

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

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

HOBART, AUSTRALIA  
14 – 25 OCTOBER 2024

CCAMLR  
181 Macquarie Street  
Hobart 7000  
Tasmania AUSTRALIA

---

Telephone: 61 3 6210 1111  
Facsimile: 61 3 6224 8744  
Email: [ccamlr@ccamlr.org](mailto:ccamlr@ccamlr.org)  
Website: [www.ccamlr.org](http://www.ccamlr.org)



Chair of the Commission  
October 2024

### **Abstract**

This document is the adopted record of the Forty-third Meeting of the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources held in Hobart, Australia, from 14 to 25 October 2024. 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-third 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
<b>Opening of the meeting</b> .....	1
<b>Organisation of the meeting</b> .....	5
Adoption of agenda .....	5
Status of the Convention .....	6
Chair's Report .....	6
Proposals for new measures .....	7
Meeting the obligations under the Headquarters Agreement between the Commission and the Government of Australia .....	7
<b>Implementation of Convention objectives</b> .....	9
Objectives of the Convention .....	9
Second Performance Review .....	10
<b>Management of marine resources</b> .....	11
Advice from the Scientific Committee .....	11
Krill resources .....	12
Fish resources .....	19
Statistical Area 48 .....	20
Statistical Area 58 .....	24
Statistical Area 88 .....	25
Fisheries classifications .....	25
Non-target species .....	26
Fish and invertebrates .....	26
Seabirds and marine mammals .....	26
Gear specifications and diagrams .....	27
Bottom fishing and vulnerable marine ecosystems .....	27
Ecosystem monitoring .....	27
<b>Spatial management</b> .....	27
Review of existing Marine Protected Areas .....	29
Proposals for new Marine Protected Areas .....	30
Other spatial management issues .....	34
<b>Impacts of climate change on the conservation of Antarctic marine living resources</b> .....	35
<b>Implementation and compliance</b> .....	38
Advice from SCIC .....	38
Implementation of the CDS .....	38
CDS Fund Expenditure .....	39
Vessel inspections .....	40
Vessel monitoring system (VMS) .....	40
Promotion of compliance in CCAMLR .....	41
Transshipment .....	42

Implementation of the Scheme of International Scientific Observation (SISO) ...	42
NCP Engagement Strategy .....	42
Proposals for new and revised compliance related conservation measures .....	43
Conservation Measure 10-03 .....	43
Conservation Measure 10-04 .....	44
Conservation Measures 21-01 and 21-02 .....	44
Conservation Measure 23-01 .....	45
Conservation Measure 31-02 .....	45
Conservation Measures 41-01 and 41-10 .....	45
Fish nest areas .....	45
Harmonisation Symposium .....	46
Resolution on Labour and Safety Standards .....	46
Text of the Scheme of International Scientific Observation (SISO) .....	46
CCAMLR Compliance Report .....	47
Illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing in the Convention Area .....	50
Fishery notifications .....	53
Advice from the Scientific Committee to SCIC .....	54
Other business .....	55
<b>CCAMLR Scheme of International Scientific Observation .....</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>Conservation measures .....</b>	<b>56</b>
Measures on compliance .....	56
Measures on general fishery matters .....	56
Measures on fishery regulation .....	56
Measures on protected area .....	57
Resolutions .....	57
Review of existing measures .....	57
Measures on compliance .....	57
Revised measures on general fishery matters .....	57
Revised measures on fishery regulation .....	57
Protected Areas .....	57
Implementation and Compliance .....	57
General fishery matters .....	58
Fishery regulations .....	59
Exploratory fisheries .....	59
Toothfish catch limits .....	59
Icefish catch limits .....	60
Krill fisheries .....	60
Protected Areas .....	60
Other fishery matters .....	60
<b>Administration and Finance .....</b>	<b>63</b>
Review of the 2024 budget, the 2025 budget and forecast budget for 2026 .....	63
Administration Matters .....	65
<b>Cooperation with the Antarctic Treaty System and international organisations ...</b>	<b>68</b>
Cooperation with the Antarctic Treaty System .....	69
Cooperation with international organisations .....	69
Reports of observers from international organisations .....	69

Reports from CCAMLR representatives at meetings of international organisations in the previous intersessional period and nominations of representatives to forthcoming meetings of relevant international organisations .....	71
<b>Administrative matters</b> .....	71
Election of officers .....	71
Invitation of observers .....	71
Next meeting .....	72
<b>Other business</b> .....	73
<b>Report of the forty-third meeting of the Commission</b> .....	75
<b>Close of the meeting</b> .....	75
<b>Tables</b> .....	76
<b>Annex 1:</b> List of Registered Participants .....	77
<b>Annex 2:</b> List of Documents .....	107
<b>Annex 3:</b> Opening Address by the Governor of Tasmania, Her Excellency the Honourable Barbara Baker AC .....	119
<b>Annex 4:</b> Agenda .....	123
<b>Annex 5:</b> Budget for 2025 and Forecast Budget for 2026 .....	127
<b>Annex 6:</b> Report of the Standing Committee on Implementation and Compliance 2024 (SCIC-2024) .....	135
<b>Annex 7:</b> Report of the Standing Committee on Administration and Finance 2024 (SCAF-2024) .....	243



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

**Opening of the meeting**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.10 A number of statements were made by Members.

1.11 Ukraine made the following statement:

‘Distinguished delegates!

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

1.12 The United States made the following statement:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you.’

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

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

1.14 Australia made the following statement:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.19 China made the following statement:

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

Mr. Chair,

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

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

Mr. Chair,

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

Mr. Chair,

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

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

## **Organisation of the meeting**

Adoption of agenda

2.1 The agenda, as drafted, was adopted.

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

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

## Status of the Convention

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

2.5 Australia made the following statement:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2.6 The United States made the following statement:

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

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

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

We are satisfied this issue is resolved.’

## Chair’s Report

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

## Proposals for new measures

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **Implementation of Convention objectives**

### Objectives of the Convention

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Second Performance Review

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



## Management of marine resources

### Advice from the Scientific Committee

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Krill resources

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.44 ASOC made the following statement

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



## Fish resources

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.58 COLTO made the following statement:

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

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

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

## Statistical Area 48

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

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

4.63 Ukraine made the following statement:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.69 The UK made the following statement:

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

As paragraph 3.39 of the Scientific Committee report states:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.70 Argentina made the following statement:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.74 COLTO made the following statement:

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

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

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

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

## Statistical Area 58

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

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

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

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

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

4.83 The UK made the following statement:

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

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

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

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

#### Statistical Area 88

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

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

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

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

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

#### Fisheries classifications

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Non-target species

### Fish and invertebrates

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

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

### Seabirds and marine mammals

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

#### Gear specifications and diagrams

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

#### Bottom fishing and vulnerable marine ecosystems

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

#### Ecosystem monitoring

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

#### **Spatial management**

5.1 The EU and its Member States presented CCAMLR-43/BG/35 describing the benefits of large-scale (using a working definition of areas greater than 100 000 km<sup>2</sup>) Marine Protected Areas. These included:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Review of existing Marine Protected Areas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Proposals for new Marine Protected Areas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Other spatial management issues

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Implementation and compliance

### Advice from SCIC

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

### Implementation of the CDS

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

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

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

7.5 Colombia made the following statement:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## CDS Fund Expenditure

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

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

## Vessel inspections

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Vessel monitoring system (VMS)

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

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

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

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

#### Promotion of compliance in CCAMLR

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### Transshipment

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

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

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

### Implementation of the Scheme of International Scientific Observation (SISO)

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

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

### NCP Engagement Strategy

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



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

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

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

#### Proposals for new and revised compliance related conservation measures

##### Conservation Measure 10-03

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Conservation Measure 10-04

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

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

#### Conservation Measures 21-01 and 21-02

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

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

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

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

### Conservation Measure 23-01

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

### Conservation Measure 31-02

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

### Conservation Measures 41-01 and 41-10

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

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

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

### Fish nest areas

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

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

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

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

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

#### Harmonisation Symposium

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

#### Resolution on Labour and Safety Standards

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

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

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

#### Text of the Scheme of International Scientific Observation (SISO)

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

## CCAMLR Compliance Report

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

7.73 Ukraine made the following statement:

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

We consider that the situation in CCAMLR conservation measures regarding toothfish fishery in the Subarea 48.3, as it is, is very far from real stock precautionary needs over the last years. This situation has been caused by blocking relevant conservation measure prolongation by the Russian Federation, and it should be considered rather as a technical attack by one CCAMLR Member in relation to the other CCAMLR Member, and it has only political reasons.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Fishery notifications

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Advice from the Scientific Committee to SCIC

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

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

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

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

#### Other business

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

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

#### **CCAMLR Scheme of International Scientific Observation**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **Conservation measures**

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

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

### Measures on compliance

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

### Measures on general fishery matters

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

### Measures on fishery regulation

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

#### Measures on protected area

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

#### Resolutions

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

#### Review of existing measures

9.3 The Commission adopted the following revised conservation measures:

#### Measures on compliance

10-03 (2024)

#### Revised measures on general fishery matters

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

#### Revised measures on fishery regulation

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

#### Protected Areas

91-02 (2024)

#### Implementation and Compliance

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### General fishery matters

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

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

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

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

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

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



## Fishery regulations

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

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

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

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

## Exploratory fisheries

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

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

## Toothfish catch limits

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Icefish catch limits

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

#### Krill fisheries

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

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

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

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

#### Protected Areas

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

#### Other fishery matters

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

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

9.33 The USA made the following statement:

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

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

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

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

9.34 China made the following statement:

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

9.35 Australia made the following statement:

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **Administration and Finance**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Administration Matters

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Listening and valuing others’ different viewpoints and experiences;

Using inclusive language, tone and posture; and

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

Relevant policies and procedures include:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **Cooperation with the Antarctic Treaty System and international organisations**

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Cooperation with the Antarctic Treaty System

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

#### Cooperation with international organisations

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

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

#### Reports of observers from international organisations

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **Administrative matters**

### Election of officers

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

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

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

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

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

### Invitation of observers

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

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

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

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

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

#### Next meeting

12.9 The Commission agreed to use the process determined in 2023 (CCAMLR-42, paragraphs 12.8 to 12.11), repeated below with dates amended, to set the dates for the 2025 meeting.

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

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

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

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

## Other business

### 13.1 Argentina made the following statement:

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

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

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

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

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

### 13.2 The UK made the following statement:

‘The UK rejects Argentina’s statement.

