ingresar las inspecciones</p>		

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				<p>en el sistema GIES (Global Information Exchange System) mejorando la información disponible previamente a la autorización de entrada a puerto de Montevideo.</p> <p>Work is under way to improve the processes for prior vessel notification to the port authority in order to streamline inspection times.</p> <p>It should be noted that, as of May 2025, inspections began to be recorded in the GIES (Global Information Exchange System), thereby increasing the information available prior to authorisation for entry to the port of Montevideo.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-011	Chile		<p>CM 10-03, paragraph 8, requires the transmission of a port inspection report to the Secretariat within 30 days of the inspection date (or as soon as possible where compliance issues have arisen).</p> <p>The inspection of the Chilean-flagged vessel <i>Globalpesca I</i> occurred on 25 March 2025 at Punta Arenas, Chile.</p> <p>The Secretariat noted in reconciling the CDS database with the port inspection database that the port inspection report had not been received. The Secretariat requested the port inspection report on 17 July 2025. The port inspection report was received on 17 July 2025.</p>	<p>Con relación al retraso en el envío a la Secretaría del informe de inspección en puerto a la embarcación chilena <i>GLOBALPESCA I</i>, la cual fue realizada el 25 de marzo de 2025 en el puerto de Punta Arenas y notificada a la Secretaría el día 17 de julio de 2025 (84 vencido el plazo), se informa que ello se debió a una confusión asociada a un problema de control y supervisión para su envío dentro de los plazos establecidos en la Medida de Conservación. Es relevante señalar que este retraso ocurrió sólo en 1 de las 33 inspecciones realizadas por Chile durante el período analizado, lo que refleja un alto estándar de cumplimiento general por parte de Chile.</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			Time delay of transmission after the 30 day deadline: 84 days	<p>Con el fin de evitar la reiteración de este tipo de situaciones, se han reforzado los mecanismos internos de control y supervisión, con el objeto de asegurar que los informes de inspección sean remitidos a la Secretaría dentro de los plazos normativos previstos.</p> <p>Regarding to delay in sending the port inspection report on the Chilean vessel <i>GLOBALPESCA I</i> to the Secretariat, which was carried out on March 25, 2025, in the port of Punta Arenas and notified to the Secretariat on July 17, 2025 (84 days after the deadline), it is reported that this was due to confusion associated with a control and supervision problem for its submission within the deadlines established in the Conservation Measure. It is important to note that this delay occurred in only 1 of the 33 inspections carried out by Chile during the period analysed, reflecting a high standard of overall compliance by Chile.</p> <p>In order to prevent the recurrence of such situations, internal control and supervision mechanisms have been strengthened to ensure that inspection reports are submitted to the Secretariat within the prescribed timeframes.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
44-012	Namibia		<p>CM 10-03, paragraph 8, requires the transmission of a port inspection report to the Secretariat within 30 days of the inspection date (or as soon as possible where compliance issues have arisen).</p> <p>Namibia issued DCD NA-24-0002-E which states that the <i>Helena Ndume</i> unloaded 4 905 kg of toothfish from Area 47 on 17 June 2024 at Walvis Bay, Namibia.</p> <p>The inspection of the Namibian-flagged vessel <i>Helena Ndume</i> occurred on 17 June 2024 at Walvis Bay, Namibia.</p> <p>The Secretariat noted in reconciling the CDS database with the port inspection database that the port inspection report had not been received. The Secretariat requested the port inspection report on 17 July 2025. The port inspection report was received on 17 July 2025.</p> <p>Time delay of transmission after the 30 day deadline: 365 days</p>	<p>The <i>Helena Ndume</i> was licence to harvest toothfish in SEAFO Convention Area. She complied with all SEAFO Reporting Requirements, and the SEAFO port inspection report was submitted to SEAFO Secretariat within the required time frame. Namibia unfortunately neglects to submit copy of the port inspection report to CCAMLR Secretariat and when made aware by the Secretariat, the inspection report was submitted on the same date of 17 June 2025 as requested.</p> <p>Further Action: Namibia commits to ensure that port inspection reports will be shared with both CCAMLR and SEAFO irrespective of where the vessel operates and unload her cargo.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required
44-013	South Africa		<p>CM 10-03, paragraph 8, requires the transmission of a port inspection report to the Secretariat within 30 days of the inspection date (or as soon as possible where compliance issues have arisen).</p> <p>The inspection of the Ukrainian-flagged vessel <i>More Sodruzhestva</i> occurred on 25 May 2024 by South African port officials</p>	<p>The inspection was done timeously, however the delay to submit the report was due to the lack of dedicated inspectors with specific roles to take responsibility of submitting the reports.</p> <p>This matter has been addressed and officials have been assigned to this function.</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>and the transmission of the port inspection report occurred on 6 August 2024.</p> <p>Time delay of transmission after the 30 day deadline: 43 days</p>	<p>There was no compliance issues reported in the inspection form, with the vessel being fully compliant with all Conservation Measures for the trip.</p> <p>To address this challenge and prevent delays in reporting, South Africa has strengthened its inspection procedures. These reports will be updated and finalized as soon as offloading concludes, ensuring timely communication regardless of operational delays.</p> <p>To reinforce consistency, a dedicated Fishery Control Officer (FCO) has been assigned to all CCAMLR, SIOFA, and SEAFO vessels. All inspection reports will be copied to the Acting Director: Compliance, who will provide oversight and ensure that no submissions are missed.</p> <p>South Africa regrets the delay in reporting in this instance and is confident that the above measures will ensure more timely inspection reporting in the future, while maintaining full compliance with Port State obligations.</p> <p>Further Action: None required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-014	South Africa		<p>CM 10-03, paragraph 8, requires the transmission of a port inspection report to the Secretariat within 30 days of the</p>	<p>South Africa is committed to strengthening the effectiveness and consistency of its Port State measures across all relevant RFMOs.</p>	<p>Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	<p>No further action required</p>

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>inspection date (or as soon as possible where compliance issues have arisen).</p> <p>The inspection of the Japanese-flagged vessel <i>Shinsei Maru No 8</i> occurred on 08 May 2025 by South African port officials. A IOTC port inspection report was transmitted to the CCAMLR Secretariat on 26 Jun 2025. A CCAMLR port inspection form was requested and provided on 2 July 2025. The fishing activity occurred in Area 47 and Subareas 88.1 and 48.6. Only toothfish and bait species were reported in the inspection reports, no tuna species.</p> <p>Time delay of transmission after the 30 day deadline: IOTC inspection report 20 days and CCAMLR inspection report 26 days</p>	<p>To further improve efficiency, a dedicated Fishery Control Officer (FCO) has been assigned to oversee inspections of all CCAMLR, SIOFA, and SEAFO vessels. Where the assigned officer is unavailable, coverage will be provided by other trained FCOs to ensure continuity.</p> <p>To ensure robust oversight, the Acting Director: Compliance will be copied on all reports and will monitor submissions to confirm their timely transmission.</p> <p>Through these measures, South Africa aims to reinforce its commitment to full transparency, accountability, and cooperation with CCAMLR and other RFMOs</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-015	United Kingdom		<p>CM 10-03, paragraph 8, requires the transmission of a port inspection report to the Secretariat within 30 days of the inspection date (or as soon as possible where compliance issues have arisen).</p> <p>The inspection of the UK-flagged vessel <i>Argos Helena</i> occurred on 08 April 2025.</p> <p>The Secretariat noted in reconciling the CDS database with the port inspection</p>	<p>The UK investigated this potential compliance issue.</p> <p>The port inspection was carried out on 8 April, in accordance with Conservation Measure 10-03. On the same day, the inspection report was submitted to the single contact point at the monitoring centre, rather than to the monitoring team, as required.</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>database that the port inspection report had not been received. The Secretariat requested the port inspection report on 17 July 2025. The port inspection report was received on 17 July 2025.</p> <p>Time delay of transmission after the 30 day deadline: 70 days</p>	<p>Subsequently, the responsible individual attempted to submit the report to the Secretariat on 10 April. However, due to a system error, the email remained in the outbox and was not delivered. This issue went unnoticed as the individual commenced a period of annual leave immediately afterward.</p> <p>Following notification from the Secretariat, the report was promptly submitted to the Secretariat on 17 July.</p> <p>A consultation with the relevant departments has since been completed. As a result, internal guidance and procedures have been updated to prevent similar issues from occurring in the future.</p> <p>Further Action: None</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-016	Uruguay		<p>CM 10-03, paragraph 8, requires the transmission of a port inspection report to the Secretariat within 30 days of the inspection date (or as soon as possible where compliance issues have arisen).</p> <p>The inspection of the Uruguayan-flagged vessel <i>Proa Pioneer</i> occurred on 12 Feb 2025 at Montevideo, Uruguay.</p> <p>The Secretariat noted in reconciling the CDS database with the port inspection</p>	<p>El retraso de las transmisiones de los datos puede ser atribuido al cambio de personal técnico asignado a la tarea. Durante el año 2025 se incorporó nuevo personal, y se envió a un técnico para su preparación al Taller sobre Sistema SDC para inspectores realizado en Sudáfrica (12 al 16 mayo 2025). Se espera incorporar más personal calificado para los períodos de mayor frecuencia de ingreso barcos al puerto de Montevideo. Asimismo, se solicitó a las empresas mayor puntualidad en la emisión</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>database that the port inspection report had not been received. The Secretariat requested the port inspection report on 17 July 2025. The port inspection report was received on 26 July 2025.</p> <p>Time delay of transmission after the 30 day deadline: 134 days</p>	<p>de los documentos/conocimientos de embarque.</p> <p>The cause of the delay in the notification of data is changes to the technical staff assigned to the task. In 2025, new staff were hired, and a technical officer attended the South Africa CDS workshop for inspectors (12 to 16 May 2025). We are planning to increase the number of qualified staff for the periods of high frequency of vessel entries to the port of Montevideo. Also, we pointed out to companies the importance of the timely issuing of documents/bills of lading.</p> <p>Further Action: Se solicitó al organismo de control y a las empresas pesqueras mayor puntualidad en la emisión de los documentos/conocimientos de embarque.</p> <p>We pointed out both to the monitoring entity and to the fishing companies the importance of the timely issuing of documents/bills of lading.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-017	Uruguay		<p>CM 10-03, paragraph 8, requires the transmission of a port inspection report to the Secretariat within 30 days of the inspection date (or as soon as possible where compliance issues have arisen).</p>	<p>El retraso de las transmisiones de los datos puede ser atribuido al cambio de personal técnico asignado a la tarea. Durante el año 2025 se incorporó nuevo personal, y se envió a un técnico para su preparación al Taller sobre Sistema SDC para inspectores realizado en Sudáfrica (12 al 16 mayo</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>The inspection of the Uruguayan-flagged vessel <i>Proa Pioneer</i> occurred on 26 May 2025 at Montevideo, Uruguay.</p> <p>The Secretariat noted in reconciling the CDS database with the port inspection database that the port inspection report had not been received. The Secretariat requested the port inspection report on 17 July 2025. The port inspection report was received on 26 July 2025.</p> <p>Time delay of transmission after the 30 day deadline: 31 days</p>	<p>2025). Se espera incorporar más personal calificado para los periodos de mayor frecuencia de ingreso barcos al puerto de Montevideo. Asimismo, se solicitó a las empresas mayor puntualidad en la emisión de los documentos/conocimientos de embarque.</p> <p>The cause of the delay in the notification of data is changes to the technical staff assigned to the task. In 2025, new staff were hired, and a technical officer attended the South Africa CDS workshop for inspectors (12 to 16 May 2025). We are planning to increase the number of qualified staff for the periods of high frequency of vessel entries to the port of Montevideo. Also, we pointed out to companies the importance of the timely issuing of documents/bills of lading.</p> <p>Further Action: Se solicitó al organismo de control y a las empresas pesqueras mayor puntualidad en la emisión de los documentos/conocimientos de embarque.</p> <p>We pointed out both to the monitoring entity and to the fishing companies the importance of the timely issuing of documents/bills of lading.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-018	Uruguay		<p>CM 10-03, paragraph 8, requires the transmission of a port inspection report to</p>	<p>El retraso de las transmisiones de los datos puede ser atribuido al cambio de personal</p>	<p>Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	<p>No further action required</p>

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>the Secretariat within 30 days of the inspection date (or as soon as possible where compliance issues have arisen).</p> <p>The inspection of the Russian-flagged vessel <i>Yantar 31</i> occurred on 31 March 2025 at Montevideo, Uruguay.</p> <p>The Secretariat noted in reconciling the CDS database with the port inspection database that the port inspection report had not been received. The Secretariat requested the port inspection report on 17 July 2025. The port inspection report was received on 23 July 2025.</p> <p>Time delay of transmission after the 30 day deadline: 84 days</p>	<p>técnico asignado a la tarea. Durante el año 2025 se incorporó nuevo personal, y se envió a un técnico para su preparación al Taller sobre Sistema SDC para inspectores realizado en Sudáfrica (12 al 16 mayo 2025). Se espera incorporar más personal calificado para los períodos de mayor frecuencia de ingreso barcos al puerto de Montevideo. Asimismo, se solicitó a las empresas mayor puntualidad en la emisión de los documentos/conocimientos de embarque.</p> <p>The cause of the delay in the notification of data is changes to the technical staff assigned to the task. In 2025, new staff were hired, and a technical officer attended the South Africa CDS workshop for inspectors (12 to 16 May 2025). We are planning to increase the number of qualified staff for the periods of high frequency of vessel entries to the port of Montevideo. Also, we pointed out to companies the importance of the timely issuing of documents/bills of lading.</p> <p>Further Action: Se solicitó al organismo de control y a las empresas pesqueras mayor puntualidad en la emisión de los documentos/conocimientos de embarque.</p> <p>We pointed out both to the monitoring entity and to the fishing companies the importance of the timely issuing of documents/bills of lading.</p>		

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)						
CM 10-04						
44-019	France	<i>Albius</i>	<p>CM 10-04, paragraph 13, requires Flag States to notify the Secretariat within 24 hours of each entry to, exit from and movement between subareas of the Convention Area.</p> <p>Analysis of VMS data identified that a movement notice had not been provided by the <i>Albius</i> for entry into Division 58.4.4b. The Secretariat requested a movement notice from the French VMS Contact Officers on 0551 UTC 05 August 2024.</p> <p>A movement notification was provided to the Secretariat on 0825 UTC 05 August 2024 for the <i>Albius</i> entry into Division 58.4.4b notifying the entry time of 0322 UTC 26 July 2024.</p> <p>Time delay after the 24 hour deadline: 9 days 5 hours 3 minutes</p>	<p>France acknowledges that the notification was provided after the 24h-deadline. The vessel hadn't expected her course to go that South and enter the CCAMLR area, so the crew forgot to provide a notification.</p> <p>Further Action: A reminder to be careful and diligent with CCAMLR notification has been made to the vessel.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required
44-020	France	<i>Albius</i>	<p>CM 10-04, paragraph 13, requires Flag States to notify the Secretariat within 24 hours of each entry to, exit from and movement between subareas of the Convention Area.</p> <p>Analysis of VMS data identified that a movement notice had not been provided by the <i>Albius</i> for entry into Division 58.5.1. The Secretariat requested a movement</p>	<p>France acknowledges that the notification was provided after the 24h-deadline. The vessel hadn't expected her course to go that South and enter the CCAMLR area, so the crew forgot to provide a notification.</p> <p>Further Action: A reminder to be careful and diligent with CCAMLR notification has been made.</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>notice from the French VMS Contact Officers on 0551 UTC 05 August 2024.</p> <p>A movement notification was provided to the Secretariat on 0825 UTC 05 August 2024 for the <i>Albius</i> entry into Division 58.5.1 notifying the entry time of 1920 UTC 26 July 2024.</p> <p>Time delay after the 24 hour deadline: 8 days 13 hours 5 minutes</p>	<p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-021	France	<i>Ile de la Reunion II</i>	<p>CM 10-04, paragraph 13, requires Flag States to notify the Secretariat within 24 hours of each entry to, exit from and movement between subareas of the Convention Area.</p> <p>Analysis of VMS data identified that a movement notice had not been provided by the <i>Ile de la Reunion II</i> for entry into Division 58.4.4b. The Secretariat requested a movement notice from the French VMS Contact Officers on 13 August 2024 2258 UTC.</p> <p>A movement notification was provided to the Secretariat on 14 August 2024 0429 UTC for the <i>Ile de la Reunion II</i> entry into Division 58.4.4b notifying the entry time of 13 August 2024 0250 UTC.</p> <p>Time delay after the 24 hour deadline: 1 hour 39 minutes</p>	<p>France acknowledges that the notification was provided 1 hour and 39 minutes after the 24h-deadline. The ship forgot to transmit the notification.</p> <p>Further Action: Reminders to the ship have been issued.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required
44-022	Korea, Republic of	<i>Sae In Master</i>	<p>CM 10-04, paragraph 13, requires Flag States to notify the Secretariat within 24</p>	<p>This case does not constitute non-compliance. Both the <i>SAE IN MASTER</i></p>	Compliant	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>hours of each entry to, exit from and movement between subareas of the Convention Area.</p> <p>Analysis of VMS data identified that a movement notice had not been provided by the <i>Sae In Master</i> for entry into Subarea 88.2. The Secretariat requested a movement notice on 28 January 2025 0314 UTC.</p> <p>A movement notification was provided to the Secretariat on 28 January 2025 0519 UTC for the <i>Sae In Master</i> for entry into Subarea 88.2 notifying the entry time of 26 January 2025 1500 UTC.</p> <p>The submission of the notification noted that the vessel's telecommunications equipment was malfunctioning.</p> <p>Time delay after the 24 hour deadline: 14 hours 19 minutes</p>	<p>and <i>SAE IN PIONEER</i> submitted entry and movement reports when transiting from the Ross Sea SRZ into 88.2A MPA GPZ 1. These reports were filed on 27 January 2025 at 01:44 and 07:35 UTC, respectively—within 24 hours of their entry into Subarea 88.2A as required by CM 10-04.</p> <p>3) Detailed Circumstances</p> <p>The Ross Sea SRZ covers Subareas 88.1K and 88.2A. Both vessels filed entry and movement reports when first entering the SRZ, and thereafter continued navigating within the SRZ.</p> <p>Because GPZ 1 is located inside Subarea 88.2A, the reports submitted upon entering GPZ 1 were treated as the required entry and movement reports for Subarea 88.2A.</p> <p>The vessels did not exit the SRZ (e.g. from 88.1K into 88.1I) and then re-enter Subarea 88.2A, which would have required an additional set of intention and movement reports. Instead, they remained continuously within the Ross Sea SRZ before proceeding into GPZ 1 of 88.2A.</p> <p>Both vessels submitted their movement reports for 88.2A MPA GPZ 1 on 27 January 2025 within 24 hours of entry, thereby meeting the requirements of CM 10-04.</p>		

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				<p>4) Record of Reports Submitted (UTC times)</p> <p><i>SAE IN MASTER</i></p> <p>A. 88.1 SRZ Intention Entry Report: 25 Jan 2025, 10:54</p> <p>B. 88.1 SRZ Movement Report: 26 Jan 2025, 02:23</p> <p>C. 88.2 MPA GPZ1 Intention Entry Report: 26 Jan 2025, 05:09</p> <p>D. 88.2 MPA GPZ1 Movement Report: 27 Jan 2025, 01:44</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Compliant</p>		
44-023	Korea, Republic of	<i>Sae In Pioneer</i>	<p>CM 10-04, paragraph 13, requires Flag States to notify the Secretariat within 24 hours of each entry to, exit from and movement between subareas of the Convention Area.</p> <p>Analysis of VMS data identified that a movement notice had not been provided by the <i>Sae In Pioneer</i> for entry into Subarea 88.2. The Secretariat requested a movement notice on 28 January 2025 0314 UTC.</p> <p>A movement notification was provided to the Secretariat on 28 January 2025 0512 UTC for the <i>Sae In Pioneer</i> for entry into Subarea 88.2 notifying the entry time of 26 January 2025 1900 UTC.</p>	<p>This case does not constitute non-compliance. Both the <i>SAE IN MASTER</i> and <i>SAE IN PIONEER</i> submitted entry and movement reports when transiting from the Ross Sea SRZ into 88.2A MPA GPZ 1. These reports were filed on 27 January 2025 at 01:44 and 07:35 UTC, respectively—within 24 hours of their entry into Subarea 88.2A as required by CM 10-04.</p> <p>3) Detailed Circumstances</p> <p>The Ross Sea SRZ covers Subareas 88.1K and 88.2A. Both vessels filed entry and movement reports when first entering the SRZ, and thereafter continued navigating within the SRZ.</p>	Compliant	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>The submission of the notification noted that the vessel's telecommunications equipment was malfunctioning.</p> <p>Time delay after the 24 hour deadline: 10 hours 12 minutes</p>	<p>Because GPZ 1 is located inside Subarea 88.2A, the reports submitted upon entering GPZ 1 were treated as the required entry and movement reports for Subarea 88.2A.</p> <p>The vessels did not exit the SRZ (e.g. from 88.1K into 88.1I) and then re-enter Subarea 88.2A, which would have required an additional set of intention and movement reports. Instead, they remained continuously within the Ross Sea SRZ before proceeding into GPZ 1 of 88.2A.</p> <p>Both vessels submitted their movement reports for 88.2A MPA GPZ 1 on 27 January 2025 within 24 hours of entry, thereby meeting the requirements of CM 10-04.</p> <p>4) Record of Reports Submitted (UTC times)</p> <p><i>SAE IN PIONEER</i></p> <p>A. 88.1 SRZ Intention Entry Report: 25 Jan 2025, 19:32</p> <p>B. 88.1 SRZ Movement Report: 26 Jan 2025, 09:13</p> <p>C. 88.2 MPA GPZ1 Intention Entry Report: 26 Jan 2025, 02:54</p> <p>D. 88.2 MPA GPZ1 Movement Report: 27 Jan 2025, 07:35</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Compliant</p>		

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
44-024	Korea, Republic of	<i>Southern Park</i>	<p>CM 10-04, paragraph 13, requires Flag States to notify the Secretariat within 24 hours of each entry to, exit from and movement between subareas of the Convention Area.</p> <p>Analysis of VMS data identified that a movement notice had not been provided by the <i>Southern Park</i> for entry into Subarea 88.2. The Secretariat requested a movement notice on 28 January 2025 0314 UTC.</p> <p>A movement notification was provided to the Secretariat on 28 January 2025 0616 UTC for the <i>Southern Park</i> for entry into Subarea 88.2 notifying the entry time of 26 January 2025 1306 UTC.</p> <p>The submission of the notification noted that the vessel's telecommunications equipment was malfunctioning.</p> <p>Time delay after the 24 hour deadline: 17 hours 10 minutes</p>	<p>Timeline</p> <p>Jan 25, 2025 23:30 UTC: Hongjin Corp. HQ sent a directive to the Hongjin fleet to report their movement after concluding operations in subarea 88.1.</p> <p>Jan 26, 2025: Hongjin Corp. HQ and the vessel received an official letter from the Republic of Korea's FMC, based on a letter sent from the CCAMLR Secretariat to the ROK FMC on Jan 28.</p> <p>Jan 28, 2025 04:47 UTC :After confirming the official letter, HQ attempted to contact the <i>Southern Park</i> again but failed due to poor communication. HQ then contacted the <i>Hongjin No. 701</i> and instructed it to submit the movement report on behalf of the <i>Southern Park</i>.</p> <p>Jan 28, 2025 05:25 UTC: The <i>Hongjin No. 701</i> and <i>Seven Park</i> completed their movement reports from subarea 88.1 to 88.2. It was confirmed through the fleet that the <i>Southern Park's</i> report was delayed due to poor communication, and the vessel would report once the connection stabilized.</p> <p>Jan 28, 2025 05:40 UTC: The <i>Hongjin No. 701</i> submitted the movement report to the Secretariat on behalf of the <i>Southern Park</i>.</p> <p>Jan 28, 2025 06:16 UTC: A corrected report was resubmitted due to an error in the previously reported information.</p> <p>Despite the best efforts of the <i>Southern Park</i> to respond as proactively as possible, the transmission was not successfully completed within the regulated 24-hour period during the transit, leading to a delay</p>	Compliant	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				<p>in the movement report due to communication errors.</p> <p>During the 24/25 fishing season, the <i>Southern Park</i> was equipped with a total of four communication systems (two Inmarsat FBB sets, GX equipment, and an Iridium phone). However, communication failures frequently occurred in certain areas. To prevent compliance issues arising from such failures in the upcoming season, Hongjin Corp. plans to install additional Starlink communication equipment on all its vessels to minimize connection disturbances. A trial installation of Starlink on the <i>Hongjin No. 701</i> during the same season confirmed its stable connectivity in the Antarctic region. As follow-up actions, the Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries issued a warning to the operator, provided an educational session and instructed to submit a plan for preventive measures.</p> <p>As part of the measures, the vessel will be using its electronic reporting system which features two-way communication between the vessel and the Korean FMC in addition to its communication with the CCAMLR Secretariat, to make sure all required information is transmitted in a timely manner even with weather-induced communication disturbances.</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
44-025	South Africa	<i>Koryo Maru No. 11</i>	<p>CM 10-04, paragraph 13, requires Flag States to notify the Secretariat within 24 hours of each entry to, exit from and movement between subareas of the Convention Area.</p> <p>Analysis of VMS data identified that a movement notice had not been provided by the <i>Koryo Maru No. 11</i> for entry into Subarea 58.7. The Secretariat requested a movement notice on 16 December 2024 0209 UTC.</p> <p>A movement notification was provided to the Secretariat on 16 December 2024 0638 UTC for the <i>Koryo Maru No. 11</i> for entry into Subarea 58.7 notifying the entry time of 13 December 2024 0811 UTC.</p> <p>Time delay after the 24 hour deadline: 1 day 22 hours 27 minutes</p>	<p>South Africa acknowledges the Secretariat’s finding regarding the absence of a clear and timely entry notification for the <i>Koryo Maru No. 11</i> into Subarea 58.7 on 13 December 2024.</p> <p>The vessel did transmit several emails during this period, including positional reports and explanations of movements. However, these communications were not expressed in the prescribed CM 10-04 Annex 10-04/A format and were therefore not interpreted by the Secretariat as constituting a formal entry notification. South Africa accepts that this caused uncertainty and resulted in the notification being considered late.</p> <p>We apologise for this lack of clarity. The master of the vessel has been formally instructed to ensure that all future subarea entry, exit, and movement reports are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • transmitted explicitly as entry notifications when crossing into a subarea; • made strictly in compliance with CM 10-04, paragraph 13, using the prescribed Annex 10-04/A format; and • submitted within the required 24-hour timeframe. <p>To prevent recurrence, the Department has re-issued guidance to the vessel master, reinforcing the need for clarity, format compliance, and timeliness in all movement notifications.</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				<p>Further Action: No further action required</p>		
				<p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-026	South Africa	<i>Koryo Maru No. 11</i>	<p>CM 10-04, paragraph 13, requires Flag States to notify the Secretariat within 24 hours of each entry to, exit from and movement between subareas of the Convention Area.</p> <p>A movement notification was provided to the Secretariat on 18 December 2024 0927 UTC for the <i>Koryo Maru No. 11</i> for entry into Subarea 58.7 notifying the entry time of 14 December 2024 0816 UTC.</p> <p>Time delay after the 24 hour deadline: 3 days 1 hour 11 minutes</p>	<p>South Africa acknowledges the Secretariat’s observation regarding the movement notification for the <i>Koryo Maru No. 11</i> on 18 December 2024, relating to its entry into Subarea 58.7 at 08:16 UTC on 14 December 2024.</p> <p>It is noted that while the vessel master did transmit a position and activity update to various recipients on 14 December 2024, the formal movement notification to the Secretariat was only received on 18 December 2024, thereby exceeding the 24-hour reporting deadline set out in CM 10-04, paragraph 13.</p> <p>This delay arose due to the sequencing of notifications and the failure to submit the report in the prescribed CM 10-04A format, which created uncertainty and ultimately resulted in non-compliance with the strict timeline.</p> <p>Corrective measures have been taken. The vessel master has been reminded of the specific requirements under CM 10-04, paragraph 13, and instructed to ensure all future reports are submitted directly to the Secretariat, within the required timeframe, and in the prescribed format. Furthermore, the Department has reiterated reporting</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				<p>obligations to all operators and strengthened internal monitoring procedures to prevent recurrence.</p> <p>South Africa reaffirms its commitment to ensuring full compliance with CCAMLR conservation measures and will continue working with the Secretariat to maintain consistency and accuracy in reporting</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-027	South Africa	<i>Koryo Maru No. 11</i>	<p>CM 10-04, paragraph 13, requires Flag States to notify the Secretariat within 24 hours of each entry to, exit from and movement between subareas of the Convention Area.</p> <p>A movement notification was provided to the Secretariat on 30 September 2024 1851 UTC for the <i>Koryo Maru No. 11</i> for entry into Subarea 58.7 notifying the entry time of 29 September 2024 0722 UTC.</p> <p>Time delay after the 24 hour deadline: 11 hours 29 minutes</p>	<p>South Africa acknowledges the Secretariat’s observation regarding the movement notification for the <i>Koryo Maru No. 11</i> on 30 September 2024.</p> <p>We note that the vessel master submitted notifications on 29 September 2024 regarding entry into the EEZ as well as commencement of fishing activities. However, the subsequent movement notification to the Secretariat was received outside of the 24-hour period prescribed in CM 10-04, paragraph 13.</p> <p>The delay resulted from the sequencing and format of the transmitted messages, which may have created difficulty in verifying compliance within the required timeframe. While notifications were indeed submitted, they were not provided in the prescribed CM 10-04A format.</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				<p>The Department has since reminded the master of the <i>Koryo Maru No. 11</i> of the strict requirement to submit all movement reports within the 24-hour deadline and in the correct format. In addition, guidance has been reinforced to all operators to prevent recurrence of similar issues, and enhanced monitoring measures are being applied to ensure future compliance with CM 10-04.</p> <p>South Africa remains committed to maintaining full transparency and adherence to CCAMLR conservation measures and appreciates the Secretariat’s continued engagement in strengthening implementation</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
CM 10-05						
44-028	Argentina		<p>CM 10-05, paragraph 6, requires that each Contracting Party and non-Contracting Party cooperating with CCAMLR by participating in the CDS shall require that each shipment of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. imported into, or exported or re-exported from its territory be accompanied by a DED or DRED. The import, export or re-export of <i>Dissostichus</i></p>	<p>With regard to this incident, the Argentine National Directorate of Fisheries Coordination and Supervision has informed that all the steps in the eCDS of this document were completed and validated on June 28, 2024, prior to the date of export, except for Step 4, where the signature was omitted due to an inadvertent error. Alerted to this by the exporting company about the box that had</p>	Compliant	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>spp. without a DED or DRED is prohibited.</p> <p>CM 10-05, paragraph 7, requires that DEDs and DREDs must be completed as described in Annex 10-05/A. The use of the e-CDS to generate, validate and complete a DED and/or a DRED is mandatory. A DED and/or DRED is not completed nor validated in the eCDS without the verification provided by a government official at section 5 of the DED template (“step 4: Export state confirmation” in eCDS). Without this validation the import State will not have access to the document in the eCDS.</p> <p>Analysis of the e-CDS data has identified Argentina validated 1 DED after the declared export date. Therefore this shipment did not have a completed DED available to accompany it at the time of export.</p> <p>The identified DED accounts for <1% of Argentina's exports and <1% of all CDS exports.</p> <p>The time difference between the export and validation for the identified documents are:</p> <p>1 DED was issued between 6 – 10 days after declared export date</p> <p>The DED document number is available as an attachment to this record on the website.</p>	<p>been left unvalidated, this error was corrected. The merchandise was able to enter its destination in Port Everglades.</p> <p>Further Action: No further action is needed.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Compliant</p>		