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

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

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

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

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

13.3 Argentina made the following statement:

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

13.4 France made the following statement:

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

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

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

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

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



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

### **Report of the forty-third meeting of the Commission**

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

### **Close of the meeting**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**List of Registered Participants**



## List of Registered Participants

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

Dr María Mercedes Santos  
Instituto Antártico Argentino

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

**Australia**

Head of Delegation:

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

Alternate  
Representatives:

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

Mr Russell Miles  
Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade

Advisers:

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

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

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

Ms Rachel Downes  
Australian Fisheries Management Authority

Ms Danait Ghebregabhier  
Australian Fisheries Management Authority

Ms Zoe Glasson  
Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade

Ms Emily Grilly  
WWF – Australia

Dr Constance Johnson  
University of Wollongong

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

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

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

Dr Tara Martin  
Department of State Growth

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

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

Mr Fraser McEachan  
Australian Fisheries Management Authority

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

Mr Malcolm McNeill  
Australian Longline Pty Ltd

Ms Selina Stoute  
Australian Fisheries Management Authority

Ms Lavanya Vasani  
Attorney General's Department

Ms Anna Willock  
Australian Fisheries Management Authority

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



Mr Gonzalo Rojas  
Servicio Nacional de Pesca y Acuicultura

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

Mr Francisco Santa Cruz  
Instituto Antartico Chileno (INACH)

Mr Juan Santibañez  
Undersecretary for Fishing and Aquaculture

Mr Marcos Troncoso Valenzuela  
Subsecretaría de Pesca y Acuicultura

**China, People's  
Republic of**

Head of Delegation:

Mr Yang Liu  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Alternate  
Representatives:

Dr Honglei Li  
Chinese Arctic and Antarctic  
Administration

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

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

Advisers:

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

Professor Jian-Feng He  
Polar Research Institute of China

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

Ms Lai Fun Virginia Lee  
Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation  
Department

Mr Mindong Li  
Rongcheng East China Fisheries Co., LTD

Mr Yaopeng Li  
China National Fisheries Corporation

Mr Rundong Lin  
Fujian Zhengguan Fishery Development  
Company, Ltd

Dr Jianye Tang  
Shanghai Ocean University

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

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

Dr Lei Xing  
Polar Research Institute of China

Professor Liu Xiong Xu  
Shanghai Ocean University

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

Dr Yi-Ping Ying  
Yellow Sea Fisheries Research Institute

Mr Han Yu  
Liaoning Pelagic Fisheries Co., Ltd

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

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

Ms Yun Bo Zhang  
China Overseas Fisheries Association

Dr Guangtao Zhang  
Institute of Oceanology, Chinese Academy  
of Sciences

Dr Yunxia Zhao  
Yellow Sea Fisheries Research Institute

Ms Wenting Zhao  
MFA, China

Mr Yue Zheng  
MFA, China

Professor Guoping Zhu  
Shanghai Ocean University

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

**Ecuador**

Head of Delegation:

Mrs Rebeca Espinoza Bernal  
Ministerio de Producción, Comercio  
Exterior, Inversiones y Pesca

Alternate  
Representatives:

Dr Patricia Castillo-Briceño  
MPCEIP

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

Advisers:

Mr Jorge Costain  
Transmarina S.A.

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

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

**European Union**

Head of Delegation:

Ms Fiona Harford  
European Union

Alternate  
Representative:

Ms Barbara Focquet  
European Commission

Adviser:

Dr Sebastián Rodríguez Alfaro  
European Union

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

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

Mr Kazuya Usami  
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and  
Fisheries

Advisers:

Mr Naohiko Akimoto  
Japanese Overseas Fishing Association

Dr Nobuo Kokubun  
National Institute of Polar Research

Mr Tomohiro Kondo  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Mr Naohisa Miyagawa  
Taiyo A & F Co. Ltd.

Mr Satoshi Miyazaki  
Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry

Dr Mao Mori  
Japan Fisheries Research and Education  
Agency

Mr Hideki Moronuki  
Japan Overseas Fishing Association

Ms Haruka Okamoto  
Taiyo A&F Co

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

Mr Takeshi Shibata  
Taiyo A & F Co. Ltd.

Mr Kyo Uehara  
Taiyo A & F Co. Ltd.

**Korea, Republic  
of**

Head of Delegation:

Ms Jung-re Riley Kim  
Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries

Alternate  
Representative:

Ms Sumin Jeong  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of  
Korea

Advisers:

Mr Gap-Joo Bae  
Hong Jin Corporation

Mr Hyun Joong Choi  
TNS Industries Inc.

Mr Sang-jin Choi  
Korea Overseas Fisheries Association

Dr Sangdeok Chung  
National Institute of Fisheries Science  
(NIFS)

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

Mr Seonjung Jeon  
JEONG IL CORP.

Mr Kunwoong Ji  
Jeong Il Corporation

Mr Ho-Jeong JIN  
Korea Overseas Fisheries Association

Mr Taebin Jung  
TNS Industries

Mr Seunggwon Kang  
Dongwon Industries Co. Ltd.

Mr Jeongwook Kim  
HONGJIN CORPORATION

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

Dr Eunhee Kim  
Citizens' Institute for Environmental  
Studies

Ms Taerin Kim  
Fishery Monitoring Center

Ms Jooyoun Lee  
Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries of Korea

Mr Seungwhan Lee  
Korea Overseas Fisheries Association

Mr Eunjae Lee  
Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries

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

Mr Hae Jun Lee  
Hongjin Company

Mr Kychong Park  
Hongjin Corporation

<b>Namibia</b>	Head of Delegation:	Ms Annely Haiphene Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources
	Alternate Representatives:	Mr Malcom Block Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources
		Mr Titus Iilende Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources
		Mr Ueritjiua Kauaria Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources
Adviser:	Mr Fernando de Castro Rey Linetach, S.L.	

<b>Netherlands, Kingdom of the</b>	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

<b>New Zealand</b>	Head of Delegation:	Ms Alice Revell Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade
	Alternate Representative:	Ms Jana Newman Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade
	Advisers:	Mr Adam Berry Ministry for Primary Industries



Mr Brian Cole  
The University of Waikato

Mr Simon Lamping  
Department of Conservation

Ms Emily McGeorge  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade New  
Zealand

Ms Michaela McGlade  
Ministry of Primary Industries

Mr Enrique Pardo  
Department of Conservation

Ms Ceisha Poirot  
Antarctica New Zealand

Mr Darryn Shaw  
Sanford Ltd

Mr Andy Smith  
Smith Fishing Consultancy (Self-employed)

Ms Aimee Tang  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade New  
Zealand

Mr Hamish Tijssen  
Talley's Ltd

Mr Nathan Walker  
Ministry for Primary Industries

Mr Barry Weeber  
ECO Aotearoa

**Norway**

Head of Delegation:

Ms Mette Strengehagen  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Alternate  
Representatives:

Mr Petter Meier  
Ministry of Trade, Industry and Fisheries

Mr Knut Seim  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs Norway

Advisers:

Ms Madeleine Jakobsen  
Ministry of Climate and Environment

Dr Ann-Lisbeth Agnalt  
Institute of Marine Research

Dr Gary Griffith  
Norwegian Polar Institute

Ms Astrid Høgestøl  
Norwegian Polar Institute

Dr Tor Knutsen  
Institute of Marine Research

Dr Bjørn Krafft  
Institute of Marine Research

Dr Cecilie von Quillfeldt  
Norwegian Polar Institute

Ms Hanne Østgård  
The Directorate of Fisheries

**Poland**

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

Adviser: Dr Anna Panasiuk  
UNIVERSITY OF GDANSK

**Russian  
Federation**

Head of Delegation: Mr Dmitry Kremenyuk  
Federal Agency for Fisheries

Alternate  
Representatives: Dr Svetlana Kasatkina  
AtlantNIRO

Ms Yulia Zhuzhginova  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian  
Federation

Advisers: Mr Evgeny Kim  
Orion Co. Ltd

Mr German Lifanov  
Vodoley LLC

**South Africa**

Head of Delegation:

Dr Andrey Petrov  
Federal Agency for Fisheries

Dr Azwianewi Makhado  
Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the  
Environment

Advisers:

Mr Saasa Pheeha  
Department of Environment, Forestry and  
Fisheries.

Mr Johannes de Goede  
Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the  
Environment

Dr Zoleka Filander  
Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the  
Environment

Mr Bernard John Liedemann  
Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the  
Environment

Ms Nicole Limberis  
Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the  
Environment

Mr Qayiso Kenneth Mketsu  
Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the  
Environment

Mr Mandisile Mqoqi  
Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the  
Environment

Mr Pheobius Mullins  
Braxton Shipping

Ms Elizabeth Magdalene Sher  
Braxton shipping

Mr Sobahle Somhlaba  
Department of Agriculture, Forestry and  
Fisheries

Mrs Nicolette Vink  
Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the  
Environment

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

Mr Oleksandr Yasynetskyi  
Terra Trans LLC

**United Kingdom** Head of Delegation:

Ms Jane Rumble  
Foreign, Commonwealth and Development  
Office

Alternate  
Representative:

Ms Kylie Bamford  
Foreign, Commonwealth and Development  
Office

Advisers:

Dr Mark Belchier  
British Antarctic Survey

Dr Martin Collins  
British Antarctic Survey

Dr Timothy Earl  
Centre for Environment, Fisheries and  
Aquaculture Science (Cefas)

Mr James Fosbery  
FCDO

Dr David Goddard  
Foreign, Commonwealth and Development  
Office

Dr Susie Grant  
British Antarctic Survey

Ms Sue Gregory  
Foreign, Commonwealth and Development  
Office

Dr Simeon Hill  
British Antarctic Survey

Mrs Rhona Kent  
WWF UK

Mr Peter Thomson  
Argos Froyanes

**United States of  
America** Head of Delegation:

Ms Ona Hahs  
Office of Ocean and Polar Affairs, Bureau  
of Oceans and International  
Environmental and Scientific Affairs

Alternate  
Representative: Dr Lauren Fields  
National Oceanic and Atmospheric  
Administration (NOAA)

Advisers: Ms Nicole Bransome  
The Pew Charitable Trusts

Ms Jamie Briggs  
U.S. Department of State

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

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

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

Ms Julia Goss  
National Oceanic & Atmospheric  
Administration

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

Mr Adam Issenberg  
National Oceanic and Atmospheric  
Administration

Dr Christopher Jones  
National Oceanographic and Atmospheric  
Administration (NOAA)

Dr Chris McCarthy  
AAAS-AFPI

Ms Suzanne McGuire  
U.S. Department of State

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

Ms Erika Olson  
U.S. Embassy Canberra

Mr David Pearl  
NOAA Fisheries Office of Law  
Enforcement

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

Dr Andrew Titmus  
National Science Foundation

Mr Conrad Tribble  
U.S. Consulate General Melbourne

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

**Uruguay**

Head of Delegation:

Ambassador Alberto Fajardo  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Advisers:

Mr Juan Dominici  
Uruguayan Antarctic Institute (UAI)

Dr Yamandú Marín  
Dirección Nacional de Recursos Acuáticos  
(DINARA)

**Observers – Acceding States**

**Canada**

Alternate  
Representatives:

Ms Olivia Lassaline  
Fisheries and Oceans Canada

Mr Gabriel McDonald  
Fisheries and Oceans Canada

Ms Jessika Woroniak  
Fisheries and Oceans Canada

Advisers:

Ms Samantha Hogg  
Global Affairs Canada

Ms Laura Hoy  
Transport Canada

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



Mr Rubén Pablo Londoño Bailon  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Peru

Mr Jorge Eduardo Maguiña Aliaga  
Ministry of Production of Peru

Ms Celia Elizabeth Méndez Chumpitazi  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Peru

Ms Teresa Pedemonte Reategui  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Peru

Mr Daniel Torres Pinguz  
Embassy of Peru

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

Ms Mishell Andrea Vidal Raurau  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Peru

#### **Observers – Non-Contracting Parties**

<b>Colombia</b>	Alternate Representatives:	Dr Javier Plata National Fisheries and Aquaculture Authority (AUNAP)  Mr Julio Sierra National Fisheries and Aquaculture Authority (AUNAP)
<b>Dominican Republic</b>	Head of Delegation:	Ms Dorka Yasmin Evangelista Pérez Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources Dominican Republic.
<b>Luxembourg</b>	Head of Delegation:	Dr Pierre Gallego Ministry of Environment
<b>Singapore</b>	Head of Delegation:	Mr Han Kiat Tan Singapore Food Agency
	Advisers:	Ms Juliat Tan Singapore Food Agency  Ms Jannie Wan Singapore Food Agency

### **Observers – International Organisations**

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

	Adviser:	Mr Clément Astruc Delor EHES - UTAS - French ministry for Environment
<b>SIOFA</b>	Head of Delegation:	Mr Thierry Clot Southern Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement
<b>UNDOALOS</b>	Head of Delegation:	Ms Amber Maggio United Nations - Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea
<b>WCPFC</b>	Adviser:	Mr Tim Jones Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission

#### **Observers – Non-Governmental Organisations**

<b>ARK</b>	Head of Delegations:	Dr Javier Arata Association of Responsible Krill harvesting companies (ARK)
		Mrs Valeria Carvajal Federación Industrias Pesqueras del Sur Austral (FIPES)
	Alternate Representative:	Mr Pål Einar Skogrand Aker BioMarine Antarctic AS
	Advisers:	Mr Enrique Gutierrez Pesca Chile
		Mr Sang-Yong Lee Jeong-Il Corporation
		Mr Steven Rooney Rimfrost AS
<b>ASOC</b>	Head of Delegation:	Ms Claire Christian Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition
	Advisers:	Mr Evan Bloom ASOC
		Mr Jiliang Chen Law School, Macquarie University
		Ms Holly Curry Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition

Ms Barbara Cvrkel  
The Pew Charitable Trusts

Mr Emil Dediu  
The Pew Charitable Trusts

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

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

Mr Chris Johnson  
WWF-Australia

Ms Andrea Kavanagh  
The Pew Charitable Trusts

Mr Nicholas Kirkham  
The Pew Charitable Trusts

Ms Kazue Komatsubara  
Friends of the Earth Japan

Ms Mary Liesegang  
Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition

Dr Susanne Lockhart  
Southern Benthics

Dr Ricardo Roura  
Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition

Ms Meike Schuetzek  
Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition

Mr Matt Spencer  
Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition

Mr Yiting Sun  
Conservation International China

Ms Francheska Ilse Tacke  
Environmental Action Germany (DUH)

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

**COLTO**

Ms Miaomiao Yin  
Macquarie University

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

Alternate  
Representative: Mr John Alexander Reid  
Polar Seafish Ltd

Advisers: Mr Michael Cronje  
Sanford

Dr Deborah Davidson  
Argos Frøyanes Ltd

Mr Bernard Fox  
Sanford

Ms Trish Henry  
Polar Seafish Ltd

Mr Dean Jurasovich  
Sanford

Mr Hans Jacob Mustad  
Mustad Autoline

Mr Andrew Newman  
Argos Froyanes Ltd

Mr Ismael Pérez  
Lafonia Sea Foods SA

Mr Laurent Pinault  
SAPMER

Ms Brodie Plum  
Talley's Ltd

Ms Phoebe Esther Reid  
Polar Seafish Ltd

Mr Theo Verios  
Austral Fisheries Pty Ltd

Mr Laurent Virapoullé  
Pêche Avenir S. A

<b>IAATO</b>	Head of Delegation:	Ms Amanda Lynnes International Association of Antarctica Tour Operators
	Alternate Representative:	Ms Lisa Kelley International Association of Antarctica Tour Operators
<b>Oceanites</b>	Head of Delegation:	Dr Grant Humphries Black Bawks Data Science
	Alternate Representatives:	Mr Ron Naveen Oceanites, Inc.
		Professor Philip Trathan Oceanites, Inc.

## Secretariat

### Executive Secretary

Dr David Agnew

### Science

Science Manager

Dr Steve Parker

Fisheries and Observer Reporting Coordinator

Isaac Forster

Science Data Officer

Daphnis De Pooter

Fisheries and Ecosystems Analyst

Dr Stéphane Thanassekos

### Fishery Monitoring and Compliance

Fisheries Monitoring and Compliance Manager

Todd Dubois

Compliance Officer

Eldene O'Shea

Fisheries Monitoring and Compliance Data Officer

Henrique Anatole

Research, Monitoring and Compliance Analyst

Claire van Werven

Data Assistant

Alison Potter

Administrative Assistant

Anna Balis

### Finance and Administration

Finance, Administration and HR Manager

Alexandra Seager

Accountant

Terri McDermott

Human Resources Officer

Angie McMahon

Administrative Services Officer

Amelia Stoneham

Administration Assistant

Nicki Squibb

### Communications

Communications Manager

Catherine Stubberfield

Communications Assistant

Mariana Cordeiro

French Translator/Team Coordinator

Karine Bachelier

Russian Translator/Team Coordinator

Olga Kozyrevitch

Russian Translator

Anar Umerkhanova

Russian Translator

Blair Denholm

Spanish Translator/Team Coordinator

Facundo Alvarez

Spanish Translator

Alejandra Sycz

Print Production

Bowen Zhang

### Data and Information Systems

Data and Information Systems Manager

Gary Dewhurst

Systems Analyst

Ian Meredith

Software Developer

Mingyun Qie

Technical Business Analyst

Mitchell John

Web Project Officer

Dane Cavanagh

## **Interpreters (ONCALL Conference Interpreters)**

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



**List of Documents**



## List of Documents

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

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

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

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

CCAMLR-43/47 Rev. 1	Draft conservation measure for a Weddell Sea Marine Protected Area – Phase 2 Delegations of Norway and the United Kingdom
CCAMLR-43/48	Suggestions for establishing Marine Protected Areas in the CCAMLR Convention Area: regulation of the uniform process for establishing MPAs and the Commission's management of MPAs Delegation of the Russian Federation
CCAMLR-43/49	Amendments to Conservation Measure 41-01 Delegation of Australia
CCAMLR-43/50	Report of the Forty-third Meeting of the Scientific Committee (Hobart, Australia, 14 to 18 October 2024)
CCAMLR-43/51	Report of the Meeting of the Standing Committee on Implementation and Compliance (SCIC) (Hobart, Australia, 14 to 18 October 2024)
*****	
CCAMLR-43/BG/01	CCAMLR Observer Report (Argentina) to the Sixth session of the United Nations Environment Assembly of the United Nations Environment Programme, from 26 February to 1 March 2024, in Nairobi, Kenya Delegation of Argentina
CCAMLR-43/BG/02 Rev. 1	COLTO Gear Workshop - Final Report COLTO
CCAMLR-43/BG/03	Description of the Budget CCAMLR Secretariat
CCAMLR-43/BG/04	Report of the CCAMLR Observer to the Forty-sixth Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties Meeting (ATCM 46) (Kochi, India, 20-30 May 2024) Executive Secretary
CCAMLR-43/BG/05 Rev. 1	Summary of activities of the Commission during the 2023/24 intersessional period - Report of the Chair 2024 Chair of the Commission
CCAMLR-43/BG/06 Rev. 1	Chair's Guide to the order of business Chair of the Commission

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



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

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

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

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

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



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

‘Mr. Chair, Your Excellencies, Distinguished Delegates,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you.'



**Agenda for the Forty-third Meeting of the Commission**



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

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

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

**Budget for 2025 and Forecast Budget for 2026**



## General Fund – Budget for 2025 and Forecast Budget for 2026

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

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

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



## Equity Funds

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

### Special Funds

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

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

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



**Report of the Standing Committee on  
Implementation and Compliance 2024 (SCIC-2024)**



## Contents

	Page
<b>Opening of the meeting</b> .....	139
<b>Organisation of the meeting</b> .....	139
Agenda .....	139
<b>Review of compliance and implementation-related measures and systems</b> .....	139
Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS) .....	139
CDS Fund Review Proposal .....	139
Implementation of the CDS .....	140
Vessel Inspection .....	142
Vessel monitoring system (VMS) and vessel movement activity within the Convention Area .....	143
Promotion of Compliance in CCAMLR .....	145
Transshipment .....	147
Implementation of the Scheme of International Scientific Observation (SISO) .....	148
NCP Engagement Strategy .....	149
Proposals for new and revised compliance-related conservation measures .....	150
Conservation Measure 10-03 .....	150
Conservation Measure 10-04 .....	151
Conservation Measures 21-01 and 21-02 .....	151
Conservation Measure 23-01 .....	152
Conservation Measure 31-02 .....	152
Conservation Measures 41-01 and 41-10 .....	152
Fish nest areas .....	153
Harmonisation Symposium .....	153
Resolution on Labour and Safety Standards .....	153
SISO .....	154
<b>CCAMLR Compliance Evaluation Procedure (CCEP)</b> .....	155
Provisional Compliance Report .....	155
Conservation Measure 10-03 .....	155
Conservation Measure 10-04 .....	158
Conservation Measure 10-05 .....	161
Conservation Measure 10-09 .....	166
Conservation Measure 22-07 .....	170
Conservation Measure 22-08 .....	174
Conservation Measure 23-04 .....	175
Conservation Measure 25-02 .....	176
Conservation Measure 26-01 .....	180
Conservation Measure 31-01 .....	183
Conservation Measure 31-02 .....	185
Conservation Measure 41-09 .....	187
Conservation Measure 91-05 .....	188
CCAMLR Scheme of International Scientific Observation .....	189

<b>Illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing in the Convention Area</b> .....	194
Current level of IUU fishing.....	194
IUU Vessel Lists.....	195
NCP-IUU Vessel List.....	195
CP-IUU Vessel List.....	196
<b>Fishery notifications</b> .....	199
<b>Advice from the Scientific Committee to SCIC</b> .....	201
Discards .....	203
Late gear removal .....	203
Harmonisation Symposium .....	203
<b>Consideration of the Second Performance Review</b> .....	203
<b>Other business</b> .....	204
<b>Close of the meeting</b> .....	205
<b>Appendix I:</b> Compliance Issues 2023/24 .....	206
<b>Appendix II:</b> Proposed Non-Contracting Party IUU Vessel List 2024/25 .....	232
<b>Appendix III:</b> Proposed Contracting Party IUU Vessel List 2024/25 .....	233
<b>Appendix IV:</b> Statement by the Delegation of South Africa .....	234
<b>Appendix V:</b> Statement by the Delegation of South Africa .....	239



**Report of the Meeting of the Standing Committee  
on Implementation and Compliance (SCIC)**  
(Hobart, Australia, 14 October to 18 October 2024)

**Opening of the meeting**

1. The Meeting of the Standing Committee on Implementation and Compliance (SCIC) was held in Hobart, Australia, from 14 to 18 October 2024.
2. The Chair of SCIC, Ms M. Engelke-Ros (USA) opened the meeting, welcomed Members and Observers, and thanked the Secretariat for its support. The Chair further expressed thanks to Members for their intersessional work to prepare for SCIC.