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
44-029	Chile		<p>CM 10-05, paragraph 6, requires that each Contracting Party and non-Contracting Party cooperating with CCAMLR by participating in the CDS shall require that each shipment of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. imported into, or exported or re-exported from its territory be accompanied by a DED or DRED. The import, export or re-export of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. without a DED or DRED is prohibited.</p> <p>CM 10-05, paragraph 7, requires that DEDs and DREDs must be completed as described in Annex 10-05/A. The use of the e-CDS to generate, validate and complete a DED and/or a DRED is mandatory. A DED and/or DRED is not completed nor validated in the eCDS without the verification provided by a government official at section 5 of the DED template (“step 4: Export state confirmation” in eCDS). Without this validation the import State will not have access to the document in the eCDS.</p> <p>Analysis of the e-CDS data has identified Chile validated 3 DED after the declared export date. Therefore this shipment did not have a completed DED available to accompany it at the time of export. The identified DED accounts for <1% of Chile's exports and <1% of all CDS exports.</p>	<p>Con relación a la identificación de 3 DEDs que fueron validados en forma extemporánea, se informa que ellos se encuentran asociados 3 embarques diferentes de <i>Dissostichus eleginoides</i> (TOP) realizados por Chile durante el período analizado.</p> <p>El primer caso (DED 3E7E-94A4-7D28), con fecha de exportación del 16 de abril de 2025, fue parte de un embarque que consideró 9 DEDs, de los cuales sólo 1 fue validado con fecha 08 de mayo de 2025 (22 días después de la fecha de exportación).</p> <p>El segundo caso (DED E517-A696-3F64), con fecha de exportación del 20 de abril de 2025, fue parte de un embarque que consideró 36 DEDs, de los cuales sólo 1 fue validado con fecha 04 de junio de 2025 (45 días después de la fecha de exportación).</p> <p>El tercer caso (DED DAEC-9500-EBD3), con fecha de exportación del 10 de mayo de 2025, fue parte de un embarque que consideró 49 DEDs, de los cuales sólo 1 fue validado con fecha 05 de junio de 2025 (26 días después de la fecha de exportación).</p> <p>Una característica del sistema eCDS implementado en Chile, es la gran cantidad de DCD y DED que se validan (sobre el 65% del total mundial), lo que se explica por tener que registrar en el sistema eCDS</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>The time difference between the export and validation for the identified documents are: 3 DED were issued between 21–50 days after declared export date</p> <p>The DED document number is available as an attachment to this record on the website.</p>	<p>las capturas de TOP realizadas dentro de nuestra Zona Económica Exclusiva (ZEE) por embarcaciones artesanales (174 aproximadamente), implicando por ello la generación de una gran cantidad de documentos de exportación (DEDs) en el sistema, lo que consecuentemente redundaba en una gran cantidad de DEDs asociados a nuestros embarques.</p> <p>Dado el contexto anterior, y en relación a los 3 DED validados en una fecha posterior a la de exportación, se informa que todos estos casos se debieron a errores involuntarios de carácter puntual, en la medida que los Inspectores de Pesca no completaron el paso 4 en el sistema eCDS para dichos DEDs, toda vez que los restantes documentos asociados a cada uno de los embarques se encontraban validados correctamente.</p> <p>Frente a ello, junto con reiterar las instrucciones realizadas a los Inspectores Nacionales respecto a los procedimientos que aplican a este tipo de certificación, es preciso señalar que los 3 casos detectados comprometen sólo el 0,1% de los DEDs validados por Chile durante el período analizado (3056 en total). Esta cifra supone una significativa disminución para estos hallazgos respecto de las temporadas anteriores, lo que estaría dando cuenta de la efectividad de las medidas dispuestas por Chile para enfrentarlos y evitarlos.</p>		

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				<p>Regarding to three DEDs that were validated after the deadline, it is reported that they are associated with three different shipments of <i>Dissostichus eleginoides</i> (TOP) made by Chile during the period analyzed.</p> <p>The first case (DED 3E7E-94A4-7D28), with an export date of April 16, 2025, was part of a shipment that included nine DEDs, of which only one was validated on May 8, 2025 (22 days after the export date).</p> <p>The second case (DED E517-A696-3F64), with an export date of April 20, 2025, was part of a shipment that included 36 DEDs, of which only 1 was validated on June 4, 2025 (45 days after the export date).</p> <p>The third case (DED DAEC-9500-EBD3), with an export date of May 10, 2025, was part of a shipment that included 49 DEDs, of which only 1 was validated on June 5, 2025 (26 days after the export date).</p> <p>One feature of the eCDS system implemented in Chile is the large number of DCDs and DEDs that are validated (over 65% of the global total), which is explained by the requirement to register in the eCDS system the TOP catches made within our Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) by artisanal vessels (approximately 174), thereby generating a large number of export documents (DEDs) in the system, which consequently results in a large</p>		

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				<p>number of DEDs associated with our shipments.</p> <p>Given the above context, and in relation to the three DEDs validated after the date of export, it is reported that all these cases were due to unintentional one-off errors, insofar as the Fisheries Inspectors did not complete step 4 in the eCDS system for those DEDs, since the remaining documents associated with each of the shipments were correctly validated.</p> <p>In view of this, in addition to reiterating the instructions given to National Inspectors regarding the procedures that apply to this type of certification, it should be noted that the three cases detected represent only 0.1% of the DEDs validated by Chile during the period analyzed (3,056 in total). This figure represents a significant decrease in these findings compared to previous seasons, which would indicate the effectiveness of the measures taken by Chile to address and prevent them.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-030 (a)	France		<p>CM 10-05, paragraph 6, requires that each Contracting Party and non-Contracting Party cooperating with CCAMLR by participating in the CDS shall require that each shipment of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. imported into, or exported or re-exported from its territory</p>	<p>Response submitted to the Secretariat by the European Union (EU) via email:</p> <p>We have investigated these incidents.</p> <p>In the case of 3 DEDs (FR-24-0030-E, FR-24-0029-E, and FR-24-0018-E,</p>	Compliant	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>be accompanied by a DED or DRED. The import, export or re-export of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. without a DED or DRED is prohibited.</p> <p>CM 10-05, paragraph 7, requires that DEDs and DREDs must be completed as described in Annex 10-05/A. The use of the e-CDS to generate, validate and complete a DED and/or a DRED is mandatory. A DED and/or DRED is not completed nor validated in the eCDS without the verification provided by a government official at section 5 of the DED template (“step 4: Export state confirmation” in eCDS). Without this validation the import State will not have access to the document in the eCDS.</p> <p>Analysis of the e-CDS data has identified France validated 4 DED after the declared export date. Therefore this shipment did not have a completed DED available to accompany it at the time of export. The identified DED accounts for 1% of France's exports and <1% of all CDS exports.</p> <p>The time difference between the export and validation for the identified documents are: 3 DED were issued between 3 – 5 days after declared export date 1 DED was issued between 11 – 20 days after declared export date</p>	<p>corresponding to export reservation number EBKG11039890), an encoding error was made. The date entered for the export (13 December 2024) was in fact the date on which the DEDs were requested. The actual export took place on 26 December 2024 as indicated on the booking confirmation, which is after the DEDs were validated by the competent authorities (16 December 2024). As a result, the shipment was accompanied by validated DEDs as required by CM 10-05, paragraph 6. The competent authorities have been reminded of the importance of ensuring the correct encoding of information in the e-CDS.</p> <p>Further Action: None</p>		
				<p>Preliminary status: Compliant</p>		

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			The DED document number is available as an attachment to this record on the website.			
44-030 (b)	France		<p>CM 10-05, paragraph 6, requires that each Contracting Party and non-Contracting Party cooperating with CCAMLR by participating in the CDS shall require that each shipment of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. imported into, or exported or re-exported from its territory be accompanied by a DED or DRED. The import, export or re-export of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. without a DED or DRED is prohibited.</p> <p>CM 10-05, paragraph 7, requires that DEDs and DREDs must be completed as described in Annex 10-05/A. The use of the e-CDS to generate, validate and complete a DED and/or a DRED is mandatory. A DED and/or DRED is not completed nor validated in the eCDS without the verification provided by a government official at section 5 of the DED template (“step 4: Export state confirmation” in eCDS). Without this validation the import State will not have access to the document in the eCDS.</p> <p>Analysis of the e-CDS data has identified France validated 4 DED after the declared export date. Therefore this shipment did not have a completed DED available to accompany it at the time of export.</p>	<p>Response submitted to the Secretariat by the European Union (EU) via email:</p> <p>We have investigated these incidents.</p> <p>In the case of one DED FR-24-0011-E, our investigation found that the export took place before the DED was validated. The export took place on 14 July 2024 but validation of the DED was delayed due to incomplete information having been provided by the exporter. The missing information (bill of lading number) was provided on 31 July and the DED was subsequently validated on 1 August 2024. The competent authorities have reviewed and improved their internal procedures to avoid this happening again. We note that the identified DED represents less than 1% of France’s exports.</p> <p>Further Action: None</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
44-031	Japan		<p>The identified DED accounts for 1% of France's exports and <1% of all CDS exports.</p> <p>The time difference between the export and validation for the identified documents are: 3 DED were issued between 3 – 5 days after declared export date 1 DED was issued between 11 – 20 days after declared export date</p> <p>The DED document number is available as an attachment to this record on the website.</p> <p>CM 10-05, paragraph 6, requires that each Contracting Party and non-Contracting Party cooperating with CCAMLR by participating in the CDS shall require that each shipment of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. imported into, or exported or re-exported from its territory be accompanied by a DED or DRED. The import, export or re-export of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. without a DED or DRED is prohibited.</p> <p>CM 10-05, paragraph 7, requires that DEDs and DREDs must be completed as described in Annex 10-05/A. The use of the e-CDS to generate, validate and complete a DED and/or a DRED is mandatory. A DED and/or DRED is not completed nor validated in the eCDS without the verification provided by a government official at section 5 of the</p>	<p>(1) On 22 May 2025, an exporter inquired of the Fisheries Agency (FAJ) about the procedure of issuance and validation of DRED. During communications with this exporter, it was found that the toothfish products in question had already departed for Hong Kong.</p> <p>(2) FAJ immediately asked the exporter to explain the reason why this situation occurred. The exporter explained that it had never re-exported toothfish and was unfamiliar with the procedures for re-export of toothfish. Then, it was turned out that they overlooked the requirements for the necessary validation, which resulted in the above mentioned “late” inquiry after the export vessel had departed.</p> <p>(3) On the same day (22 May), the relevant authority of Hong Kong provided with</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>DED template (“step 4: Export state confirmation” in eCDS). Without this validation the import State will not have access to the document in the eCDS.</p> <p>Analysis of the e-CDS data has identified Japan validated 1 DED after the declared export date. Therefore this shipment did not have a completed DED available to accompany it at the time of export. The identified DED accounts for 100 % of Japan's exports and <1% of all CDS exports.</p> <p>The time difference between the export and validation for the identified documents are: 1 DED was issued between 11 – 20 days after declared export date</p> <p>The DED document number is available as an attachment to this record on the website.</p>	<p>FAJ the information on the mentioned re-exported products arriving there inquiring the status of DRED validation. Considering that the exporter promised to prevent a recurrence of such mistake, FAJ exceptionally conducted a document review and validated the re-export certificate retrospectively.</p> <p>(4) Although the requirement regarding the issuance and validation of DRED had already been widely publicized to exporters, following this incident, FAJ gave a stern instruction to the exporter to meet the requirements upon re-export. Since then, the exporter has fully complied with the requirements on DRED issuance and validation and been proceeding with re-exports without incidence.</p> <p>Further Action: No further action needed</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-032	New Zealand		<p>CM 10-05, paragraph 6, requires that each Contracting Party and non-Contracting Party cooperating with CCAMLR by participating in the CDS shall require that each shipment of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. imported into, or exported or re-exported from its territory be accompanied by a DED or DRED. The import, export or re-export of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. without a DED or DRED is prohibited.</p>	<p>The DED was issued to the requesting company for an export date of the 2nd of April.</p> <p>The exporter requested an amendment to their DED on the 22nd of April to show an export date of the 26th of March. This amendment was requested to reflect the internal (within NZ territorial sea) movements of the container as the importing country had a change to its trade</p>	Compliant	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
44-033	South Africa		<p>CM 10-05, paragraph 7, requires that DEDs and DREDs must be completed as described in Annex 10-05/A. The use of the e-CDS to generate, validate and complete a DED and/or a DRED is mandatory. A DED and/or DRED is not completed nor validated in the eCDS without the verification provided by a government official at section 5 of the DED template (“step 4: Export state confirmation” in eCDS). Without this validation the import State will not have access to the document in the eCDS.</p> <p>Analysis of the e-CDS data has identified New Zealand validated 1 DED after the declared export date. Therefore this shipment did not have a completed DED available to accompany it at the time of export.</p> <p>The identified DED accounts for 1% of New Zealand's exports and <1% of all CDS exports.</p> <p>The time difference between the export and validation for the identified documents are: 1 DED was issued between 6 – 10 days after declared export date</p> <p>The DED document number is available as an attachment to this record on the website.</p>	<p>policy and wanted this information to be reflected on the DED.</p> <p>The container departed at Timaru Port on the 2nd of April for Port Chalmers Port before departing New Zealand on the 6th of April.</p> <p>Because these ports are both in New Zealand the movement between the ports is within New Zealand’s territory (according to paragraph 6 of CM 10-05), therefore, it did not require a DED. The DED was amended to account for this domestic movement at the request of the importer.</p> <p>This shipment had a complete and valid DED available to accompany it at the time of export.</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Compliant</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>Contracting Party cooperating with CCAMLR by participating in the CDS shall require that each shipment of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. imported into, or exported or re-exported from its territory be accompanied by a DED or DRED. The import, export or re-export of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. without a DED or DRED is prohibited.</p> <p>CM 10-05, paragraph 7, requires that DEDs and DREDs must be completed as described in Annex 10-05/A. The use of the e-CDS to generate, validate and complete a DED and/or a DRED is mandatory. A DED and/or DRED is not completed nor validated in the eCDS without the verification provided by a government official at section 5 of the DED template (“step 4: Export state confirmation” in eCDS). Without this validation the import State will not have access to the document in the eCDS.</p> <p>Analysis of the e-CDS data has identified South Africa validated 3 DED after the declared export date. Therefore this shipment did not have a completed DED available to accompany it at the time of export. The identified DED accounts for 7% of South Africa's exports and <1% of all CDS exports.</p> <p>The time difference between the export and validation for the identified documents are:</p>	<p>permits (DEDs) relating to consignments exported on 12 January 2025.</p> <p>The client submitted complete applications for all applicable DEDs on Friday, 10 January 2025, prior to the estimated export date. The Department duly processed the applications and issued the corresponding DCDs (ZA-24-0002-E-1, ZA-24-0002-E-2, ZA-24-0002-E-3, ZA-24-0003-E-1, and ZA-24-0003-E-2), which correctly reflected the importers and product quantities. At the time, it was understood that all relevant DEDs had been issued.</p> <p>However, upon review by the client, it was identified that three of ten DEDs forming part of the original application were inadvertently omitted. This omission was immediately corrected by the Department on Tuesday, 14 January 2025, when the matter was brought to its attention. Unfortunately, this meant that the three outstanding DEDs were issued two days after the actual export date of 12 January 2025.</p> <p>The delay in reporting the omission was not intentional. The client experienced an urgent family crisis, which delayed their ability to review the documents and notify the Department promptly. Once notified, the Department took immediate corrective action.</p> <p>We regret this administrative oversight and the late reporting and assure the</p>		

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>3 DED were issued between 1 – 2 days after declared export date</p> <p>The DED document number is available as an attachment to this record on the website.</p>	<p>Commission that all applications were submitted on time and that corrective action was taken at the earliest possible opportunity. Measures are being reinforced to prevent such oversights in future</p> <p>Further Action: None</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-034	Spain		<p>CM 10-05, paragraph 6, requires that each Contracting Party and non-Contracting Party cooperating with CCAMLR by participating in the CDS shall require that each shipment of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. imported into, or exported or re-exported from its territory be accompanied by a DED or DRED. The import, export or re-export of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. without a DED or DRED is prohibited.</p> <p>CM 10-05, paragraph 7, requires that DEDs and DREDs must be completed as described in Annex 10-05/A. The use of the e-CDS to generate, validate and complete a DED and/or a DRED is mandatory. A DED and/or DRED is not completed nor validated in the eCDS without the verification provided by a government official at section 5 of the DED template (“step 4: Export state confirmation” in eCDS). Without this validation the import State will not have access to the document in the eCDS.</p>	<p>Response submitted to the Secretariat by the European Union (EU) via email:</p> <p>This incident relates to the DRED with export code 38A9-5B63-5654 that was validated after the export date. Steps 1–3 of the DRED were completed by the export authorities in the e-CDS on 8 May 2025. However, due to an administrative error, step 4 ‘Export state confirmation’ remained pending and the exporter was notified of the DRED without this step having been completed. Upon noticing this omission following cross-checks, the export authorities proceeded to confirm the export in the e-CDS by completing step 4 on 21 May 2025. As a result, the date of confirmation by the exporting State is recorded as later than the date of export. Although the shipment was accompanied by the DRED and the export authorities had confirmed their agreement to the exporter on 8 May, this was not reflected in the e-CDS until 21 May 2025. The export authorities have been reminded of</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>Analysis of the e-CDS data has identified Spain validated 1 DED after the declared export date. Therefore this shipment did not have a completed DED available to accompany it at the time of export. The identified DED accounts for <1% of Spain's exports and <1% of all CDS exports.</p> <p>The time difference between the export and validation for the identified documents are: 1 DED was issued between 6 – 10 days after declared export date</p> <p>The DED document number is available as an attachment to this record on the website.</p>	<p>the importance of ensuring that consignments of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. are not exported without a DED/DRED that is validated in the e-CDS and to take the necessary actions to prevent this to happen in the future. The identified incident accounts for less than 1% of Spain's exports.</p> <p>Further Action: No further action needed</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-035	Uruguay		<p>CM 10-05, paragraph 6, requires that each Contracting Party and non-Contracting Party cooperating with CCAMLR by participating in the CDS shall require that each shipment of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. imported into, or exported or re-exported from its territory be accompanied by a DED or DRED. The import, export or re-export of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. without a DED or DRED is prohibited.</p> <p>CM 10-05, paragraph 7, requires that DEDs and DREDs must be completed as described in Annex 10-05/A. The use of the e-CDS to generate, validate and complete a DED and/or a DRED is</p>	<p>Se reconoce el incumplimiento en cada caso.</p> <p>Durante el año 2025 se incorporó nuevo personal de certificación, y se envió a un técnico al Taller sobre Sistema SDC para inspectores realizado en Sudáfrica (12 al 16 mayo 2025). Se espera incorporar más personal calificado para los períodos de mayor frecuencia de ingreso barcos al puerto de Montevideo. Asimismo, se solicitó a las empresas mayor puntualidad en la emisión de los documentos/conocimientos de embarque.</p> <p>Non-compliance was acknowledged for each one of the issues.</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	See paragraph 115

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>mandatory. A DED and/or DRED is not completed nor validated in the eCDS without the verification provided by a government official at section 5 of the DED template (“step 4: Export state confirmation” in eCDS). Without this validation the import State will not have access to the document in the eCDS.</p> <p>Analysis of the e-CDS data has identified Uruguay validated 20 DED after the declared export date. Therefore this shipment did not have a completed DED available to accompany it at the time of export.</p> <p>The identified DED accounts for 14% of Uruguay's exports and <1% of all CDS exports.</p> <p>The time difference between the export and validation for the identified documents are:</p> <p>2 DED were issued between 1 – 2 days after declared export date 6 DED were issued between 3 – 5 days after declared export date 4 DED were issued between 6 – 10 days after declared export date 3 DED were issued between 11 – 20 days after declared export date 4 DED were issued between 21 – 50 days after declared export date 2 DED were issued between 51 – 100 days after declared export date</p>	<p>In 2025, new certification staff were hired, and a technician attended the South Africa CDS workshop for inspectors (12 to 16 May 2025). Plans are under way to increase the number of qualified staff during peak periods of vessel arrivals at the port of Montevideo. Also, companies were advised of the importance of the timely issuance of documents/bills of lading.</p> <p>Further Action: Se solicitó al organismo de control y a las empresas pesqueras mayor puntualidad en la emisión de los documentos/conocimientos de embarque.</p> <p>Both the monitoring authority and the fishing companies were advised of the importance of the timely issuance of documents/bills of lading.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			The DED document number is available as an attachment to this record on the website.			
CM 10-09						
44-036	Netherlands	<i>Fortunagracht</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 2, states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance if any of its vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area. CM 10-09, paragraph 3 clarifies that that this notification requirement covers the transhipment of harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a notification on 15:16 UTC 19 May 2025 from the <i>Fortunagracht</i> notifying its intention to tranship krill and supplies with the <i>Antarctic Sea</i> at 12:00 UTC 22 May 2025.</p> <p>Time difference: 68 hours 44 minutes</p>	<p>Response submitted to the Secretariat by the European Union (EU) via email:</p> <p>Investigations have confirmed that although the notification was duly provided, it was not submitted at least 72 hours in advance of the intended transhipment. The notification was provided 3 hours and 16 minutes late.</p> <p>The delay was the result of human error and time constraints due to the regular operation of the vessel. This issue was raised with the owner and the master of the vessel who were given a warning and reminded of their responsibilities and obligations.</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required
44-037	Netherlands	<i>Fortunagracht</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 2, states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance if any of its vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area. CM 10-09, paragraph 3 clarifies that that this notification requirement covers the transhipment of</p>	<p>Response submitted to the Secretariat by the European Union (EU) via email:</p> <p>Investigations have confirmed that although the notification was duly provided, it was not submitted at least 72 hours in advance of the intended</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a notification on 22:13 UTC 25 May 2025 from the <i>Fortunagracht</i> notifying its intention to tranship fuel and shipments with the <i>Antarctic Provider</i> at 22:00 UTC 28 May 2025.</p> <p>Time difference: 71 hours 47 minutes</p>	<p>transhipment. The notification was provided 13 minutes late.</p> <p>The delay was the result of human error and time constraints due to the regular operation of the vessel. This issue was raised with the owner and the master of the vessel who were given a warning and reminded of their responsibilities and obligations.</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-038	Netherlands	<i>Fortunagracht</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 2, states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance if any of its vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area. CM 10-09, paragraph 3 clarifies that that this notification requirement covers the transhipment of harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a notification on 19:18 UTC 23 May 2025 from the <i>Fortunagracht</i> notifying its intention to tranship Krill with the <i>Antarctic Endurance</i> at 16:00 UTC 26 May 2025.</p> <p>Time difference: 68 hours 42 minutes</p>	<p>Response submitted to the Secretariat by the European Union (EU) via email:</p> <p>Investigations have confirmed that although the notification was duly provided, it was not submitted at least 72 hours in advance of the intended transhipment. The notification was provided 3 hours and 18 minutes late.</p> <p>The delay was the result of human error and time constraints due to the regular operation of the vessel. This issue was raised with the owner and the master of the vessel who were given a warning and reminded of their responsibilities and obligations</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)		
44-039	Netherlands	<i>Fortunagracht</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 2, states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance if any of its vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area. CM 10-09, paragraph 3 clarifies that that this notification requirement covers the transhipment of harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a notification on 13:29 UTC 15 March 2025 from the <i>Fortunagracht</i> notifying its intention to tranship krill with the <i>Antarctic Endurance</i> at 12:00 UTC 18 March 2025.</p> <p>Time difference: 70 hours 31 minutes</p>	<p>Response submitted to the Secretariat by the European Union (EU) via email:</p> <p>Investigations have confirmed that although the notification was duly provided, it was not submitted at least 72 hours in advance of the intended transhipment. The notification was provided 1 hour and 29 minutes late.</p> <p>The delay was the result of human error and time constraints due to the regular operation of the vessel. This issue was raised with the owner and the master of the vessel who were given a warning and reminded of their responsibilities and obligations.</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required
44-040	Netherlands	<i>Fortunagracht</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 2, states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance if any of its vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area. CM 10-09, paragraph 3 clarifies that that this notification requirement covers the transhipment of harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p>	<p>Response submitted to the Secretariat by the European Union (EU) via email:</p> <p>Investigations have confirmed that although the notification was duly provided, it was not submitted at least 72 hours in advance of the intended transhipment. The notification was provided 2 hours and 17 minutes late.</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>The Secretariat received a notification on 19:17 UTC 10 April 2025 from the <i>Fortunagracht</i> notifying its intention to tranship krill with the <i>Antarctic Sea</i> at 17:00 UTC 13 April 2025.</p> <p>Time difference: 69 hours 43 minutes</p>	<p>The delay was the result of human error and time constraints due to the regular operation of the vessel. This issue was raised with the owner and the master of the vessel who were given a warning and reminded of their responsibilities and obligations.</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-041	Netherlands	<i>Fortunagracht</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 2, states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance if any of its vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area. CM 10-09, paragraph 3 clarifies that that this notification requirement covers the transshipment of harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a notification on 17:10 UTC 12 May 2025 from the <i>Fortunagracht</i> notifying its intention to tranship krill and supplies with the <i>Saga Sea</i> at 11:00 UTC 15 May 2025.</p> <p>Time difference: 65 hours 50 minutes</p>	<p>Response submitted to the Secretariat by the European Union (EU) via email:</p> <p>Investigations have confirmed that although the notification was duly provided, it was not submitted at least 72 hours in advance of the intended transshipment. The notification was provided 6 hours and 10 minutes late.</p> <p>The delay was the result of human error and time constraints due to the regular operation of the vessel. This issue was raised with the owner and the master of the vessel who were given a warning and reminded of their responsibilities and obligations.</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)						
44-042	Norway	<i>Antarctic Endurance</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 2, states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance if any of its vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area. CM 10-09, paragraph 3 clarifies that that this notification requirement covers the transhipment of harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a notification on 18:48 UTC 23 May 2025 from the <i>Antarctic Endurance</i> notifying its intention to tranship Krill with the <i>Fortunagracht</i> at 16:00 UTC 26 May 2025.</p> <p>Time difference: 69 hours 12 minutes</p>	<p>Norway confirms that the vessel did not provide the notification to the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance of the intended transhipment operation due to a human error.</p> <p>Regarding the compliance status, we consider this case of non-compliance to constitute a minor infringement (Level 1) if assessed in isolation. However, as several incidents of non-compliance with CM 10-09 have been identified, we suggest assigning the status Non-compliant Level 2.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Non-compliant (Level 2)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	See paragraph 118
44-043	Norway	<i>Antarctic Endurance</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 2, states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance if any of its vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area. CM 10-09, paragraph 3 clarifies that that this notification requirement covers the transhipment of harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a notification on 12:24 UTC 15 March 2025 from the <i>Antarctic Endurance</i> notifying its intention to tranship krill with the <i>Fortunagracht</i> at 12:00 UTC 18 March 2025.</p>	<p>Norway confirms that the vessel did not provide the notification to the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance of the intended transhipment operation due to a human error.</p> <p>Regarding the compliance status, we consider this case of non-compliance to constitute a minor infringement (Level 1) if assessed in isolation. However, as several incidents of non-compliance with CM 10-09 have been identified, we suggest assigning the status Non-compliant Level 2.</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	See paragraph 118

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			Time difference: 71 hours 36 minutes	Preliminary Status: Non-compliant (Level 2)		
44-044	Norway	<i>Antarctic Sea</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 2, states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance if any of its vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area. CM 10-09, paragraph 3 clarifies that that this notification requirement covers the transhipment of harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a notification on 12:44 UTC 19 May 2025 from the Antarctic Sea notifying its intention to tranship krill and supplies with the <i>Fortunagracht</i> at 12:00 UTC 22 May 2025.</p> <p>Time difference: 71 hours 16 minutes</p>	<p>Norway confirms that the vessel did not provide the notification to the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance of the intended transhipment operation due to a human error.</p> <p>Regarding the compliance status, we consider this case of non-compliance to constitute a minor infringement (Level 1) if assessed in isolation. However, as several incidents of non-compliance with CM 10-09 have been identified, we suggest assigning the status Non-compliant Level 2.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Non-compliant (Level 2)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	See paragraph 118
44-045	Norway		<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 2, states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance if any of its vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area. CM 10-09, paragraph 3 clarifies that that this notification requirement covers the transhipment of harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a notification on 18:41 UTC 26 July 2024 from the <i>Antarctic Provider</i> notifying its intention to tranship Krill, Fuel, supply, provisions</p>	<p>Norway confirms that the vessel did not provide the notification to the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance of the intended transhipment operation due to a human error.</p> <p>Regarding the compliance status, we consider this case of non-compliance to constitute a minor infringement (Level 1) if assessed in isolation. However, as several incidents of non-compliance with CM 10-09 have been identified, we suggest assigning the status Non-compliant Level 2.</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	See paragraph 118

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			and personnel with the <i>Saga Sea</i> at 01:00 UTC 29 July 2024. Time difference: 54 hours 19 minutes	Preliminary Status: Non-compliant (Level 2)		
44-046	Norway		CM 10-09, paragraph 2 , states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance if any of its vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area. CM 10-09, paragraph 3 clarifies that that this notification requirement covers the transhipment of harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel. The Secretariat received a notification on 18:46 UTC 26 July 2024 from the <i>Antarctic Provider</i> notifying its intention to tranship Krill, Fuel, supply, provisions and personnel with the <i>Antarctic Sea</i> at 01:00 UTC 29 July 2024. Time difference: 54 hours 14 minutes	Norway confirms that the vessel did not provide the notification to the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance of the intended transhipment operation due to a human error. Regarding the compliance status, we consider this case of non-compliance to constitute a minor infringement (Level 1) if assessed in isolation. However, as several incidents of non-compliance with CM 10-09 have been identified, we suggest assigning the status Non-compliant Level 2. Preliminary Status: Non-compliant (Level 2)	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	See paragraph 118
44-047	Panama	<i>Frio Hellenic</i>	CM 10-09, paragraph 2 , states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance if any of its vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area. CM 10-09, paragraph 3 clarifies that that this notification requirement covers the transhipment of harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel. The Secretariat received a notification on 16:10 UTC 02 August 2024 from the <i>Frio Hellenic</i> notifying its intention to tranship	Panama confirms that the activity initially notified by the vessel <i>FRIO HELLENIC</i> on 2 August 2024 at 16:10 UTC was rescheduled due to adverse weather conditions and subsequently reported to the Competent Authority and the Secretariat of the Commission on 5 August 2024 at 12:28 UTC. Consequently, the vessel submitted a new notification with a scheduled date of 9 August 2024 at 10:00 UTC.	Compliant	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>Krill with the <i>Shen Lan</i> at 10:00 UTC 05 August 2024.</p> <p>Time difference: 65 hours 50 minutes</p>	<p>For this activity, the vessel <i>FRIO HELLENIC</i> complied with the minimum 72-hour advance notice requirement established under paragraph 2 of Conservation Measure 10-09. Attached is an email and notification template that proves compliance (Annex 1.1 y 1.2).</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Compliant</p>		
44-048	Panama	<i>Frio Poseidon</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 2, states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance if any of its vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area. CM 10-09, paragraph 3 clarifies that that this notification requirement covers the transhipment of harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a notification on 21:25 UTC 21 April 2025 from the <i>Frio Poseidon</i> notifying its intention to tranship krill with the <i>Sae In Leader</i> at 10:00 UTC 23 April 2025.</p> <p>Time difference: 36 hours 35 minutes</p>	<p>Panama acknowledges the information provided by the CCAMLR Secretariat and confirms that, according to the notification records received, the communication submitted by the vessel <i>FRIO POSEIDON</i> did not comply with the minimum 72-hour advance notice required under paragraph 2 of Conservation Measure 10-09.</p> <p>Accordingly, this non-compliance has been referred to the Enforcement Department of the competent Panamanian authority for the initiation of an administrative investigation in order to determine responsibilities and, if applicable, impose the sanctions established under national legislation.</p> <p>Panama will keep the Commission and its Members informed of the final outcome of this process.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required
44-049	Russian Federation	<i>Atmoda</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 2, states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at</p>	<p>По итогам детального расследования выявлено, что причина отклонения по</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>least 72 hours in advance if any of its vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area. CM 10-09, paragraph 3 clarifies that that this notification requirement covers the transhipment of harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a notification on 14:16 UTC 01 May 2025 from the <i>Atmoda</i> notifying its intention to tranship fuel with the <i>Sealion</i> at 23:00 UTC 03 May 2025.</p> <p>Time difference: 56 hours 44 minutes</p>	<p>времени вызвана техническими проблемами с передачей данных и человеческим фактором.</p> <p>A detailed investigation has revealed that a deviation from the timeframe had been caused by technical data transmission issues and human error.</p> <p>Further Action: не требуется.</p> <p>Not required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-050	Russian Federation	<i>Pamyat Ilich</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 2, states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance if any of its vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area. CM 10-09, paragraph 3 clarifies that that this notification requirement covers the transhipment of harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a notification on 17:27 UTC 15 June 2025 from the <i>Pamyat Ilich</i> notifying its intention to tranship fuel with the <i>Sealion</i> at 01:00 UTC 18 June 2025.</p> <p>Time difference: 55 hours 33 minutes</p>	<p>Проведено расследование данного случая и по итогам выявлено следующее. 15.06.2025 с судна "Память Ильича" направлено сообщение в 14.27 LT о планируемой на 18.06.2025 работе в 01.00 UTC приём топлива с <i>Sealion</i>. Вместе с тем из-за ухудшения погодных условий (с учетом прогноза погоды) во избежания риска безопасности мореплавания капитан принял решения о корректировки сроков необходимости. 16.06.2025 отправлено уведомление в 15.46 (UTC -3) в котором указывается, что из-за непогоды приём топлива с <i>Sealion</i> будет 17.06.2025 в 01.00 UTC, т.е. на сутки раньше (из-за непогоды). В виду нарушения установленных сроков, судовладельцу вынесено предупреждение в части контроля</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				<p>действия на судах при проведении операций в море.</p> <p>This matter was investigated, and the following findings were made. On 15.06.2025 at 14.27 LT a notification had been sent from the vessel <i>Pamyat Ilich</i> informing about the intended refuelling from <i>Sealion</i> that had to take place on 18.06.2025 at 01.00 UTC. However, due to deteriorating weather conditions (taking into account the weather forecast) and in order to avoid risks to maritime safety, the skipper made a decision to adjust the relevant deadlines.</p> <p>On 16.06.2025 at 15.46 (UTC -3) a notification was sent stating that due to the poor weather conditions refuelling from <i>Sealion</i> was to take place on 17.06.2025 at 01.00 UTC, that is, one day early (due to adverse weather). Given the violation of the established deadlines, the shipowner was issued a warning regarding the control of the on-board actions during at-sea operations.</p> <p>Further Action: Не требуются Not required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-051	Russian Federation	<i>Pamyat Kirova</i>	CM 10-09, paragraph 2 , states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance if any of its	По итогам детального расследования выявлено, что причина отклонения по времени вызвана техническими	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area. CM 10-09, paragraph 3 clarifies that that this notification requirement covers the transhipment of harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a notification on 10:09 UTC 25 March 2025 from the <i>Pamyat Kirova</i> notifying its intention to tranship krill with the <i>Fu Xing Hai</i> at 10:00 UTC 28 March 2025.</p> <p>Time difference: 71 hours 51 minutes</p>	<p>проблемами с передачей данных и человеческим фактором.</p> <p>A detailed investigation has revealed that a deviation from the timeframe had been caused by technical data transmission issues and human error.</p> <p>Further Action: Не требуется.</p> <p>Not required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-052	Ukraine		<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 2, states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance if any of its vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area. CM 10-09, paragraph 3 clarifies that that this notification requirement covers the transhipment of harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a notification on 16:08 UTC 31 Jan 2025 from the <i>Simeiz</i> notifying its intention to tranship bait and a mainline with the <i>Calipso</i> at 17:00 UTC 02 Feb 2025.</p> <p>Time difference: 48 hours 52 minutes</p>	<p><i>SIMEIZ</i> and <i>CALIPSO</i> failed to submit the notifications earlier.</p> <p>The shipowner was reminded of the need to strictly comply with the requirements of the CCAMLR Conservation Measures and was obliged to conduct additional training for vessel's crews.</p> <p>Further Action: Additional trainings introduced. Additional check-list implemented.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required
44-053	Vanuatu	<i>Hai Feng 678</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 2, states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 72 hours in advance if any of its</p>	<p>As per our investigation, <i>HAI FENG 678</i> in fact sent notification notice email on 1st Apr 2025. Due to poor satellite signal</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	See paragraph 118