**Organisation of the meeting**

Agenda

3. 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

4. SCIC considered the proposal from the Secretariat for expenditure from the Catch Documentation Scheme for *Dissostichus* spp. (CDS) Fund (CCAMLR-43/20). SCIC noted that proposals approved at CCAMLR-42 were successfully implemented for e-CDS maintenance and in-person CDS training for Thailand and Colombia, with the remainder of the funds for the two activities being returned to the CDS Fund.
5. SCIC recalled the approval at CCAMLR-42 (CCAMLR-42, paragraph 18) for funds to support online CDS training in 2024 and 2025, noted that this is on track for implementation in late 2024 and throughout 2025, and that an in-person CDS and Port Inspection workshop is on track for 2025.
6. SCIC congratulated the Secretariat on the launch of the updated e-CDS and noted the ongoing maintenance work that has been undertaken to support the operation of the e-CDS.
7. Noting the requirement of CM 10-05, Appendix I0-05/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, the Republic of Korea (Korea), New Zealand, Russia, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

8. 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) An e-CDS maintenance fund, with a value of A\$20 000 a year for three years (2025 – 2027), with the addition of a 2.5% increase a year to cover CPI, for a total amount of A\$61 513. The panel recommended that, going forward, the Secretariat characterise this as a request for upgrades and development costs to clarify that it is not a standard, routine activity of the Secretariat.
- (ii) In-person CDS training on request, with a value of A\$60 000 for use in 2025 and 2026 for two in-person CDS training workshops requested by Contracting Parties or cooperating non-Contracting Parties (NCPs). The panel recommended that requests for training should be prioritised according to volume of catch documents and history of non-compliance.
- (iii) A\$30 000 for 2025 and 2026 to support the implementation of the NCP Engagement Strategy and action plan (CCAMLR-43/16) for activities where there is an interest in cooperating with CCAMLR through the implementation of the CDS.
- (iv) In-person CDS training for Singapore, with a value of A\$25 000 to cover the costs of travel, accommodation, and incidental training materials for use in 2025 or 2026. The panel noted that Singapore last received training in 2017 and has had some staff turnover since that time.

9. The panel recommended that going forward, the Secretariat’s annual report on the expenditure of the CDS fund includes the outcomes of the training, including improvements in compliance and a statement of competency on the use of the CDS. Additionally, the panel recommends that the Secretariat focuses on developing e-learning CDS modules and online training resources to facilitate further virtual training opportunities to support all CPs and NCPs in regular CDS training.

10. The panel did not support the request for A\$30 000 for in-person CDS training for Mexico, noting that Mexico imported very little *Dissostichus* spp. (0.09% of total import weight of *Dissostichus* spp. in 2023) and value for money impact needed to be considered. The panel further noted that a point of contact for Mexico has not been identified and recommended further outreach to Mexico virtually and consideration of virtual training prior to any in-person training. The panel noted that should a request for in-person training from Mexico be received, this could be implemented through the funds assigned to in-person training on request as outlined above in paragraph 8 (ii).

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

#### Implementation of the CDS

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

participating in the CDS. Korea thanked Chile for their efforts as the Port State that handles the greatest number of landings of toothfish and subsequent issuance of *Dissostichus* spp. Catch Documents (DCDs).

13. South Africa noted the arrangement for a Uruguayan-flagged vessel to fish in Subarea 58.7 under authorisation by both countries, noting that this requires the DCDs to be started by Uruguay, as the Flag State, and then completed by South Africa, as the Port State.

14. Two SVDCDs were issued in 2024, one by Argentina (COMM CIRC 24/66) and one by Spain (COMM CIRC 24/07). The European Union clarified that the catch relating to the Spanish SVDCD was seized by authorities and put in cold storage whilst an investigation was underway. At the conclusion of the investigation a fine was issued to the operator and the catch was returned with an accompanying SVDCD.

15. Argentina made the following statement:

‘The Argentine Republic recalls that the Malvinas, South Georgias and South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime areas are an integral part of Argentine national territory and that, being illegally occupied by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, they are the subject of a sovereignty dispute between the two countries, recognised by the United Nations.

Consequently, the Argentine Republic makes it known that it does not recognise the toponymy mentioned in this note, nor does it recognise the intervention in catch documents made by the alleged authorities of the Islands.

It is recalled that all names given to the disputed areas must be in accordance with United Nations Editorial Directive ST/CS/SER.A/42.

Likewise, Argentina wishes to record that all fishing carried out in FAO zone 41.3.2 in waters under the jurisdiction of the Argentine Republic must have the corresponding fishing permit from the Argentine authorities.’

16. The United Kingdom made the following statement:

‘The UK rejects Argentina’s statement. The UK once again reiterates that it has no doubt about its sovereignty over the Falkland Islands and South Georgia & the South Sandwich Islands, and their surrounding maritime zones, as is well known to all delegates.’

17. SCIC, noting the explanations from the respective Members on the issuance of the SVDCDs, recommended to the Commission that no further action was necessary.

18. As per CM 10-05, Appendix I0-05/C, paragraph C9, SCIC considered the current cooperating status granted to Colombia, Mexico, Singapore and Thailand. SCIC recognised that the Secretariat has been trying to get a Mexican point of contact assigned to arrange for CDS training for the previous three years and supports the Secretariat’s continued efforts in this regard.

19. SCIC noted the success of the in-person CDS training undertaken in Thailand and Colombia in 2024. SCIC thanked the Secretariat for their reconciliation of the CDS with trade

data from Thailand following the CDS workshop. SCIC recognised the efforts made by many Members to investigate and report on the discrepancies identified.

### Vessel Inspection

20. SCIC reviewed the implementation of CM 10-03 and the System of Inspection (SoI) in the 2023/24 fishing season (CCAMLR-43/15) which noted that 132 port inspections and 12 at sea inspections were undertaken.

21. SCIC noted that during the 2023/24 season, there were four cases of vessels required to enter port due to a crew member needing medical treatment and that in two of these instances, Part A of the port inspection report was not provided at least 48 hours in advance of their intended arrival time. SCIC expressed concern that there was no allowance given in CM 10-03 for a Port State not to conduct a port inspection or a vessel not to submit Part A of the port inspection report in cases of emergency port entry.

22. SCIC recalled that the safety and well-being of human lives at sea is of paramount importance and that situations involving *force majeure*, distress or medical emergencies require special consideration. SCIC further noted that CCAMLR regulations permitting emergency port entry should be aligned with International Law.

23. SCIC endorsed amendments to CM 10-03 to address situations of *force majeure*, distress or medical emergency.

24. SCIC noted that during SCIC-2023, the Secretariat presented a modified Port Inspection Form (CCAMLR-42/16) which could be utilised in conjunction with the Agreement on Port State Measures (PSMA) to eliminate duplicative work for fisheries inspectors. SCIC noted that the modified inspection form and accompanying changes to CM 10-03 were endorsed by SCIC-2023 but consensus was not reached by the Commission. SCIC endorsed the modified form and CM 10-03 revisions.

25. SCIC endorsed the proposed project plan (CCAMLR-43/15, Appendix I) to improve the accessibility and content of inspector resources.

26. SCIC endorsed the Secretariat's plans for future work on CCAMLR website operations and electronic inspection reporting (CCAMLR-43/BG/20).

27. China suggested that electronic reporting systems be made available in the languages of all Members. China further suggested that additional stakeholder engagement take place to incorporate the views of vessel operators on current inspector resources and the development of electronic inspection reporting.

28. SCIC considered information presented by the United Kingdom on the development of an electronic version of the identification document carried by designated CCAMLR inspectors (CCAMLR-43/BG/30). Many Members noted that this would simplify the process of creating inspector identification documents and is in line with the development of the inspector resource workplan (paragraph 24).

29. Russia requested that further consideration of any changes to the current inspector identification system and tasked the Secretariat with including this proposal in its resource workplan.

30. SCIC did not endorse the inclusion of an electronic inspector identification document in the proposed project plan (CCAMLR-43/15, Appendix I).

31. SCIC considered information presented by the United Kingdom on patrols carried out in the Convention Area by the HMS Protector in the 2023/24 fishing season (CCAMLR-43/BG/25). SCIC considered the need for a radio inspection form and aerial overflight inspection form, noting the extreme and hostile environments in which CCAMLR fishing operations and inspections take place.

32. SCIC thanked the United Kingdom and all Members who undertake patrols in the Convention Area. Some Members noted that radio and ariel inspections can contribute to increased compliance with CCAMLR conservation measures by providing information on vessel operations when inclement weather or other adverse circumstances prevent an at-sea inspection.

33. Some Members expressed concern regarding the transmission of potentially sensitive information during radio inspections. Russia further expressed concern that language barriers could result in the reporting of incorrect information during radio inspections and that the technical elements of remote inspections were not clear. China indicated some errors in the names and pictures of Chinese flagged vessels in CCAMLR-43/BG/25 and also expressed concern that photographs in the paper may not reflect the accurate time of inspection.

34. The United Kingdom thanked Members for these suggestions and expressed willingness to incorporate these into future reports and any future proposals to SCIC.

35. SCIC welcomed Chile's submission (CCAMLR-43/BG/41) on inspections undertaken by Chile's vessel OPV-83 Marinero Fuentealba in Subarea 48.1 during the 2023/24 fishing season, where six vessels in total were inspected with all vessels demonstrating compliance with all CCAMLR conservation measures, and a further five vessels were contacted by radio.

36. SCIC thanked the captains of the vessels for their cooperation with CCAMLR's System of Inspection. SCIC also expressed appreciation to Chile for its efforts in undertaking inspection activities on behalf of all Members, noting that Chile conducts the highest number of port inspections and issues the greatest number of CDS documents.

#### Vessel monitoring system (VMS) and vessel movement activity within the Convention Area

37. SCIC considered the vessel monitoring system (VMS) implementation report submitted by the Secretariat (CCAMLR-43/BG/16) and noted the implementation of CM 10-04 by Contracting Parties.

38. SCIC reminded vessels and Members to ensure vessel movement reports are submitted to the Secretariat in the format outlined in Appendix I0-04/A.