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>vessels intend to tranship within the Convention Area. CM 10-09, paragraph 3 clarifies that that this notification requirement covers the transshipment of harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a notification on 10:32 UTC 04 April 2025 from the <i>Hai Feng 678</i> notifying its intention to tranship krill and fuel with the <i>Hua Xiang 9</i> at 10:00 UTC 6 April 2025.</p> <p>Time difference: 47 hours 28 minutes</p>	<p>sometimes even no signal in some area of Antarctic, the email was actually send unsuccessfully. When captain found this failure and resent email again, time already comes to 04 Aug 2025. That's why in the email the sending time shows UTC time 10:31 04 Apr 2025.</p> <p>According to the confirmation notice, the actually transshipment start time was 12:10 06 Apr 2025, and finish time was 17:00 08 Apr 2025. The time difference between emial sending and actual transshipment start time is only about 60 hours 40 miniuts, indeed less than 72 hours.</p> <p>We're sorry about this case, the Capitain only remembered that he sent email on 01 Apr 2025 but neglect the real eail resending time was actually on 04 Apr 2025. We have warned the operator of <i>HAI FENG 678</i> and her captain to be more carefully when sending the notification email. daily check the status of email system, make sure such case will never happen again.</p> <p>Sincerely sorry for any inconvenience that brought to you.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Nil Response</p>		
44-054	China	<i>Shen Lan</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 3, states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 2 hours in advance from the</p>	<p>In accordance with CM 10-09, paragraph 3 states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 2 hours in advance of the transshipment of items other than</p>	Compliant	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>transhipment of items other than harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p> <p>The Secretariat received notification from the Chinese-flagged vessel the <i>Shen Lan</i> on 11:41 UTC 16 Feb 2025 of their intended transhipment of crew at 12:00 UTC 16 Feb 2025.</p> <p>Time difference: 19 minutes</p>	<p>harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p> <p>In accordance with CM 10-09, footnote 1 “Transhipment means the transfer of harvested marine living resources and any other goods or materials to or from fishing vessels”.</p> <p>The definition of transshipment does not include the transfer of personnel. The submitted personnel notification is voluntary.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Compliant</p>		
44-055	China	<i>Fu Xing Hai</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 5, states that each Flag State shall confirm the information provided for a transhipment in accordance with paragraphs 2 or 3 to the Secretariat within 3 working days of having transhipped.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a confirmation from China on 03:56 UTC 13 August 2024 of the <i>Fu Xing Hai</i>'s transhipment of fuel from 16:24 UTC 06 August 2024 - 07:00 UTC 07 August 2024 with the <i>Jason</i>.</p> <p>Confirmation was received 4 working days after the transhipment.</p>	<p><i>FU XING HAI</i> started the bunkering with <i>JASON</i> at 16:24 August 6th 2024 and finished it at 07:00 August 7th 2024 (UTC). The confirmation was sent to her company at 13:40 8th 2024 (UTC). Unfortunately, the data manager of the company was ill at that time. This is the reason for the late confirmation.</p> <p>Further Action: China will strictly submit the transhipment notifications and confirmations in accordance with CM 10-09 to prevent similar issues from happening.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required
44-056	Korea, Republic of	<i>Sae In Leader</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 5, states that each Flag State shall confirm the information provided for a transhipment in accordance with paragraphs 2 or 3 to the Secretariat</p>	<p>Due to the change of the bunkering vessel, the initial advance report sent on 14 June (MT <i>SEALION</i>, MGO 600KL) was amended on 15 June to reflect the change of the fuel supply vessel (MV <i>PAMYAT</i></p>	Compliant	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>within 3 working days of having transhipped.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a notification on 01:08 UTC 14 June 2025 from the <i>Sae In Leader</i> notifying its intention to tranship Fuel with the <i>Sealion</i> at 13:00 UTC 19 June 2025.</p> <p>No confirmation has been received by the <i>Sae In Leader</i> or Korea</p>	<p><i>ILICHA</i>, MGO 600KL). Subsequently, the bunkering took place on June 21 and completion of bunkering was reported (MV <i>PAMYAT ILICHA</i>, MGO 600KL) on the same day.</p> <p>3) Detailed Circumstances:</p> <p>While operating in FAO Area 48.2, the <i>SAE IN LEADER</i> submitted on 14 June at 01:08 UTC the initial 72-hour advance transshipment report (plan to transship 600MT of krill and 45MT of krill meal to MV <i>TAGANROGSKIY ZALIV</i> on 22 June UTC) and, at 01:09 UTC the same day, the initial 72-hour advance bunkering report (plan to receive 600KL MGO from MT <i>SEALION</i> on 19 June UTC), in preparation for the anticipated transshipment and bunkering around 20 June.</p> <p>On the following day, due to changes in the carrier vessel’s schedule, the originally planned separate bunkering and transshipment operations were combined into one vessel. Accordingly, on 15 June at 23:14 UTC, the first amendment report was submitted (plan to transship 600MT of krill and receive 600KL MGO from MV <i>PAMYAT ILICHA</i> on 21 June UTC).</p> <p>Later, after coordination with the carrier vessel, changes occurred in the transshipment volume, the scheduled date/time, and the position. Two additional amended reports were submitted on 19 June, and finally, on 21 June at 12:01</p>		

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				<p>UTC, the completed transshipment and bunkering report was submitted (859.35MT krill, 48.8MT krill meal, and 600KL MGO). It is therefore considered that all changes and completions were duly reported.</p> <p>Chronological Summary of Reports by <i>SAE IN LEADER</i></p> <p>A. 72 HOURS PRIOR TRANSSHIPMENT REPORT: UTC 2025.06.14 01:08</p> <p>B. 72 HOURS PRIOR BUNKERING REPORT: UTC 2025.06.14 01:09</p> <p>C. CHANGE 72 HOURS PRIOR TRANSSHIPMENT & BUNKERING REPORT: UTC 2025.06.15 23:14</p> <p>D. CHANGE 72 HOURS PRIOR TRANSSHIPMENT & BUNKERING REPORT: UTC 2025.06.19 11:13</p> <p>E. CHANGE 72 HOURS PRIOR TRANSSHIPMENT & BUNKERING REPORT: UTC 2025.06.19 12:06</p> <p>F. COMPLETED TRANSSHIPMENT & BUNKERING REPORT: UTC 2025.06.21 12:01</p> <p>Further Action: no further action required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Compliant</p>		
44-057	Korea, Republic of	<i>Sein Honor</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 5, states that each Flag State shall confirm the information provided for a transshipment in accordance with paragraphs 2 or 3 to the Secretariat</p>	<p>The vessel notified its intention to fuel and transfer a worker with the <i>PAMYAT ILLICHA</i>. However, due to some technical issues of the <i>PAMYAT ILLICHA</i>, the fueling was canceled and only the transfer</p>	Compliant	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>within 3 working days of having transhipped.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a notification on 17:34 UTC 30 May 2025 from the <i>Sein Honor</i> notifying its intention to tranship Fuel with the <i>Pamyat Ilich</i> at 13:00 UTC 05 June 2025.</p> <p>No confirmation has been received by the <i>Sein Honor</i> or Korea</p>	<p>of the work took place. Paragraph 5 stipulates that “Within three (3) working days of any of its vessels having transhipped within the Convention Area, each Flag State shall confirm the information provided in accordance with paragraphs 2 or 3 to the Secretariat” As no fueling took place, and the transfer of a person does not constitute “transshipping” as per footnote 1 (Transshipment means the transfer of harvested marine living resources and any other goods or materials to or from fishing vessels) the vessel had not “transshipped.” The obligation to notify any changes within three days gets triggered from the point when a vessel has “transshipped” and therefore the vessel is not obliged to report the cancellation. If the intention is to require a vessel to notify a cancellation within 3 days, the language of the CM should be revised to clarify that.</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Compliant</p>		
44-058	Netherlands	<i>Fortunagracht</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 5, states that each Flag State shall confirm the information provided for a transshipment in accordance with paragraphs 2 or 3 to the Secretariat within 3 working days of having transhipped.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a confirmation from the <i>Fortunagracht</i> on 18:36 UTC 05 June 2025 of its transshipment of krill,</p>	<p>Response submitted to the Secretariat by the European Union (EU) via email:</p> <p>Investigations have confirmed that although the notification was duly provided, it was not submitted within 3 working days after transshipment. The notification was provided 1 working day late.</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>supplies, provisions from 09:00 28 May 2025 – 22:40 UTC 29 May 2025 with the <i>Antarctic Endurance</i>.</p> <p>Confirmation was received 4 working days after the transhipment.</p>	<p>The delay was the result of human error and time constraints due to the regular operation of the vessel. This issue was raised with the owner and the master of the vessel who were given a warning and reminded of their responsibilities and obligations.</p> <p>Further Action: No further action required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-059	Norway	<i>Antarctic Endurance</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 5, states that each Flag State shall confirm the information provided for a transhipment in accordance with paragraphs 2 or 3 to the Secretariat within 3 working days of having transhipped.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a confirmation from the <i>Antarctic Endurance</i> on 18:10 UTC 05 June 2025 of its transhipment of krill, supplies, provisions from 09:00 28 May 2025 – 22:40 UTC 29 May 2025 with the <i>Fortunagracht</i>.</p> <p>Time difference: 6 days 19h 30 min</p>	<p>Norway confirms that the vessel did not provide the required confirmation for the transhipment of a trawl net within 3 working days of having transhipped due to a human error.</p> <p>Regarding the compliance status, we consider this case of non-compliance to constitute a minor infringement (Level 1) if assessed in isolation. However, as several incidents of non-compliance with CM 10-09 have been identified, we suggest assigning the status Non-compliant Level 2.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Non-compliant (Level 2)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	See paragraph 121
44-060	Norway		<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 5, states that each Flag State shall confirm the information provided for a transhipment in accordance with paragraphs 2 or 3 to the Secretariat</p>	<p>Norway confirms that the vessel did not provide the required confirmation for the transhipment of a trawl net within 3 working days of having transhipped due to a human error.</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	See paragraph 121

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>within 3 working days of having transhipped.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a confirmation from the Norwegian flagged <i>Antarctic Provider</i> on 17:56 UTC 06 June 2025 of the transhipment of a trawl net from 10:30 – 13:00 UTC 08 May 2025 with the <i>Antarctic Sea</i>.</p> <p>Confirmation was received 20 working days after the transhipment.</p>	<p>Regarding the compliance status, we consider this case of non-compliance to constitute a minor infringement (Level 1) if assessed in isolation. However, as several incidents of non-compliance with CM 10-09 have been identified, we suggest assigning the status Non-compliant Level 2.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Non-compliant (Level 2)</p>		
44-061	Russian Federation	<i>Pamyat Ilich</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 5, states that each Flag State shall confirm the information provided for a transhipment in accordance with paragraphs 2 or 3 to the Secretariat within 3 working days of having transhipped.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a confirmation from the <i>Pamyat Ilich</i> on 21:16 UTC 02 June 2025 of the transhipment of fuel, spare parts and provisions from 15:55 – 21:40 UTC 20 May 2025 with the <i>Fu Xing Hai</i>.</p> <p>Confirmation was received 9 working days after the transhipment.</p>	<p>По итогам детального расследования выявлено, что причина отклонения по времени вызвана техническими проблемами с передачей данных и человеческим фактором.</p> <p>A detailed investigation has revealed that a deviation from the timeframe had been caused by technical data transmission issues and human error.</p> <p>Further Action: не требуется</p> <p>Not required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required
44-062	Russian Federation	<i>Pamyat Ilich</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 5, states that each Flag State shall confirm the information provided for a transhipment in accordance with paragraphs 2 or 3 to the Secretariat</p>	<p>По итогам детального расследования выявлено, что причина отклонения по времени вызвана техническими причинами и человеческим фактором. В связи со сложной навигационной</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>within 3 working days of having transhipped.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a confirmation from the <i>Pamyat Ilich</i> on 21:16 UTC 02 June 2025 of the transhipment of Krill from 15:00 UTC 20 May 2025 – 04:40 UTC 22 May 2025 with the <i>Fu Xing Hai</i>.</p> <p>Confirmation was received 7 working days after the transhipment.</p>	<p>обстановкой: большого количества айсбергов, льда, прохождения узкостей-проливов капитан первоочередно обеспечивал безопасность мореплавания и, как результат, своевременно не проконтролировал подачу уведомления об окончании грузовых операции.</p> <p>A detailed investigation has revealed that a deviation from the timeframe had been caused by technical data transmission issues and human error. Due to a difficult navigational situation: a large number of icebergs, ice, and the need to pass through narrows and straits, the skipper gave priority to ensuring maritime safety and, as a result, failed to supervise the submission of a notification concerning the completion of freight operations in a timely manner.</p> <p>Further Action: не требуется.</p> <p>Not required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>		
44-063	Panama	<i>Frio Hellenic</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 8, prohibits a vessel to tranship within the Convention Area where a prior notification has not been provided.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a confirmation on 11 Aug 2024 10:05 UTC from the <i>Frio Hellenic</i> confirming its transhipment of</p>	<p>Panama confirms that the vessel <i>FRIO HELLENIC</i> submitted to the Competent Authority and the Secretariat of the Commission, on 2 August 2024 at 16:09 UTC, the prior notification of the transfer of one crew member to be carried out with the vessel <i>Shen Lan</i>, together with the possible transshipment of product.</p>	Compliant	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p>crew with the <i>Shen Lan</i> on 10 August 2024.</p> <p>No prior notification was provided.</p>	<p>Accordingly, the vessel <i>FRIO HELLENIC</i> complied with the requirements of paragraph 8 of Conservation Measure 10-09. Attached is an email and notification template that proves compliance (Annex 2.1 y 2.2).</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Compliant</p>		
44-064	Russian Federation	<i>Pamyat Ilich</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 8, prohibits a vessel to tranship within the Convention Area where a prior notification has not been provided.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a notification on 17:34 UTC 30 May 2025 from the <i>Sein Honor</i> notifying its intention to tranship Fuel with the <i>Pamyat Ilich</i> at 13:00 UTC 05 June 2025.</p> <p>No notification has been received by the <i>Pamyat Ilich</i> or Russia.</p>	<p>Проведено расследование данного случая и по итогам выявлено следующее. Сообщение о предстоящей работе: выдача топлива/приём пассажиров с <i>Sein Honor</i> отправлено 30.05.2025 в 15.20 LT (UTC -3). Вместе с тем, судовладелец "Память Ильича" информировал <i>Sein Honor</i>, что по техническим причинам отсутствует возможность выдачи топлива. 07.05.2025 суда ошвартовались, получили только пассажиров. Топливо не выдавалось. 07.06.2025 отправлено сообщение в 17.56 LT приём пассажиров с <i>Sein Honor</i>, выдачу топлива не осуществляли по техническим причинам. Согласно сноски 1 к пункту 2 МС 10-09 под перегрузкой понимается перемещение добытых морских живых ресурсов и любых других товаров или материалов с одного судна на другое. Пересадка только пассажиров не подпадает под понятие перегрузка, как обозначено в МС 10-09.</p>	Compliant	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				<p>This matter was investigated, and the following findings were made. A notification of intended operations: fuel delivery/passengers boarding from <i>Sein Honor</i> had been sent on 30.05.2025 at 15.20 LT (UTC -3). At the same time the <i>Pamyat Ilich</i> vessel owner had informed <i>Sein Honor</i> that no fuel could be dispensed for technical reasons. On 07.05.2025 the vessels moored and received passengers only. No fuel was dispensed. On 07.06.2025 at 17.56 LT the following notification was sent: passengers transferred from <i>Sein Honor</i>; no fuel dispensed for technical reasons. As per Footnote 1 to paragraph 2, CM 10-09 “Transshipment means the transfer of harvested marine living resources and any other goods or materials to or from fishing vessels”. Under CM 10-09 transfer of passengers only does not constitute a transshipment.</p>		
				Preliminary Status: Compliant		
44-065	Vanuatu	<i>Hai Feng 688</i>	<p>CM 10-09, paragraph 8, prohibits a vessel to tranship within the Convention Area where a prior notification has not been provided.</p>	<p>We confirm that the notification notice email sent by <i>HAI FENG 688</i> was received at UTC time 17:24 01 Mar 2025, this email was also copied to fmc@ccamlr.org and data@ccamlr.org</p>	Compliant	See paragraph 122
			<p>The Secretariat received a confirmation on 11 March 2025 07:11 UTC from the <i>Hai Feng 688</i> confirming its transshipment of Krill with the <i>Hua Xiang 9</i> on 9–10 March 2025.</p>	<p>The Confirmation notice email sent by <i>HAI FENG 688</i> was received at UTC time 07:11 11 Mar 2025, this email was also copied to fmc@ccamlr.org and data@ccamlr.org</p>		
			<p>No prior notification was provided.</p>			

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				Due to the force majeure factors, the actual trasshipment with <i>HUA XIANG 9</i> delayed from 5th March to 9th - 10th March.		
				Preliminary Status: Nil Response		
CM 22-08						
44-066	Korea, Republic of	<i>Hong Jin No. 701</i>	<p>CM 22-08, paragraph 1, prohibits fishing in exploratory fisheries for <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. in depths shallower than 550 m.</p> <p>The <i>Hong Jin No. 701</i> whilst participating in the exploratory <i>Dissostichus mawsoni</i> fishery in Subarea 88.1 as per CM 41-09, reported the depth of fishing as 540 metres at the end of the line when setting haul 33 on 26 Dec 2024.</p>	<p>Upon reviewing the C2 data, it was determined that for Haul 33, the number of droppers (540) was mistakenly entered in the depth field, incorrectly recording the depth as 540m. For this haul, 12 hooks were attached to each dropper, resulting in a total of 12 hooks x 540 droppers = 6,480 hooks being set. (※ Reference 2-2)</p> <p>Furthermore, as the start position of the line for Haul 53 is nearly identical to the end position of the line for Haul 33, the depth was checked and confirmed to be recorded as 715m. (※ Reference 2-3) In addition, the VME data for Haul 33 also indicates that the depth was between 1284m and 695m. (※ Reference 2-4)</p> <p>Conclusion: After reviewing this case, it is clear that the misunderstanding arose from a typographical error during the C2 data entry. By comparing the depth information for the same location and reviewing the VME data, we can prove that no fishing activity was conducted within the 550m depth limit that was cited as the violation. Nonetheless, the government instructed the operator to ensure that the crews on all their vessels to minimize such errors in C2 data entry in the future.</p>	Compliant	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				<p>Further Action: As this is compliant, no action is required</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Compliant</p>		
CM 26-01						
44-067	Namibia	<i>Helena Ndume</i>	<p>CM 26-01, paragraph 8, prohibits the discharging or discharging of offal or discards south of 60°S.</p> <p>Section 7.3 of the Commercial Data Collection Manual – Longline Fisheries – Version 2023, states that any species that is caught and retained on the vessel for discard at a later date shall be reported in the C2 data as “Retained” and any species landed on the vessels and then discarded overboard without processing is to be reported as “Discarded”.</p> <p>From 03 Dec 2024 to 15 Jan 2025 the <i>Helena Ndume</i> reported in their C2 data discarding south of 60°S 415 individuals of Rajidae.</p>	<p>Namibia can confirm that no discarding took place rather the live release of 410 RAJ species. The report from the Ukrainian International Observer confirms that all skates were returned to sea alive and all other offal/bycatch was strictly retained on board and only discharged north of 60 degrees south.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Compliant</p>	Compliant	No further action required
44-068	Norway	<i>Antarctic Endurance</i>	<p>CM 26-01, paragraph 8, prohibits the discharging or discharging of offal or discards south of 60°S.</p> <p>The SISO observer on the Norwegian flagged <i>Antarctic Endurance</i> reported in observer trip report number 2504 in Subareas 48.1 and 48.2, the following:</p> <p>Section 6.3 – comments “On 20/04/2024, the observer saw a small amount of offal being released with the stickwater of the</p>	<p>The incident described in the observer report occurred during factory cleaning.</p> <p>A small amount of krill was discharged when the screen mesh was removed from the scupper for cleaning. The screen mesh was immediately reinstalled, whereupon the discharge of offal ceased.</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	No further action required

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			vessel, this was due to a mesh trap on the factory being removed. The vessel was notified, and the scupper was refitted to stop the offal release.”			
CM 31-01						
44-069	United Kingdom	<i>Argos Helena</i>	<p>As stated in COMM CIRC 25/65: CM 31-01 states that for each fishing season the Commission shall establish such limitations or other measures, as necessary, around South Georgia (Subarea 48.3).</p> <p><i>Argos Helena</i> was identified fishing for <i>Dissostichus eleginoides</i> in Subarea 48.3 in 2025 which COMM CIRC 25/65 alleges is contrary to CM 31-01.</p> <p>A response from the United Kingdom has been circulated in COMM CIRC 25/71.</p> <p>This event is considered further on the Draft IUU Vessel List (COMM CIRC 25/66).</p>	<p>The UK rejects the assertions contained in COMM CIRC 25/65 concerning the compliance of the <i>Argos Helena</i> and <i>Nordic Prince</i> with Conservation Measure 31-01.</p> <p>COMM CIRC 22/39, 22/51, 22/69, 23/39, 24/69 and 25/71 set out the UK’s consistent position in regard to the Patagonian toothfish fishery in the part of the proclaimed maritime zone of South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands that lies within statistical Subarea 48.3.</p> <p>There is no scientific or legal justification for any Member seeking the closure of the Patagonian toothfish fishery in Subarea 48.3. All Members of the Commission, apart from Russia, agreed that the proposed catch limit and terms on which Conservation Measure 41-02 was to be re-adopted at CCAMLR-43 were consistent with the best available science and in accordance with the CCAMLR decision rules.</p> <p>In relation to Conservation Measure 31-01, this requires CCAMLR to ‘establish such limitations or other measures, as necessary’ for fishing in Subarea 48.3, but</p>		See paragraphs 126-130

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				<p>does not provide, or imply, that if CCAMLR does not adopt such a measure (even if objectively required), any limitation on fishing will nonetheless come into existence. In connection with this, the UK notes that fishing for toothfish took place in Subarea 48.3 prior to a catch limit being set for that species, including in the years after Conservation Measure 31-01 was adopted. There is no suggestion (such as in the records of meetings at the time) that such fishing prior to the adoption of a catch-limit was contrary to the CAMLR Convention or any Conservation Measure, including Conservation Measure 31-01.</p> <p>For the information of Members, the UK continues to operate the South Georgia toothfish fishery consistently with all relevant CCAMLR Conservation Measures including, but not limited to, Conservation Measure 10-02, Conservation Measure 10-04, Conservation Measure 10-05 and Conservation Measure 23-01.</p> <p>Further Action: None</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Compliant</p>		
44-070	United Kingdom	<i>Nordic Prince</i>	<p>As stated in COMM CIRCs 25/65: CM 31-01 states that for each fishing season the Commission shall establish such limitations or other measures, as necessary, around South Georgia (Subarea 48.3).</p>	<p>The UK rejects the assertions contained in COMM CIRC 25/65 concerning the compliance of the <i>Argos Helena</i> and <i>Nordic Prince</i> with Conservation Measure 31-01.</p>		<p>See paragraphs 126-130</p>

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			<p><i>Nordic Prince</i> was identified fishing for <i>Dissostichus eleginoides</i> in Subarea 48.3 in 2025 which COMM CIRC 25/65 alleges is contrary to CM 31-01.</p> <p>A response from the United Kingdom has been circulated in COMM CIRC 25/71.</p> <p>This event is considered further on the Draft IUU Vessel List (COMM CIRC 25/66).</p>	<p>COMM CIRCs 22/39, 22/51, 22/69, 23/39, 24/69 and 25/71 set out the UK’s consistent position in regard to the Patagonian toothfish fishery in the part of the proclaimed maritime zone of South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands that lies within statistical Subarea 48.3.</p> <p>There is no scientific or legal justification for any Member seeking the closure of the Patagonian toothfish fishery in Subarea 48.3. All Members of the Commission, apart from Russia, agreed that the proposed catch limit and terms on which Conservation Measure 41-02 was to be re-adopted at CCAMLR-43 were consistent with the best available science and in accordance with the CCAMLR decision rules.</p> <p>In relation to Conservation Measure 31-01, this 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 (even if objectively required), any limitation on fishing will nonetheless come into existence. In connection with this, the UK notes that fishing for toothfish took place in Subarea 48.3 prior to a catch limit being set for that species, including in the years after Conservation Measure 31-01 was adopted. There is no suggestion (such as in the records of meetings at the time) that such fishing prior to the adoption of a catch-limit was contrary to the CAMLR</p>		

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
				<p>Convention or any Conservation Measure, including Conservation Measure 31-01.</p> <p>For the information of Members, the UK continues to operate the South Georgia toothfish fishery consistently with all relevant CCAMLR Conservation Measures including, but not limited to, Conservation Measure 10-02, Conservation Measure 10-04, Conservation Measure 10-05 and Conservation Measure 23-01.</p> <p>Further Action: None</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Compliant</p>		
CM 91-05						
44-071	Russian Federation	<i>Alpha Crux</i>	<p>CM 91-05, paragraph 24, requires Flag States to notify the Secretariat prior to entry of their fishing vessels into the MPA.</p> <p>Analysis of VMS data identified that a movement notice had not been provided by the Alpha Crux for entry into RSR MPA SRZ. The Secretariat requested a movement notice from the Russian VMS Contact Officers on 9 December 2024 0357 UTC.</p> <p>A movement notification for the Alpha Crux was provided on 9 December 2024 1159 UTC which notified entry into RSR MPA SRZ on 7 December 2024 2347 UTC.</p>	<p>По итогам детального расследования выявлено, что причина отклонения вызвана внешним фактором, а именно: оператор VSAT, предоставляющий компании услугу спутниковой связи, без уведомления судовладельца и экипажа прекратил предоставление услуги. Это невозможно к прогнозированию обстоятельство привело к сбою в обеспечении связи судно-берег, в части передачи текстовых сообщений с борта судна в адрес Секретариата.</p> <p>Оперативно уполномоченные службы отреагировали на ситуацию и совместно с береговым техническим персоналом было произведено переключение и</p>	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	See paragraph 131

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SCIC Response
			Time difference: 36 hours 12 minutes after entry	<p data-bbox="1167 252 1626 405">настройка судового радиооборудования к другому оператору. В кратчайшие сроки повторное уведомление было направлено в Секретариат АНТКОМ в установленном порядке.</p> <p data-bbox="1167 437 1626 772">A detailed investigation revealed that the deviation was caused by an external factor, namely: the VSAT satellite communications service provider working with the company terminated the service without notifying the shipowner and crew. This unforeseeable circumstance led to a failure in ship and shore communications, specifically in terms of text messages transmission from the ship to the Secretariat.</p> <p data-bbox="1167 778 1626 1018">The authorised authorities responded promptly to the situation and, together with the shore-based technical personnel, configured the onboard radio equipment to switch to a different provider. The repeat notification was sent to the CCAMLR Secretariat as soon as possible as per the established procedure.</p> <p data-bbox="1167 1054 1518 1082">Preliminary Status: Compliant</p>		

**Summary CCAMLR Compliance Report 2024/2025
Part B**

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SIC Response
CM 10-10						
44-072	Peru		<p>CM 10-10, paragraph 1, notes that the draft CCAMLR Compliance Report shall include ... issues noted by the Commission as requiring additional information from a Contracting Party in the previous year’s CCAMLR Compliance Report.</p> <p>For the following compliance issues under CM 10-05, CC-43 was able to reach a common understanding on needing additional information as no response to the draft compliance report was provided.</p> <p>Peru provided additional information in COMM CIRC 24/118.</p> <p>The compliance event considered by SCIC-2024 was: CM 10-05, paragraph 6, requires that each Contracting Party and non-Contracting Party cooperating with CCAMLR by participating in the CDS shall require that each shipment of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. imported into, or exported or re-exported from its territory be accompanied by a DED or DRED. The import, export or re-export of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. without a DED or DRED is prohibited.</p> <p>CM 10-05, paragraph 7, requires that DEDs and DREDs must be completed as described in Annex 10-05/A. The use of the e-CDS to generate, validate and complete a DED and/or a DRED is mandatory. A DED and/or DRED is not completed nor validated in the eCDS without the verification</p>	Nil Response	Minor non-compliant (Level 1)	See paragraphs 132-133