39. SCIC suggested the Secretariat submit all future implementation reports containing recommendations as Working Papers, rather than Background Papers, to draw Members' attention to any recommendations requiring consideration by SCIC.
40. SCIC considered CCAMLR-43/BG/14 which provided a report on progress and scheduled work under a grant provided by the European Union (EU) in 2022 and 2024, provided to strengthen VMS data request systems and automatic data processes. The paper also reviewed VMS hosting options and security provisions in CM 10-04, Annex B. SCIC thanked the European Union for the provision of funding for this work.
41. In light of the improvements to the VMS movement notification system highlighted in CCAMLR-43/BG/14, SCIC considered the invitation contained in CCAMLR-43/BG/16 (paragraph 20 (iii)) for interested Members to nominate vessels for inclusion in a trial of the automated VMS movement notification functionality.
42. Some Members asked for further details about the automated VMS movement notification functionality and expressed interest in participating in the trial once the details have been provided.
43. SCIC agreed that in the event any technical or administrative complications arise during the trial period, there would be no compliance implications for vessels participating in the trial.
44. Several Members highlighted the importance of establishing terms of reference to guide the project and define parameters, including identifying a timeline for the trial period. SCIC tasked those Members who expressed interest in inclusion in the trial to work closely with the Secretariat intersessionally to finalise a detailed set of guidelines or terms of reference, with clear trial objectives, timelines and expected outcomes provided.
45. SCIC tasked the Secretariat with reporting on the outcomes of the trial, including the evaluation of the system's performance and outlining any next steps for wider implementation to be considered by SCIC-2025.
46. SCIC noted the renewal of the CCAMLR Search and Rescue (SAR) Arrangements undertaken in 2024 between each of the five maritime rescue coordination centres (MRCCs) and the CCAMLR Secretariat (CCAMLR-43/17). SCIC noted that these updated Arrangements have been made available to authorised users on the CCAMLR website, and further noted that the next suggested date for renewal would occur in 2029, unless an earlier review is requested under paragraph (C) of the Arrangements.
47. SCIC noted the improvements to the CCAMLR SAR request system and thanked the Secretariat and the five MRCCs for their work.
48. SCIC considered the recommendation to add a new user group for each MRCC to improve the management of permissions for access to the SAR request system as per CM 10-04 and the relevant MRCC Arrangement.
49. Many Members supported the proposal to improve user access for MRCC representatives and noted the importance of engaging in work to improve and support SAR coordination and response in the CAMLR Convention Area.

50. Russia raised concerns about the potential access and confidentiality implications of this proposal and sought clarity as to the role of the Party Administrator in approving accounts.

51. The Secretariat provided clarification on the process, whereby the initial approval of the MRCC representative would remain with the Party Administrator/s approved by the Member, and that additional accounts could be created by this authorised representative, noting data access and use would follow the rules of the Arrangement and provisions contained in CM 10-04, paragraph 17 (iii).

52. SCIC could not reach consensus on the proposal to add a new user group for each MRCC outlined in CCAMLR-43/17 and noted that further discussion is required on the matter.

#### Promotion of Compliance in CCAMLR

53. SCIC noted the vessel sighting reports (CCAMLR-43/13), which provided a summary of information received over the 2023/24 fishing season and recommended adoption of a standardised form to facilitate reporting and compilation of reported data by the Secretariat. This summary noted 98 sighting reports were submitted from licensed fishing vessels operating in Subarea 88.1 and 88.2 to the Secretariat, which reported sightings of other licensed fishing vessels, cruise ships, scientific research vessels and supply vessels. SCIC noted that none of these sighting reports alleged illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing activity.

54. Some Members suggested that vessel sighting reports should be limited to sightings of vessels which are either conducting IUU fishing or related activities, or licensed vessels observed to be acting in a suspicious manner. COLTO recalled that CCAMLR already has a number of monitoring tools such as a centralised VMS, movement notification requirements, AIS and catch reporting requirements, and requested SCIC to consider only requesting the reporting of information regarding non-licensed vessels, which may be relevant and beneficial to licensed vessels and Flag States alike.

55. SCIC recalled that Conservation Measure 10-02, Annex A, sets out a two-step process in reporting vessel sightings, wherein vessels are required to send sighting reports to the Flag State. Upon the Flag State's assessment that the sighting meets the criteria of paragraph 3 of Conservation Measure 10-06 or paragraph 8 of Conservation Measure 10-07, the report shall then be submitted to the Secretariat. Notwithstanding this, vessels are voluntarily reporting sighting information to the Secretariat.

56. SCIC endorsed the recommendation for a standardised excel form for reporting vessel sightings and requested this be made available on the CCAMLR website data form page. SCIC requested the Secretariat to report annually to SCIC on all vessel sightings reports submitted to the Secretariat.

57. SCIC thanked New Zealand, Korea, Australia, and the Secretariat for the progress update under the agreed Workplan on addressing Unidentified Fishing Gear in the Convention Area (CCAMLR-43/BG/17). SCIC noted the importance of the work, recalled the planned next steps, and encouraged continued intersessional participation within the [e-Group](#).

58. SCIC noted the importance of continuing industry engagement and consultation in progressing the Workplan and encouraged further engagement.

59. COLTO noted that they were invited to, but unable to attend the online round table discussions on possible options for a gear marking proposal as they were conducting a gear workshop in Norway at the time. COLTO recommended that any changes to gear marking requirements be tested prior to implementation, be based on risk and be cost-effective. COLTO also highlighted the importance of a phased implementation approach.

60. ASOC recalled SCIC's endorsement of a voluntary reporting form for reporting encounters with unidentified gear (SCIC-2023, paragraph 42) and encouraged its wide use.

61. SCIC noted the report by Ukraine on the marking of fishing gear on Ukrainian longline vessels (WG-FSA-IMAF-2024/48), recognising the report has been also considered by WG-FSA-IMAF (WG-FSA-IMAF-2024, paragraphs 8.1 to 8.3). SCIC supported the recommendation that Members voluntarily submit gear marking reports, noting that this would assist in the identification of lost gear, ensure transparent documentation of gear to be used in the upcoming fishing season, and assist in identifying and combatting IUU fishing in the Convention Area.

62. SCIC considered COLTO's report on the COLTO Gear Workshop held in Oslo, Norway on 15-16 August 2024 (CCAMLR-43/BG/02, Rev. 1). COLTO highlighted the recommendations for CCAMLR to consider delaying the start of the Ross Sea fishery to avoid high ice coverage and minimise gear loss, permit efforts to attempt to recover lost fishing gear outside of open fishing periods, and gear end-of-life use.

63. As a contribution to the important work of ensuring compliance with conservation measures and detecting IUU fishing, New Zealand presented a summary of its routine aerial patrol activities in the Ross Sea region. Aerial patrols are carried out by CCAMLR designated inspectors in accordance with CCAMLR's rules and procedures.

64. SCIC thanked New Zealand for their aerial surveillance patrols undertaken during the 2023/24 season as reported in CCAMLR-43/BG/24 and for their commitment to conducting regular patrols of the Ross Sea region into the future. SCIC further noted its appreciation to Members that undertake surveillance patrols and inspection activities on behalf of CCAMLR.

65. SCIC noted the need for further work to develop the protocol on carrying out aerial surveillance activities in the Convention Area. Some Members highlighted the need to keep a balance of rights and obligations of both the inspectors and the inspected.

66. SCIC further noted the protocol set out in CM 10-04, paragraph 21 regarding the obligation for Contracting Parties conducting active surveillance, and/or CCAMLR inspection activities make information regarding such activities available to the Flag State(s) concerned without undue delay after the activities are completed.

67. China indicated the need to increase the transparency of the aerial surveillance activities and their reports, and highlighted the importance of safeguarding the right of Members of SCIC to access to the reports under certain conditions of confidentiality. In its view, without such access, it is difficult for Members to evaluate any allegations contained in the reports.

68. SCIC considered Chile's report outlining the implementation of electronic monitoring systems (EMS) used in Chile to control discards and incidental by-catch and to implement fishing regulations (CCAMLR-43/BG/33). SCIC thanked Chile for its paper and endorsed the



recommendation for an intersessional e-Group to be established on the CCAMLR Discussions platform to facilitate the participation of Members and Observers on the development of EMS guidelines and standards at CCAMLR, CCAMLR-43/BG/33 Rev. 1 contains draft terms of reference for the establishment of the CCAMLR Discussion platform.

69. The United Kingdom recalled their report CCAMLR-38/BG/40, which describes the United Kingdom's implementation of EMS and supported SCIC's recommendation to establish a CCAMLR Discussion platform for intersessional collaboration. COLTO noted that the majority of their member's vessels have EMS installed for compliance and scientific purposes and highlighted that additional considerations should be given to the economic impact of requiring EMS alongside observers.

70. SCIC considered the report on an informal compliance workshop co-hosted by Korea and ASOC on improving CCAMLR's compliance regime hosted online on 6 and 7 February 2024 (CCAMLR-43/BG/39 Rev. 1). SCIC thanked Korea and ASOC for convening the informal workshop and noted that the workshop identified areas for improving CCAMLR's compliance regime, focusing on aligning with global best practices, standardising data collection, and ensuring transparency. Key topics for further work included transshipment, krill traceability, port inspections, and vessel monitoring. Participants emphasised making compliance measures easy to implement and applicable to all vessels, while considering fishery differences.

71. The United States of America noted the papers submitted by the USA and co-proponents CCAMLR-43/40, CCAMLR-43/42, and CCAMLR-43/43, aimed to further improve CCAMLR's compliance monitoring regime.

## Transshipment

72. SCIC considered the transshipment implementation report (CCAMLR-43/BG/15) provided by the Secretariat, noting that 187 notifications for transshipments were received in the 2022/2023 season. SCIC noted the improved compliance with CM 10-09 since the 2021/2022 season.

73. SCIC noted that the transshipment of harvested marine living resources caught within the Convention Area from a fishing vessel to a transshipment vessel and then to another transshipment vessel may compromise the traceability of products. SCIC further noted that transshipments by non-Contracting Parties (NCPs) are concerning and that the 25 transshipments undertaken by two vessels flagged to Liberia in the 2022/2023 season may present a risk requiring further consideration. SCIC recalled that the NCP Engagement Strategy (CCAMLR-43/16) involves the inclusion of NCP's involved in transshipments of marine living resources harvested within the Convention Area.

74. Russia noted that the identification of risk activities should extend beyond the consideration of the actions of individual Flag States and highlighted the importance of ensuring an objective interpretation of risk in this context.

75. SCIC considered an analysis of the FAO Voluntary Guidelines for Transshipment and CCAMLR transshipment regulations, presented by Korea and the Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition (ASOC) (CCAMLR-43/BG/38), noting that 38 guidelines were identified as

being implemented partially or not at all, and 15 were identified as being completely implemented. The analysis identified that the guidelines that CCAMLR is fully aligned with included transshipment reporting and procedures to address non-compliance. Additionally, the analysis noted that a number of CCAMLR measures relating to transshipment only apply to fishing vessels, whereas the guidelines recommend application to both fishing and carrier vessels. Furthermore, contrary to the Guidelines CCAMLR does not require mechanisms for independent verification of transshipments such as observers or electronic monitoring, and much information on transshipments and carrier vessels is not public.

76. SCIC thanked Korea and ASOC for the information provided in their paper and noted its general support for strengthening transshipment procedures. Many Members recognised that CCAMLR has fallen behind other international organisations and Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (RFMO) in terms of the monitoring, control and surveillance of transshipment activities and expressed support for strengthening CCAMLR's regulation of transshipment.

77. China agreed on the need to strengthen the regulation of transshipment in the Convention Area. China recalled that SCIC had reached a consensus on a proposal to amend CM 10-09 which would have established a CCAMLR Record of Carrier Vessels, but the proposal had been withdrawn by the proponents during the Commission meeting (CCAMLR-XXXV, paragraphs 3.32 to 3.37). China and the Russian Federation suggested that a concrete proposal would facilitate the discussion to improve CM 10-09.

78. The United States expressed interest in developing a proposal to strengthen CCAMLR's monitoring of transshipment and invited other interested Members to join that effort; several Members expressed interest in doing so.

79. SCIC highlighted the gaps between the Guidelines and conservation measures and noted that this analysis will assist the work of SCIC to consider future development of proposals with accompanying conservation measure changes.

80. SCIC noted the role that monitoring of transshipments plays in combatting illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing and safeguarding supply chains.

81. Several Members noted that CCAMLR should develop an authorised carrier vessel list, VMS requirements on carrier vessels and improvement on actions in ports to better address monitoring of transshipment activities.

#### Implementation of the Scheme of International Scientific Observation (SISO)

82. SCIC considered the report on the implementation of the Scheme of International Scientific Observation (SISO) (WG-FSA-IMAF-2024/11 Rev. 1) provided by the Secretariat. The report provided a summary of deployment information for all observers appointed under SISO onboard vessels in the Convention Area during the 2023/24 fishing season, an update of forms and instructions for the 2025/26 season, and the development of a recognition initiative for krill fishery observers.

83. SCIC thanked the Secretariat for bringing this paper to the attention of SCIC and expressed appreciation to all SISO observers for their diligent work in providing high-quality data which enables the Scientific Committee to conduct its work.

84. Many Members recalled ongoing discussions surrounding the topic of improving SISO observer coverage across the krill fishery and encouraged Members to keep this under consideration moving forward. Some Members expressed the view that national observers appointed under SISO can fill the same role as international observers appointed under SISO.

85. China rejected any question about the quality of the data collected by national scientific observers just because of their nationality, highlighting that both national scientific observers and international scientific observers conform to the same scientific requirements and protocols as per CM 51-06.

86. Some Members noted the advice from the Chair of the Scientific Committee and highlighted the importance of SISO observers to the work of CCAMLR, their independence and the specific requirements required of SISO observers on board vessels that may not be required of national observers (Item 7). Some Members acknowledged the high quality of national observers in CCAMLR but reiterated that the collection of data in a consistent manner across vessels in accordance with SISO's requirements enhances CCAMLR's ability to adjust catch limits and assess ecosystem impacts.

87. The Russian Federation expressed concerns as to the nature under which the report (WG-FSA-IMAF-2024/11 Rev. 1) was submitted to SCIC, querying why a paper from a scientific working group was submitted with no explicit context or considerations for SCIC to consider.

88. SCIC noted the Secretariat's explanation that the report was submitted for information only as has been the usual practice for implementation reporting under this agreed agenda item in past meetings. SCIC recommended that an annotation be included in the introduction of future reports submitted to clarify the reasoning behind the submission of any working group documents to SCIC.

#### NCP Engagement Strategy

89. SCIC noted the review of the implementation of the NCP Engagement Strategy for 2023-2024 (CCAMLR-43/16). SCIC acknowledged the efforts of the Secretariat in developing relationships with non-Contracting Parties (NCPs) in order to promote their cooperation with CCAMLR.

90. SCIC endorsed the 2025–2026 NCP Engagement Strategy (CCAMLR-43/16, Annex 2) and Action Plan (CCAMLR-43/16, Annex 3).

91. Many Members expressed support for the direction of the NCP Engagement Strategy for 2025-2026 and the increased engagement by the Secretariat with NCPs. Korea noted that the inclusion of NCPs engaged in transshipment activity in the Convention Area was a valuable addition to the NCP Engagement Strategy.

92. Russia thanked the Secretariat for its timely identification of the need to engage directly with Middle Eastern countries given increases in the quantity of *Dissostichus spp.* imported into this region. Russia suggested identifying priority countries to engage with and noted that providing information to SCIC regarding the specific countries in this region that become involved in the NCP Engagement Strategy would be beneficial.

93. SCIC noted the collaboration by the Secretariat with the Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center (SEAFDEC) and The Regional Plan of Action to promote responsible fishing practices including combatting IUU fishing (RPOA-IUU) within the framework of the NCP Engagement Strategy. SCIC encouraged continued engagement by the Secretariat with SEAFDEC and RPOA-IUU, including an invitation to the CCAMLR Secretariat to attend an RPOA-IUU partners coordination meeting in early November 2024. SCIC endorsed the recommendation that both organisations be invited to observe future CCAMLR meetings.

94. SCIC encouraged Contracting Parties to actively participate in the NCP Engagement Strategy through methods such as attendance and presenting at workshops, joining formal dialogue with NCPs, and providing technical advice and support.

#### Proposals for new and revised compliance-related conservation measures

##### Conservation Measure 10-03

95. SCIC reviewed the implementation of CM 10-03 and the System of Inspection (SoI) in the 2023/24 fishing season (CCAMLR-43/15) and the proposal to modify CM 10-03 to allow for delayed inspections and the waiver of the requirement for advanced submission of the information in Appendix I0-03/A in cases of port entry involving medical emergency. The proposed amendments were endorsed by SCIC and referred to the Commission for adoption.

96. SCIC considered the proposal previously agreed during SCIC-2023 (paragraph 26) to amend CM 10-03 and to add an alternative CCAMLR Port Inspection Form which can be utilised by inspectors in conjunction with the Agreement on Port State Measures (PSMA) inspection form to reduce redundancy in reporting for inspectors. The proposed amendments to CM 10-03, including the addition of an alternative CCAMLR inspection form (CM 10-03, Annex C), were endorsed by SCIC and referred to the Commission for adoption.

97. SCIC considered the proposal by Australia, Korea, New Zealand, and the USA to amend CM 10-03 (CCAMLR-43/42) to require 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. Additionally, proposals were made to include in Appendix I0-03/B references to CMs 25-03, 51-01, 51-02, 51-03 and 51-04 to record inspection of marine mammal exclusion devices on trawl gear and other measures related to the mitigation of seabird mortality, and the inclusion of product codes for boiled, peeled and oil for krill products. Two related papers were presented at the same time (CCAMLR-43/40, paragraphs 130 to 134; CCAMLR-43/43, paragraphs 102 to 106).

98. Many Members expressed support for the proposed revisions to CM 10-03 and highlighted the need to harmonise its requirements across all CCAMLR fisheries, particularly under the krill fishery management approach being considered by the Commission.

99. Some Members recalled that differences exist between the fisheries, further noting that the different levels of risks of IUU activities require further consideration.

100. China made the following statement:

‘The difference between established krill fisheries and exploratory toothfish fisheries rest in the Convention, in particular the conservation principles set out in Article II. With respect to toothfish fisheries, they are established fisheries and exploratory fisheries, subject to different conservation measures. The difference between the krill fisheries and toothfish fisheries should by no means be the pretext for revising relevant conservation measures. In this respect, Article IX of the Convention stipulates clearly that the Commission shall identify conservation needs, analyse the effectiveness of conservation measures, and revise conservation measures on the basis of best scientific evidence available.’

101. SCIC discussed improvements to the proposed text to address concerns expressed by Members, however it could not endorse the revision of the CM 10-03 in this proposal at this time. The proposal was referred to the Commission for further consideration.

#### Conservation Measure 10-04

102. SCIC considered the proposal by the delegations of Australia, New Zealand, Korea, Norway, the United Kingdom and the USA to amend CM 10-04 (CCAMLR-43/43) to require 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.

103. Many Members supported the proposal, highlighting the importance of real-time transmission of VMS data for monitoring of fishing activities. The importance of real-time movement reporting was further highlighted in the context of the krill fishery management approach and the changes required to facilitate this approach if approved.

104. Some Members expressed concerns regarding the feasibility of the measure.

105. Some Members noted that some krill fishing Members already undertake near real-time transmission of VMS data, and that all CCAMLR-licensed vessels transmit VMS data to their Flag State hourly.

106. SCIC could not reach consensus on the proposal to amend CM 10-04. The proposal was referred to the Commission for further consideration.

#### Conservation Measures 21-01 and 21-02

107. SCIC considered the proposal by the EU to amend CMs 21-01 and 21-02 (CCAMLR-43/45). The proposed changes were 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.

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

109. SCIC did not reach consensus on the proposal and referred it to the Commission for further consideration.

#### Conservation Measure 23-01

110. SCIC considered the proposal by the Secretariat (CCAMLR-43/19) to amend CM 23-01 which sought to improve the reporting deadline for vessels where Contracting Parties are required to report catch and effort data to the Executive Secretary. The paper also proposed amendments to the measure which would require fishery closures to be communicated by the Secretariat to fishing vessels in addition to their Contracting Parties.

111. SCIC thanked the Secretariat for their work in developing practical solutions to the recent overrun of krill. SCIC endorsed the proposed improvement to CM 23-01, paragraph 2 to the reporting deadline, and referred it to the Commission for adoption. Some Members questioned whether the proposed changes to CM 23-01, paragraph 7 would have implications on toothfish fisheries and raised concern with the proposed language and its application to different fisheries. SCIC could not reach consensus on the amendments to CM 23-01, paragraph 7.

#### Conservation Measure 31-02

112. SCIC considered the proposals by the Russian Federation (CCAMLR-43/34 and CCAMLR-43/35) to amend CM 31-02 to clarify the management procedures regarding the delayed retrieval of longline gear after fisheries close in Subareas 88.1 and 88.2. Many Members expressed appreciation for the paper and noted it was presented last year during SCIC-2023, further noting that drafting suggestions previously provided on this matter should be incorporated into any future proposals.

113. Some Members expressed the view that recurrent late gear retrieval is not a systematic issue and has no impacts on the management of the stock, however could further consider the proposal provided that further refinements be made to this measure.

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

#### Conservation Measures 41-01 and 41-10

115. SCIC considered two proposals to amend CM 41-01. The first proposal was presented by the Secretariat (CCAMLR-43/18), to realign and clarify the respective requirements of CM 41-01 and CM 41-10 regarding the requirement of research hauls to be conducted when

fishing in Subarea 88.2 SSRU H. SCIC endorsed these revisions proposed for CM 41-01 and 41-10 and referred these to the Commission for adoption.