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SIC Response
44-073	Vanuatu	<i>Hai Feng 718</i>	<p>provided by a government official at section 5 of the DED template (“step 4: Export state confirmation” in eCDS). Without this validation the import State will not have access to the document in the eCDS.</p> <p>Analysis of the eCDS data has identified Peru validated 6 DEDs after the declared export date. Therefore these shipments did not have a completed DED available to accompany them at the time of export. The identified DEDs account for 6 % of Peru's exports and <1 % of all CDS exports.</p> <p>The time difference between the export and validation for the identified documents are: 3 DEDs were issued between 1 – 5 days after declared export date 1 DED was issued between 3 – 5 days after declared export date 1 DED was issued between 11 – 20 days after declared export date 1 DED was issued between 21 – 50 days after declared export date</p>	<p>We confirm that the notification notice email sent by <i>HAI FENG 718</i> was received at UTC time 07:54 03 Feb 2024, this email was also copied to fmc@ccamlr.org and data@ccamlr.org</p> <p>The Confirmation notice email sent by <i>HAI FENG 718</i> was received at UTC time 12:43 09 Feb 2024, this email was also</p>	Compliant	See paragraphs 134-135

#	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat	Response – Contracting Party	Status	SIC Response
			<p>The Secretariat requested the information on 21 January 2025, 10 June 2025 and 1 July 2025. Vanuatu has not responded to any of these emails.</p> <p>The compliance event considered by SCIC-2024 was: CM 10-09, paragraph 8, prohibits a vessel to tranship within the Convention Area where a prior notification has not been provided.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a confirmation on 9 Feb 2024 1243 UTC from the Hai Feng 718 confirming its transhipment of Krill and Fuel with the Hua Xiang 9 from 07 – 08 Feb 2024.</p> <p>No prior notification was provided.</p>	<p>copied to fmc@ccamlr.org and data@ccamlr.com</p> <p>Preliminary Status: Nil Response</p>		

Proposed Contracting Party IUU Vessel List 2025/26 (Conservation Measure 10-06)

No changes recommended by SCIC to the existing [2024/25 CP IUU Vessel List](#)

Proposed Non-Contracting Party IUU Vessel List 2025/26 (Conservation Measure 10-07)

No changes recommended by SCIC to the existing [2024/25 NCP IUU Vessel List](#)

Secretariat Tasking

SCIC agenda item	Topic	Task	SCIC report reference
3.1	e-CDS resource development	SCIC requested the Secretariat continue the development of e-learning CDS modules in 2026 and 2027.	10 (i)
3.1	e-CDS resource development	Requested that the Secretariat develop a workplan in the intersessional period on how this could be implemented in 2027.	10 (i)
3.1	CDS-related Cape Town workshop recommendations	Tasked the Secretariat to make the necessary arrangements and to report back on the implementation of the CDS-related recommendations at SCIC 2026.	15
3.2	Inspection resources intersessional panel	SCIC tasked the Secretariat with making the necessary arrangements to facilitate and support the work of the panel.	21
3.2	Electronic reporting project High priority	SCIC requested that further development take into account integration with internal CCAMLR data holdings, the need for offline data entry capability and consideration of interoperability with relevant external data systems, including the GIES under the PSMA.	23
3.2	AIS and port inspection data holdings proxy analysis	SCIC recognised the usefulness of this analysis and recommended that the Secretariat undertake it on an annual basis. The AIS and port inspection analysis would be reviewed annually for its applicability. SCIC further noted that future analyses should acknowledge the limitations in the accuracy of AIS data and confirmed that such analyses are not to be used for compliance purposes.	25
3.3	Automated VMS movement notifications High priority	SCIC endorsed the Secretariat's continued work to develop an automated VMS movement notification as a matter of priority and highlighted its potential benefits.	29
3.3	Inmarsat	SCIC endorsed the Secretariat's recommendation to discontinue paying for Inmarsat position reports from the 2025/2026 season forward and have Contracting Parties with vessels continuing to report to CCAMLR via the Inmarsat email address to ensure that these positions are redirected, or that vessel operators are instructed to undertake this action.	30
3.7	NCP Engagement – Kuwait and UAE	SCIC noted the positive engagement from Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates (UAE) and tasked the Secretariat with continuing to foster these dialogues and others in interested NCPs in the Middle East region. Additionally, SCIC also endorsed the continued engagement with NCPs in the Southeast Asia region	51
3.7	Transshipment NCP strategy	SCIC noted the importance of transshipment in the context of NCP engagement and requested the	52

		Secretariat to engage with NCPs that provide transshipment services in the Convention Area to support their understanding of and compliance with CCAMLR Conservation Measures.	
4	Open-source data analysis and CCEP	In relation to the use of open-source data by the Secretariat within the CCEP, SCIC noted that such data should be objective and reliable before being used for compliance analysis. SCIC requested that the Secretariat further explore this recommendation and provide additional information to SCIC in 2026.	104
5.1	Unidentified gear workplan	SCIC considered the update provided by the Secretariat on the workplan to address unidentified fishing gear in the Convention Area. SCIC acknowledged the progress made in this area and endorsed the extension of the workplan for 2026-2027.	148
6	Fishing notifications High priority	SCIC requests assurances from Ecuador that they will exercise their Flag State responsibilities through implementation of the appropriate monitoring and control measures of the vessel, that the master, charterer, owner, and any beneficial owners have no association with IUU fishing, and that <i>Altar 45</i> will not carry gillnets while operating within the Convention Area. SCIC tasked the Secretariat to contact Ecuador in this regard	183

**Report of the Standing Committee on
Administration and Finance (SCAF-2025)**

Contents

	Page
Opening of the meeting	1
Organisation of the meeting	1
Annual Financial Statements	1
Secretariat matters	1
Executive Secretary's Report	1
Capacity Building	3
Activities of the General Capacity Building Fund	3
Review of 2025 Budget, 2026 Draft Budget and 2027 Forecast Budget	5
Review of 2025 Budget	5
MPA Fund Discussion	5
Draft Budget for 2026 and Forecast Budget for 2027	5
Administrative issues	8
Other business	8
Adoption of the Report	9
Close of the meeting	9
Appendix I: 2025 Revised Budget, Draft Budget for 2026 and Forecast Budget for 2027	10
Appendix II: Members' Contributions 2025, 2026, 2027	13

**Report of the Meeting of the Standing Committee
on Administration and Finance (SCAF-2025)
(Hobart, Tasmania, 22 to 24 October 2025)**

Opening of the meeting

1. Ambassador M. Gowland (Argentina), in his second year as Chair of the Standing Committee on Administration and Finance (SCAF), facilitated discussions on Item 10 of the Commission's agenda.
2. The Chair welcomed delegates to the meeting.

Organisation of the meeting

3. SCAF considered its agenda as adopted by the Commission.

Annual Financial Statements

4. The Secretariat introduced CCAMLR-44/03, which contains the 2024 Financial Statements. The 2024 Financial Statements were signed off by the Australian National Audit Office (ANAO) on 5 May 2025.
5. SCAF accepted the financial statements for year ended 31 December 2024 and recommended that the Commission adopt the audited financial statements for the 2024 financial year.
6. SCAF endorsed the reappointment of the ANAO for the audit of financial statements for the 2025 and 2026 financial years.

Secretariat matters

Executive Secretary's Report

7. The Executive Secretary presented CCAMLR-44/05, reporting on and highlighting the work of the Secretariat over the past year and on the Secretariat Strategic Plan 2023–2026.
8. SCAF accepted the report of the Executive Secretary and congratulated the Secretariat on the large amount of work undertaken during the year and the support offered to all Commission and Scientific Committee activities.
9. SCAF noted the efforts made by the Secretariat to reduce CCAMLR's 2025 budget deficit and commended the actions taken in order to identify efficiencies and cost reductions that would aim to achieve a balanced budget by the end of 2026 (CCAMLR-44/05, paragraph 10). Many Members noted the need to address the issue of incomes for a balanced

budget to be achieved in the near future, while the Russian Federation (Russia) suggested that the current budget was adequate.

10. The Chair and many Members thanked the European Union (EU) for their additional financial support to CCAMLR through the provision of grant funding, including the most recent funding call for support in 2026 and 2027.

11. Russia stressed the need for approval of a pilot program by the Commission of plans to develop a Member autoloading system of Observer data before new technologies and the process would be financed.

12. The Chair and many Members thanked China for the support provided to interns through the China fund.

13. SCAF thanked the Australian Government and the State Government of Tasmania for support of rental costs and tax rebates and other ongoing support to the Secretariat.

14. SCAF noted the Secretariat's intent in 2026 to review the current Strategic Plan and accompanying Staffing and Salary Strategy (2023–2026) and propose strategies for the next 4-year period (2027–2030), including consideration of the Staff Regulations and Secretariat Policies and their alignment with national law and practices.

15. Several members expressed their regret that SCAF had not been able to reach consensus on a sustainable budget approach at SCAF-2024 and indicated their willingness to continue Sustainable Financing discussions intersessionally, including ongoing consideration of proposals.

16. On sustainable financing, the United Kingdom (UK) recalled the recommendations outlined in CCAMLR-42/23, Recommendations to alleviate the General Fund deficit and ensure broad inclusion of relevant scientific and policy officials.

17. SCAF endorsed the proposals in paragraphs 14 and 15 of the Executive Secretary's report.

18. SCAF noted CCAMLR-44/BG/24, describing the Secretariat's work on the website. The Secretariat presented the draft new website. SCAF welcomed the new website and thanked the Secretariat for all the work that has gone into designing and developing it.

19. In response to a request by the EU, the Secretariat indicated that the new website had been developed on advanced versions of the software which have improved cybersecurity.

20. SCAF noted the comment by Argentina that the current website features content that is only available in English, and requested this be addressed to ensure all content is available in all four official languages in the final version of the new website.

21. The Secretariat thanked Argentina for their comments, confirming that full translation of all new website content is planned for 2026 quarter 1, at which point the website will be launched.

22. The Republic of Korea (Korea) expressed its strong support of the Secretariat's preparation of the website to support prototype VMS-driven automated movement notifications system, outlined in CCAMLR-44/BG/24, paragraph 12(ii).

23. Russia sought clarification on the timeline for the Data Autoload System work outlined in CCAMLR-44/BG/24, paragraphs 22 and 23. The Secretariat confirmed that this project was being developed and maintained in-house with support from the EU grant funding. The project aims to complete autoload systems for all CCAMLR data and to develop additional functionality to enable Members to validate and upload their own data in the medium term.

24. SCAF noted CCAMLR-44/BG/23, which summarises the Secretariat's plan to migrate from the current e-groups platform to the new CCAMLR Discussions platform based on Discourse.

25. Russia sought clarification on whether this would entail any changes to current access permissions for Observers and Invited Experts and noted that participants in these categories should be subject to relevant decisions of the Scientific Committee or the Commission.

26. The Secretariat confirmed that the migration to the new CCAMLR Discussions platform based on Discourse will not alter the rules of access for Observers and Invited experts. The new system provides an improved technical capacity for flexible, fine-grained, access control of user permissions to individual discussion groups in response to requests from the Scientific Committee (SC-CAMLR-42, paragraphs 2.83, 2.84 and 14.4). The Secretariat will ensure each individual Discussion group's permissions are configured in accordance with the rules of access agreed upon by the Commission or Scientific Committee for that Discussion group.

Capacity Building

Activities of the General Capacity Building Fund (GCBF)

27. The Chair of the General Capacity Building Fund Panel (GCBF), Mr D. Dziewezo Polski (Argentina), introduced CCAMLR-44/07 Rev. 1. The paper presented the activities of the Fund during 2025, noting that there was one application for the general component of the GCBF and eleven applicants for the travel component in 2025, with travel support awarded to five applicants totalling A\$35 213. The Panel recommended that the Guidelines be modified as shown in CCAMLR-44/07 Rev. 1, Annex 1.

28. Mr Dziewezo Polski noted that due to unforeseen personal circumstances, a recipient in the second round was unable to travel as planned. The Secretariat reported that it was in the process of retrieving as much of this grant as possible. To guard against any similar future circumstances, SCAF recommended the inclusion of a new sub-paragraph 23(v) to the Guidelines in addition to those proposed in CCAMLR-44/07, Annex 1 as follows:

23(v) In the event that a travel grant recipient is unable to attend the meeting for which funding is awarded, it is expected that funds awarded are returned to the GCBF as soon as is practical. Applicants are encouraged to make provisions to facilitate this in consultation with the Secretariat.

29. SCAF thanked the Panel for the paper and noted:
- (i) the final report for the CAP-DLISA project (CCAMLR-44/BG/30)
 - (ii) the successful applications for travel assistance in 2025
 - (iii) the request for voluntary contributions to the GCBF from Members
 - (iv) the valuable work of the outgoing Panel Members Ms M. Schmid (Spain) and Prof P. Koubbi (France)
 - (v) the intention of Mr Dziewezo Polski, Dr A. Makhado (South Africa), Ms A. Camilli (Uruguay), Dr R. Cavanagh (UK) and Ms S. Carney (Australia) to seek reappointment to a second 2-year term
 - (vi) the willingness of Mr Dziewezo Polski to continue serving as Chair if reappointed
 - (vii) the call for expressions of interest to join the Panel, and
 - (viii) the proposed minor modifications to the Guidelines outlined in CCAMLR-44/07 Rev. 1, Annex 1, including the addition of 23(v).
30. Ukraine thanked the Panel for their support and feedback regarding the joint Norway and Ukraine project: Acoustic data processing and method development for delineation and biomass estimation of mackerel icefish (*Champscephalus gunnari*) from other key scatterers.
31. New Zealand expressed concern about the diminishing funds in the GCBF and emphasised the value of these funds for upskilling the CCAMLR community and ensuring CCAMLR is keeping pace with developments and following best practice.
32. In response to Russia's request, Mr Dziewezo Polski confirmed that the Panel had evaluated all travel funding applicants against the criteria outlined under Guidelines for the Administration of the General Capacity Building Fund, Schedule D, and that all applicants awarded funds met with the established criteria.
33. SCAF endorsed the recommendation to the Commission to modify the Guidelines as outlined in CCAMLR-44/07 Rev. 1, Annex 1 including the addition of sub-paragraph 23(v) to the Guidelines.
34. SCAF endorsed the reappointment of Mr Dziewezo Polski, Dr Makhado, Ms Camilli, Dr Cavanagh and Ms Carney to a second 2-year term on the GCBF Panel.
35. Chile nominated Mr R. Segura and New Zealand nominated Ms E. McGeorge to the GCBF Panel.
36. SCAF endorsed the appointment of the delegates from Chile and New Zealand.

Review of 2025 Budget, 2026 Draft Budget and 2027 Forecast Budget

37. The Secretariat introduced CCAMLR-44/04, noting that continuing high demands on the Secretariat and some costs rising at a faster rate than CPI were making it increasingly difficult to deliver long-term financial sustainability of the General Fund.

Review of 2025 Budget

38. As requested by SCAF at CCAMLR-43, the Secretariat worked to find operational efficiencies and cost reductions during the intersessional period which resulted in a forecast reduction in the budget deficit for the 2025 financial year. Many Members commended the Secretariat's efforts to obtain efficiencies and reduce the budget deficit.

MPA Fund Discussion

39. The EU welcomed the review of Special Funds conducted by the Secretariat in response to a request from CCAMLR-43, paragraph 10.23 (CCAMLR-44/BG/03). It noted that the MPA Fund was identified as needing consideration under the provisions of CCAMLR-XXXVII, Annex 7, paragraph 53.

40. The EU confirmed that it saw a continuing need for the Fund and therefore no changes to the Fund nor its Terms of Reference were required. Many Members agreed with the EU regarding the value and importance of maintaining the Fund, as well as regarding the fact that no changes to its Terms of Reference were required.

41. Russia expressed a differing view regarding the usefulness and ongoing need for the MPA Fund and indicated potential benefits to revising the Fund's Terms of Reference.

42. There was no consensus to dissolve or modify the Fund or to change its Terms of Reference.

43. SCAF noted the need for appointment of panellists and appealed to Members for nominations to the MPA Management Panel to be referred to the Commission.

44. SCAF commended the Secretariat's clear collation of the Terms of Reference and procedures for all Special Funds (CCAMLR-44/BG/03) and requested that it make this useful information more widely available, including through promotion of the availability and function of all Funds to Members.