116. The second proposal for amendments to CM 41-01 considered by SCIC was presented by Australia (CCAMLR-43/49), to permit a vessel to cease a research haul for the purpose of preventing gear loss, securing the safety of a vessel and those on board, or the safety of life at sea, noting various conditions. SCIC endorsed the proposed revision of CM 41-01 and referred it to the Commission for adoption.

#### Fish nest areas

117. SCIC considered the proposal from the European Union and its Member States (CCAMLR 43/01) for a new CM 32-XX on the protection of notothenioid fish nest areas in the Convention Area, by closing such areas to fishing. Many Members noted that a protection of such areas was recommended by the Scientific Committee.

118. Many Members welcomed the proposal, recalling that this topic had been discussed in-depth in previous years, and highlighted the need for protection of essential habitats.

119. Some Members stated that they could not support the proposal at this time, noting that further work was needed.

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

#### Harmonisation Symposium

121. Korea presented the report of the Harmonisation Symposium (HS-2024) held at the Songdo ConvensiA Centre in Incheon, Republic of Korea from 16 to 20 July 2024 (CCAMLR-43/29), with the primary objective of the Symposium to ‘provide recommendations to CCAMLR for steps to harmonise the implementation of the revised krill fishery management approach (KFMA), the establishment of a Domain 1 MPA (D1MPA) in the Antarctic Peninsula Region, and recommendations for practical and cost-effective collection and analysis of data’.

122. The paper listed many recommendations to improve the KFMA for consideration, however no explicit CM change was suggested for SCIC to consideration. SCIC thanked Korea for the paper and its presentation.

#### Resolution on Labour and Safety Standards

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

124. Many Members recognised that while CCAMLR has made strides in recent years to improve the safety of life at sea, it has failed to keep up with steps taken by other international fisheries bodies (such as RFMOs), preventing progress in this important area. Many Members further noted that the proposal draws from the experience of these organisations in proposing a non-binding resolution, and urged CCAMLR to consider best practices for labour standards, preventing labour abuses, and ensuring safe and fair working and living conditions onboard all fishing vessels engaged in CCAMLR fisheries.

125. Some Members recalled CCAMLR Resolution 23/XXIII (Safety on board vessels fishing in the Convention Area), noting that additional consideration would be required as to the level of implementation of the proposed Resolution and that, therefore, they were unable to support the proposal at this time. Many Members noted that Resolution 23/XXIII is insufficient in addressing complex issues of labour standards, as it only refers to the provision of equipment and clothing.

126. The USA presented a Rev 1 of the proposal referencing Resolution 23/XXIII in the preamble and incorporating comments received by Members during SCIC.

127. SCIC noted the universal agreement as to the importance of the issue, and thanked the USA for preparing the proposal and facilitating discussions during the meeting.

128. The USA thanked SCIC for the constructive discussions and looked forward to continuing the discussion at Commission.

129. SCIC could not reach consensus to endorse the Resolution on Labour and Safety Standards in CCAMLR Fisheries at this time. The revised proposal was referred to the Commission for further consideration.

## SISO

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

131. China expressed the view that national scientific observers are trained to carry out the data collection requirements in line with SISO tasks and follow the same guidelines to produce data of a similar quality.

132. Some Members noted that SISO observers are independent and may prioritise tasks differently.

133. Russia noted that no evidence exists that national scientific observers are not able to accomplish similar tasks as SISO observers.

134. SCIC did not reach consensus on this proposal. The proposal was referred to the Commission for further consideration.



## CCAMLR Compliance Evaluation Procedure (CCEP)

135. SCIC considered the Secretariat's report and analysis of the CCEP (CCAMLR-43/11), drawing attention to the high compliance rates of greater than 98% across the majority of compliance measures analysed. SCIC noted the improved compliance with CM 10-09 from year-to-year, with a decrease in the number of non-compliance events associated with this Conservation Measure. However, SCIC also noted that there has been an increase in the number of non-compliance events associated with CM 26-01.

136. SCIC considered the request from the Secretariat to advise what steps should be taken to better clarify the reporting requirements when reporting discards and offal in fine-scale catch and effort data, noting that 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 later 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”. SCIC sought the advice of the Chair of the Scientific Committee on the proper completion of the C2 data form with respect to the reporting of discards.

137. SCIC recalled the request that Panama report back with additional information on the status of sanctions applied to two vessels for breaches of CM 10-09 that were considered at SCIC-2023 (SCIC-2023, paragraph 112). SCIC noted that further information was provided by Panama and circulated to Members in COMM CIRC 24/76.

138. SCIC endorsed the recommendation that Contracting Parties biennially report aggregated trade data for the purpose of enhancing CDS implementation. Submissions by Contracting Parties shall contain details on trade flow (import/export), year, country, species and quantity.

### Provisional Compliance Report

139. In accordance with CM 10-10, paragraph 3(i), SCIC considered the 68 potential compliance incidents in the CCEP Summary Report (CCAMLR-43/11). SCIC held protracted discussions on the compliance issues presented in the CCEP Summary Report and reached a common understanding of what would be the appropriate compliance statuses for 55 of the incidents. However, because SCIC could not agree on the remaining issues, it was unable to reach consensus to adopt its annual Provisional Compliance Report in accordance with CM 10-10. The compliance issues considered are identified in Appendix I.

### Conservation Measure 10-03

140. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-03, paragraph 1, by New Zealand regarding the requirement to undertake port inspections of all fishing vessels carrying *Dissostichus* spp. in item 1 of Appendix I.

141. In its response to the draft compliance report New Zealand had provided the following:

‘This issue in relation to CM 10-03 paragraph 1 is a matter relating to safety at sea.

The *San Aotea II* made an unscheduled stop to allow medical services to remove a crew member for transport to Dunedin hospital.

There were no compliance issues reported in the Inspection report and the vessel was inspected within the 48-hour time period specified in CM 10-03 upon arriving at the intended port (Timaru).

Other than the injured crew member, no other crew or product was discharged from the vessel during its emergency call in Dunedin.

Further Action: No further action required

Preliminary Status: No compliance status assigned'

142. SCIC reached a common understanding on a compliance status of no compliance status proposed by New Zealand.

143. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-03, paragraph 4, by Chile regarding the requirement for vessels to provide the information in CM 10-03, Appendix 10-03/A, at least 48 hours in advance of port entry in item 2 of Appendix I.

144. In its response to the draft compliance report Chile has provided the following:

'In relation to this case, we are able to point out that the absence of notification for the call at the port of Bluff in New Zealand by the fishing vessel *Puerto Ballena*, was due to a medical emergency of a crew member, which was duly communicated to and coordinated with the Competent Authority of New Zealand (RCCNZ) who suggested proceeding in that manner ("The medical advice we have for you remains unchanged and we recommend you make your way to New Zealand for your crewman to receive higher level care.'). Given the above, it is not possible to classify this activity in port as a fishing operation as such (e.g. provisions, refueling, disembarking, crew change), but rather as a medical emergency.

Given the above, and in accordance with the provisions contained in paragraph 6 of CM 10-03, it is considered that the general rule of the procedure does not apply, since what happened is explained by a forced stopover due to a medical emergency.

Preliminary Status: No compliance status assigned'

145. SCIC reached a common understanding on a compliance status of no compliance status assigned proposed by Chile.

146. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-03, paragraph 5, by Korea (item 3 of Appendix I) and Uruguay (item 4 of Appendix I) regarding the requirement for a port inspection to be conducted within 48 hours of port entry.

147. In its response to the draft compliance report Korea has provided the following:

'The *Procyon* enter the port at 09:30, September 17, 2023, which was delayed by 25 hours and 30 minutes from the estimated time of arrival (06:00, September 16, 2023). The inspection took place at 10:11, September 18, 2023, within the span of 24 hours 41

minutes. Therefore, this case is compliant. However, the actual time of arrival was not indicated in the inspection report, which led to the identification of the alleged inspection delay. The inspection authority will make sure that the actual arrival time will be clearly indicated in all port inspection reports in order to prevent any future confusions.

Further Action: No further action required

Preliminary Status: Compliant'

148. SCIC reached a common understanding on a compliance status of compliant proposed by Korea.

149. In its response to the draft compliance report (Item 4 of Appendix I) Uruguay has provided the following:

‘Situación excepcional, la inspección se realizó con un retraso por imposibilidad de acceso al buque. Anualmente se realizan 15 inspecciones en el puerto de Montevideo sin retrasos.

Exceptional circumstance: the inspection was delayed because of impediments to accessing the vessel. 15 inspections are carried out annually in the port of Montevideo without delays.

Further Action: Se continúa con la mejora de los procesos de control para las inspecciones

Ongoing improvements of monitoring processes regarding inspections.

Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)'

150. SCIC reached a common understanding on a compliance status minor non-compliant (Level 1) proposed by Uruguay.

151. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-03, paragraph 8, by France (item 5 of Appendix I) and South Africa (item 6 of Appendix I) regarding the transmission of a port inspection report to the Secretariat more than 30 days after the inspection date.

152. In its response to the draft compliance report France (item 5 of Appendix I) has provided the following:

‘France acknowledges that the report was sent after the 30 days deadline. The inspection was delayed compared to the usual deadlines because the ship did not have access to its refrigerators in port. In fact, these had been requisitioned by the prefecture because of a breakdown in other fridges in the south of the island.

Reminders to the competent authorities of the territorial fisheries administration based in La Reunion of the importance of the 30 days deadline have been made.

Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)'

153. SCIC reached a common understanding on a compliance status of minor non-compliant (Level 1) proposed by France.

154. In its response to the compliance report South Africa (item 6 of Appendix I) provided the following:

‘The report was submitted on time via email but due to a technical glitch the mail was not delivered. The report was communicated as soon as the matter was raised.

Further Action: For future communication, a mail notification has been set up which will notify the sender when mail has been delivered thereby making the sender attentive about the non-delivery.

Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)’

155. SCIC reached a common understanding on a compliance status of minor non-compliant (Level 1) proposed by South Africa.

#### Conservation Measure 10-04

156. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-04, paragraph 13, by the Chilean vessel *Antarctic Endeavour* (item 7 of Appendix I), the French vessels *Albius* (items 8 and 9 of Appendix I) and *Sainte Rose* (item 10 of Appendix I), the Korean vessel *Greenstar* (item 11 of Appendix I), the Spanish vessel *Tronio* (item 12 of Appendix I) and the United Kingdom vessel *Nordic Prince* (item 13 of Appendix I) 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.

157. In its response to the compliance report for the *Antarctic Endeavour* (item 7 of Appendix I) Chile provided the following:

‘In relation to this case, we are able to point out that the notification of the vessel “*Antarctic Endeavour*” was made within the time established by measure CM10-04, paragraph 13. This is because the Chilean Navy guard operator sent an email to the CCAMLR Secretariat, on March 20th at 23:26 local time.

The notification in local time was correct: March 20th, 2024, at 22:26.

The problem occurred with the reported “UTC” time zone, since, by adding 3 hours, that is, “UTC+3”, the notification moved to the next day, that is, March 21 at 01:26 hours. This involuntary error by the Chilean operator was not detected when sending the notification, since he kept the day March 20 and did not change the date.