45. SCAF supported the proposal to promote all funds via the Secretariat Commission Circulars.

Draft Budget for 2026 and Forecast Budget for 2027

46. The Secretariat presented the Draft Budget for 2026 (CCAMLR-44/04). Whilst noting efficiencies had made a difference to budget deficits, some members requested that SCAF

consider the reinstatement of the Intersessional Correspondence Group on Sustainable Finance in the face of unsustainable budgetary pressures.

47. Further to the Commission's request at CCAMLR-43, the Secretariat presented a paper identifying potential meeting efficiencies (CCAMLR-44/08 Rev.1) proposing cost reductions through increasing the efficiency of scheduling and changes to the real-time translation model used during annual meetings.

48. Most Members supported the proposals for efficient meeting scheduling. Korea emphasised that scheduling is a shared responsibility, not only of the Chair but of all Members.

49. Some Members did not support the proposals on cost reductions on translation. These members considered that the translation of all meeting documents into the four official languages in real time was fundamental to the equal participation of all members of CCAMLR and to respecting the equity of the four official languages.

50. France stressed the importance of defending official languages in international organisations, which includes translation of meeting documents. It recalled that the use of the French language in international organisations is of key importance, in line with its commitment within the Francophonie. Furthermore, France considered this as a key element to ensure comprehension by all and noted that it was also helpful for interpretation.

51. Russia stressed that due to the equal status of all official and working languages as set out in the Convention and Rules of Procedure, a lack of translation would represent a violation of those fundamental rules. It also emphasised some wrong information on other organisational practices (CCAMLR-44/08) since at ATCM the translation of report texts into all four official languages is required for the report adoption.

52. Some Members supported the proposed efficiencies especially on translation and scheduling, describing them as balanced measures.

53. Some Members suggested that increasing efficiencies could be obtained by exploring AI translation further, although caution was recommended with any use of AI. Some members concurred that efficiencies could also be sought on other aspects such as meeting catering.

54. The Secretariat highlighted its continuing dedication to the language equity of the Commission and the highest quality of translation and interpretation services. It noted that the proposal as presented would alter the timing of report language versions delivered but not reduce their scope or quality. With regard to AI, the Secretariat stressed that the translation team was already using the most relevant tools available, but that human translators remained essential for validating the AI results.

55. The Chair acknowledged the importance of respecting the four official languages of CCAMLR. However, the Chair also noted that SCAF had asked the Secretariat to find efficiencies and suggested that SCAF members think creatively of ways to address the budget deficit.

56. Australia noted that income is also part of the financial equation and ensuring that Members pay their contributions by the due date is important.

57. The Secretariat confirmed that the income earned from timely payment would be equivalent to the proposed savings from translation.

58. The EU clarified that some EU Member States have a domestic policy of zero nominal growth in Member contributions for international organisations. Belgium and Germany confirmed that they had such a domestic policy. However, the EU and its Member States offered flexibility and agreed to a zero real growth budget that maintains adequate functionality of the Secretariat. The EU further encouraged all members to engage actively in discussions towards a sustainable budget.

59. Russia also indicated their adherence to a zero nominal growth policy.

60. In response to a request by Russia, the Secretariat clarified that the increase in travel costs was required to support representational travel by the incoming Executive Secretary in 2026.

61. Russia proposed to transmit 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 Secretariat noted that these requests had been approved by the Scientific Committee (SC-CAMLR-42, paragraph 8.4; SC-CAMLR-44, paragraph 10.2.31, respectively) and that the Science Manager was the most appropriate person, instead of a Member representative, to attend these meetings for the purpose outlined by the Scientific Committee.

62. The budget for these two meetings (A\$12 000 in 2026) was removed from the travel component of the draft budget. SCAF recommended that the Commission takes a decision on the attendees to these meetings in order to confirm whether this budget item should be re-instated as recommended by the Scientific Committee.

63. Russia further requested clarification on the equipment costs in 2026 and 2027. The Secretariat informed SCAF that the equipment budget included costs for software (which include some increased costs in 2026 to support science needs, including acoustic data processing), web development and maintenance, photocopier rental and minor hardware, and costs supported by the EU voluntary contributions, including for combating IUU fishing (Secretariat cooperation with INTERPOL and the Joint Analytical Cell (JAC)) and the development of a pilot Member data autoloading system.

64. Following discussion, the Member data autoloading costs were removed from 2027, pending confirmation on the success of the pilot by the Commission and Scientific Committee at CCAMLR-45; and the additional savings from the discontinuation of INMARSAT position reports approved by SCIC (SCIC-2025, paragraph 30) were recognised.

65. SCAF agreed an equipment budget for 2026 and 2027 applying CPI to the 2025 budget.

66. The Secretariat noted that this was a reduction in the equipment budget proposed for 2026 and brought the attention of SCAF and the Commission to the additional risk associated with not supporting the purchase of some software to support increased needs, for instance science and cybersecurity.

67. SCAF approved the draft budget (Appendices I and II) and recommended its adoption by the Commission.

Administrative issues

68. The Secretariat introduced CCAMLR-44/06 (Performance Review 2 – summary of outcomes).

69. SCAF noted the report and thanked the Secretariat for their work.

70. New Zealand acknowledged the progress made against the Performance Review and expressed appreciation for the Secretariat's ongoing work coordinating the work of CCAMLR with the rest of the Antarctic Treaty System, as well as the continued application of ecosystem-based management by the Scientific Committee, the capacity-building activities of the GCBF and GSCF (which are vital for the strengthening the integrity of the institution) and the projects involving INTERPOL and JAC. New Zealand expressed appreciation for the preparations for the second joint SC-CCAMLR/CEP climate change workshop to be held in Hiroshima next year.

71. New Zealand requested these annual updates on Performance Review 2 (PR2) continue, and supported the call made by some Members to restart the intersessional process focused on increasing income.

72. Russia requested an amendment to the proposed response under CCAMLR-44/06 Recommendation 24:

‘(2025) a new Discussion Groups platform using Discourse implemented to allow the inclusion of Observers and external experts into selected discussion groups subject to the relevant decisions of the Scientific Committee and Commission.’

73. SCAF accepted the amendments requested by Russia and endorsed the placement of the PR2 outcomes on the CCAMLR website.

Other business

74. SCAF thanked the Executive Secretary for his unwavering commitment to managing the Secretariat so efficiently and the Chair for his excellent service over the last two years.

75. The Chair informed SCAF that he would not be seeking re-election, noting that nominations had been received from current SCAF Vice-Chair Ms S. McGuire (USA) for the position of Chair, and from Mr J. Fosbery (UK) for the position of Vice-Chair.

76. SCAF thanked Ms McGuire and Mr Fosbery for their nominations and appointed them as Chair and Vice-Chair, respectively.

77. The Chair thanked the Secretariat for their close collaboration and added his personal thanks to the Executive Secretary, noting it had been a pleasure to work with him both in SCAF and beyond and thanking him for his contribution to the work of the Commission and the Secretariat.

78. Some Members proposed 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. Members discussed this. Most Members agreed and some Members expressed different views since there are different positions regarding KFMA and different understanding of krill fishery management elements.

79. Argentina proposed the establishment of an intersessional group to allow discussion of general budgetary matters. This would enable parties to discuss matters intersessionally and make proposals that could be considered at SCAF-2026. Argentina offered to convene this intersessional group.

80. SCAF endorsed the creation of an intersessional group on budgetary matters.

81. The Secretariat proposed, given the substantive issues that would be discussed at SCAF in 2026 (including a new Strategic Plan), that they would make provision for SCAF to meet for a full day plenary from Wednesday through Friday.

Adoption of the Report

82. SCAF adopted its report.

Close of the meeting

83. The Chair extended his thanks to the Secretariat and, particularly, the Finance and Administration Manager for her support.

84. SCAF echoed the Chair's thanks to the Secretariat and Finance and Administration Manager and reiterated their thanks and best wishes to the outgoing Executive Secretary.

85. SCAF expressed their deep thanks to the outgoing Chair, reflecting on his collaborative approach and leadership shown in Chairing the meeting.

86. The Chair closed the meeting.

2025 Revised Budget, Draft Budget for 2026 and Forecast Budget for 2027

	2025	2026	2027	Notes
	Revised budget	Draft budget	Forecast budget	
General Fund				
Income				
Core Members' Contribution	4 537 659	4 627 209	4 799 041	Assuming no new members joining in 2026 or 2027.
Members' Special Contributions				
Interest	192 313	153 949	148 085	Interest rates are assumed to decline in 2026 and 2027.
Staff Assessment Levy (SAL)	654 886	794 574	797 228	The SAL represents income deducted from staff salaries in respect of tax.
Sales (Tagging & Merchandise)	65 705	67 085	69 164	Tagging equipment costs are recovered at cost plus a small administration fee from fishing companies.
Miscellaneous income				
Fishery Notifications	691 955	691 597	703 347	Provision is made for refunds of notification fees if fishing in some areas does not proceed.
Rent Contributions	494 900	505 293	520 957	Rent expenditure expected to increase at CPI.
Grants	220 000	436 334	184 166	2026 and 2027 revenue from the anticipated 2026 EU grant (funding application pending).
Other inc. Facilities Hire	142 000	30 000	45 000	Income from hiring of Secretariat meeting facilities is transferred to the Asset Replacement Fund.
Facilities Hire Costs reimbursed by Hirer	116 631			
Fund Transfers	- 142 000	- 30 000	- 45 000	Transfers to the Asset Replacement Fund.
Total income	6 974 049	7 276 041	7 221 988	
Expenditure				
Salaries	4 473 307	4 783 098	4 865 946	No recruitment of vacant positions approved within the Strategic Plan 2023–2026.
Equipment	474 023	483 977	498 980	Minor capital items, annual software and hardware purchases/leases, web site and data systems.
EU Grant funded Equipment: Member Autoload (Pilot)	0	44 000	0	
Depreciation	264 750	222 000	200 000	Equipment purchased over A\$1 000 is depreciated over its estimated useful life.
Insurance and Maintenance	214 443	231 091	247 099	Insurance, building service costs and land tax.
Training	30 862	31 819	32 646	Training remains an important priority for the Secretariat and is delivered efficiently to save costs.
Meeting Facilities excl. interpretation	336 917	347 362	356 392	Covers CCAMLR meetings hosted at Headquarters.
Meeting Facilities – interpretation costs	236 681	244 018	250 363	
Travel	140 000	158 000	162 420	Travel to support CCAMLR working groups, other meetings and international representation.
Executive Secretary Recruitment	26 400	0	0	Travel costs for candidates to attend CCAMLR-44.
Printing	11 092	11 325	11 676	Printing of reports and conservation measures.
Communications	21 282	21 729	22 403	Internet, telephone and postage costs.
Sundry (incl. audit)	178 232	163 137	167 379	Includes audit, legal and recruitment costs.

	2025	2026	2027	Notes
	Revised budget	Draft budget	Forecast budget	
Rent	494 900	505 293	520 957	Rental of 181 Macquarie Street.
Cost of goods sold				
Tagging & Merchandise	55 705	57 432	58 925	Tagging equipment and merchandise is sold at a small margin to recover administrative costs.
Facilities Hire Costs reimbursed by Hirer	116 631			Costs incurred and fully reimbursed by facilities hirers.
Total expenditure	7 075 225	7 304 281	7 395 185	
Fund Transfers				
Transfer to GCBF				Transfers to the GCBF are not anticipated.
Transfer to GSCF				Transfers to the GSCF are not anticipated.
Transfer to WCF				Transfers to the WCF are not anticipated.
Surplus/–Deficit	- 101 176	- 28 240	- 173 197	
General Fund balance at 01 January	525 110	423 934	395 694	
General Fund balance at 31 December	423 934	395 694	222 497	Note reducing General Fund balance.

Equity Funds 2025–2027

	2025	2026	2027	Notes
	Revised Budget	Budget	Forecast	
Equity Funds				
Working Capital Fund				
Balance at 1 January	1 350 000	1 350 000	1 350 000	The WCF is now frozen for four years at the A\$1 350 000 balance agreed by SCAF-2023. The next review will take place at SCAF-2027.
Income				
Expenditure				
Balance at 31 December	1 350 000	1 350 000	1 350 000	
Asset Replacement Fund				
Balance at 1 January	200 000	168 978	168 978	Income from hiring Secretariat meeting facilities.
Income	142 000	30 000	45 000	
Expenditure	- 141 216			
Transfer to Staff Replacement Fund	- 31 806	- 30 000	- 45 000	
Balance at 31 December	168 978	168 978	168 978	
Staff Replacement Fund				
Balance at 1 January	202 258	200 000	93 000	Costs of relocation and home leave for internationally recruited staff.
Income	31 806	30 000	45 000	
Expenditure	- 34 065	- 137 000	- 143 658	
Balance at 31 December	200 000	93 000	- 5 658	
China Contribution Fund				
Balance at 1 January	139 069	79 069	19 069	Expenditure on two internships in 2026 and one internship in 2027.
Income				
Expenditure	- 60 000	- 60 000	- 19 069	
Balance at 31 December	79 069	19 069		

Special Funds 2025 – 2027

	2025	2025	2026	2027	Notes
	Budget	Revised Budget	Budget	Forecast	All special funds have some income from investment interest.
Special Funds					
General Capacity Building Fund					
Balance at 1 January	172 375	178 283	111 223	60 776	
Income	3 136	3 597	1 797	975	
Expenditure	- 69 475	- 70 657	- 52 245	- 42 159	The GCBF supported 5 travel applications and the Cap-DLISA project in 2025.
Balance at 31 December	106 036	111 223	60 776	19 596	
CDS fund					
Balance at 1 January	1 288 177	1 299 719	1 198 312	956 161	
Income	23 436	26 221	19 362	15 591	
Expenditure	- 205 000	- 127 628	- 261 513	- 71 513	Expenditure as approved by SCIC.
Balance at 31 December	1 106 613	1 198 312	956 161	900 238	
General Science Capacity Fund					
Balance at 1 January	180 960	202 911	130 605	47 715	
Income	3 292	4 094	2 110	778	
Expenditure					
Workshop Support	- 15 000	- 5 000			
Scholarships	- 60 000	- 53 900	- 60 000	- 30 000	Funding for existing scholarships and 2 new scholarships commencing in 2026, and 1 convener beyond 2025.
Convener Travel Support	- 75 000	- 17 500	- 25 000	- 25 000	
Balance at 31 December	34 252	130 605	47 715	- 6 507	
MPA Fund					
Balance at 1 January	193 994	195 307	199 247	202 467	
Income	3 529	3 940	3 219	3 249	
Expenditure					
Balance at 31 December	197 523	199 247	202 467	205 716	
CCAMLR Ecosystem Monitoring Program (CEMP) Fund					
Balance at 1 January	485 598	487 522	442 459	349 158	
Income	9 174	9 835	7 149	5 604	
Expenditure	- 87 075	- 54 898	- 100 451	- 87 519	Expenditure on approved CEMP projects.
Balance at 31 December	407 697	442 459	349 158	267 242	

Members' Contributions 2025, 2026, 2027
General Fund contributions – payable by 31 May

	Contributions 2025	Balance Outstanding (24 October 2025)	Draft Contributions 2026	Forecast Contributions 2027
Argentina	155 686		158 955	163 883
Australia	174 680		177 644	182 807
Belgium	155 686		158 955	163 883
Brazil	155 686		158 955	163 883
Chile	168 789		171 027	176 415
China	199 956		194 926	215 826
Ecuador	155 686	155 500	158 955	163 883
European Union	155 686	- 2 462	158 955	163 883
France	191 329		195 573	201 806
Germany	155 686		158 955	163 883
India	155 686		158 955	163 883
Italy	155 686		158 955	163 883
Japan	156 849		160 402	165 548
Republic of Korea	186 021		189 442	191 692
Namibia	155 686	75 686	158 955	164 077
Netherlands	155 686	155 686	158 955	163 883
New Zealand	160 159		163 325	167 049
Norway	309 927		324 216	350 762
Poland	155 686		158 955	163 883
Russia	156 686	156 686	158 955	166 684
South Africa	157 195		160 184	164 883
Spain	158 212		161 946	166 986
Sweden	155 686		158 955	163 883
Ukraine	169 672	169 672	172 459	177 329
UK	167 523		170 421	175 469
USA	155 686		158 955	163 883
Uruguay	156 749		160 274	165 117
	4 537 659	710 768	4 627 209	4 799 041