Given the above, this finding would not correspond to a non-compliance, but only to an involuntary error. The above has already been corrected with the Secretariat by email, explaining what happened.

Preliminary Status: Compliant’

158. SCIC reached a common understanding on a compliance status of compliant for the Chilean vessel *Antarctic Endeavour* proposed by Chile.

159. In its response to the compliance report identified as item 8 in Appendix I for the *Albius* (items 8 and 9 of Appendix I) France provided the following:

‘France acknowledges that the notification was provided after the 24h-deadline because the vessel had problems with its mailbox.

Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)’

160. SCIC reached a common understanding on a compliance status of minor non-compliant (Level 1) for item 8 in Appendix I for the French vessel *Albius* proposed by France.

161. In its response to the compliance report identified as item 9 in Appendix I for the *Albius* France provided the following:

‘France acknowledges that the notification was provided after the 24h-deadline. Reminders to the competent authority of the fisheries monitoring center have been issued.

Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)’

162. SCIC reached a common understanding on a compliance status of minor non-compliant (Level 1) for item 9 in Appendix I for the French vessel *Albius* proposed by France.

163. In its response to the compliance report identified as item 10 in Appendix I for the *Sainte Rose* France provided the following:

‘France acknowledges that the notification was provided after the 24h-deadline. The ship forgot to transmit the notification. A reminder was sent by the French fisheries monitoring center on 05/02/2024 at 08:16. The CCAMLR Secretariat received the notification on 05/02/2024 at 09:03. Reminders to the ship have been issued.

Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)’

164. SCIC reached a common understanding on a compliance status of minor non-compliant (Level 1) for the French vessel *Sainte Rose* proposed by France.

165. In its response to the compliance report identified as item 11 in Appendix I for the *Greenstar* Korea provided the following:

‘The Greenstar completed its 2-moth research activities in Research Block No.5 in Subarea 88.3 at 08:31 (UTC) on April 13, 2024 and made a north-bound trip to exit the Convention Area. While steaming North-East, the vessel crossed the boundary between subareas 88.3 and 48.1 ( 65°03'46.2"S, 70°00'00"W) at 22:45 (UTC) on April 13, 2024. The vessel mistook that they were still in Subarea 88.3 and sent an exit report to the Secretariat at 08:13 (UTC) on April 15, 2024 notifying that the vessel was leaving Subarea 88.3.

Later, the operator found that the subarea from which the vessel departed was 48.1, not 88.3 and submitted an exit report for 48.1 at 05:49 (UTC) on April 16, 2024. Considering the vessel submitted an entry report for Subarea 48.1 on April 16, they genuinely believed that they were entering 48.1 on April 16 and made an exit report within 24 hours on the same day.

This was an honest mistake from the vessel and rectified as soon as the mistake had been identified. As the vessel had been sending its VMS data on an hourly basis to the Secretariat, its activities can be verified. The authorities issued a strong warning on this case, and the operator is committed to strengthening its compliance with all the conservation measures of CCAMLR.

Further Action: No further action required

Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)'

166. SCIC reached a common understanding on a compliance status of minor non-compliant (Level 1) for the Korean vessel *Greenstar* proposed by Korea.

167. In its response to the compliance report identified as item 12 in Appendix I for the Spanish vessel *Tronio*, the EU provided the following:

'We have investigated this issue further and confirm that due to human error (confusion on the part of the Master who used the SSRU map in CM 41-01 and reported movements based upon the SSRUs listed), the required movement notification was not sent. The competent authorities have since clarified the movement notification obligations under CM 10-04, paragraph 13, with the Master of the vessel to prevent this issue from happening in the future.

Further Action: no further action required

Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)'

168. SCIC reached a common understanding on a proposed compliance status of minor non-compliant (Level 1) for the Spanish vessel *Tronio*.

169. In its response to the compliance report identified as item 13 in Appendix I for the *Nordic Prince* United Kingdom provided the following:

'The UK investigated this potential infringement.

After reviewing the onboard tamper proof electronic monitoring system and VMS, the UK can confirm that the *Nordic Prince* transited through the northern edge of Subarea 48.3, entering at approximately 15:18 UTC on the 13 April, exiting at approximately 07:35 UTC on the 14 April. The vessel was transiting at speeds between 9.0 – 10.6 knots.

The transiting crew incorrectly interpreted the requirement to notify entry and exit reports as only be required in relation to fishing activity, rather than also during transit.

The vessel provided the relevant entry/exit notification report on 18 April. The transit crew have been thoroughly briefed on CCAMLR requirements and reminded of the reporting requirements within the Convention Area.

Further Action: None

Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)'

170. SCIC reached a common understanding on a compliance status of minor non-compliant (Level 1) for the United Kingdom vessel *Nordic Prince* proposed by the United Kingdom.

#### Conservation Measure 10-05

171. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-05, paragraph 6, by Argentina (item 14 of Appendix I), Chile (item 15 of Appendix I), France (item 16 of Appendix I), the Netherlands (item 17 of Appendix I), Peru (item 18 of Appendix I), South Africa (item 19 of Appendix I), Spain (item 20 of Appendix I), the United States of America (item 21 of Appendix I), and Uruguay (item 22 of Appendix I). regarding the prohibition on exporting or re-exporting toothfish without an accompanying *Dissostichus* Export Document (DED) or *Dissostichus* Re-Export Document (DRED).

172. In its response to the compliance report identified as item 14 in Appendix I Argentina provided the following:

'With regard to this incident, the Argentine National Directorate of Fisheries Coordination and Supervision has informed that all the steps in the e-CDS of this document were completed and validated on June 29, 2023, 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 been left unvalidated, this error was corrected. The merchandise was able to enter its destination in Port Everglades.

Further Action: No further action needed

Preliminary Status: Compliant'

173. SCIC reached a common understanding on a compliance status of compliant proposed by Argentina.

174. In its response to the compliance report identified as item 15 in Appendix I, Chile provided the following:

'In relation to the finding of the Secretary, regarding the non-compliance with paragraph 6 of CM 10-05 on the identification of 74 DEDs that were validated late. However, it should be noted that this error affects only 2.2% (4) of the total shipments of *Dissostichus* spp. (180) made by Chile during the period analysed.

In addition to the above, it is important to note that a characteristic of the e-CDS system implemented by Chile is the large number of DCDs and DEDs that are validated (over 50% of the world total), which is explained by the fact that the TOP catches made in our

EEZ by industrial and artisanal vessels (6 and 169 for the period analysed, respectively) have to be registered in the e-CDS system, which consequently implies the generation of a large number of export documents (DEDs). Given this, national shipments of *Dissostichus* spp. fluctuated, during the period analysed, between 1 and 67 DEDs per shipment (an average of 9 DEDs), with maritime shipments generally accounting for the largest number of DEDs.

In summary, the validation of certificates with a post-export date is explained by two reasons: i) involuntary errors by fishing inspectors by not validating step 4 in the e-CDS system for some of the DEDs considered in the shipments (2 cases), ii) late validations of the DEDs associated with the shipments (2 cases), given a failure to comply with the instructions and their control systems. Notwithstanding the above, we wish to affirm that our traceability analyses for the 74 DEDs validated late show that these documents are not related to IUU fishing activities.

Finally, it should be noted that, as corrective measures, adjustments have been made to the control systems and training regarding the procedures that apply to this type of certification, institutionally instructing and urging both Fisheries Heads and Inspectors to strictly comply with the provisions of MC 10-05.

Preliminary Status: Non-compliant (Level 2)’

175. SCIC reached a common understanding on a compliance status of non-compliant (Level 2) proposed by Chile.

176. In its response to the compliance report identified as item 16 in Appendix I for France, the EU provided the following:

‘Regarding the three DEDS identified, the French authorities realised that some information were not accurately reflected (for DED FR-23-0028-E, it was not the correct Bill of Lading number and for DED FR-23-0025-E, the trainee entered the same export information twice for 2 different DED numbers). For DED FR-23-0015-E, the modification was made to the transport vessel and its departure date. Therefore, the DEDs were modified to reflect the correct information, and validated at that moment. The competent authorities have been reminded of the importance of ensuring that consignments of *Dissostichus* spp. are not exported without completed and validated DED/DREDS and to take the necessary actions to prevent this to happen in the future.

Further Action: no further action required

Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)’

177. SCIC reached a common understanding on a proposed compliance status of minor non-compliant (Level 1).

178. In its response to the compliance report identified as item 17 in Appendix I for the Netherlands, the EU provided the following:

‘Response submitted to the Secretariat by the EU via email:



1. One DRED was issued after the declared export date. The issuing of the DRED was delayed due to a technical issue encountered with the e-CDS system on 24 May 2024 (cause unknown). Despite various attempts using different browsers (e.g., Microsoft Edge, Google Chrome, Firefox), it was not possible to complete the DRED that day, which was a Friday. The DRED could be completed after the weekend and was issued on Monday, 27 May 2024.

Proposed preliminary status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1), no further action required

2. In the case of the second DRED, there has been an administrative error. The initial DRED was submitted to the Dutch authorities for validation on 30 August 2023. The application provided the same information as an earlier application and was refused. On 12 September 2023, the export was requested again with a different catch document. However, the correct supporting documents were not available and essential information was still missing, resulting in various exchanges between the Dutch authorities and the exporter between 12 and 18 September 2023. After the missing information was provided, the DRED was issued on 18 September 2023 and the export happened the same day. However, due to an oversight, the issuing officer did not update the initial export date. The DRED therefore listed an incorrect export date of 30 August 2023. The correct export date was 18 September 2023. The DRED was issued the same day, prior to export.

Proposed preliminary status: Compliant, no further action required'

179. SCIC reached a common understanding on a proposed compliance statuses of minor non-compliant (Level 1) and compliant.

180. SCIC noted that Peru did not provide a response to the compliance report identified as item 18 in Appendix I. In recalling that Peru's compliance with CM 10-05 has been considered previously at SCIC-2022 and SCIC-2023, SCIC reached a common understanding to the compliance status of minor non-compliant (Level 1). SCIC requested Peru report back to SCIC with their response to the draft compliance report.

181. In its response to the compliance report identified as item 19 in Appendix I, South Africa provided the following:

'Notifications of intent to offload in SA ports were received from the two vessels *Southern Ocean* (21 February 2024) and *Hong Jin No. 707* (16 February 2024), i.e. well in advance of the actual vessels offloads.

All 18 x DEDs which "account for 38 % of South Africa's exports and <1 % of all CDS exports" implicated in this non-compliance incidents are applicable to one offload of each of these two vessels and noting that one DED was issued for each container stacked for these exports.

a. 8 DEDs (8 containers) were issued between 6 - 10 days (1 DED 6 days and 7 DEDs 9 days) after declared export date for *Southern Ocean* - KR-24-0009-E

b. 10 DEDs (10 containers) were issued between 21 - 50 days (29 days) after declared export date for *Hong Jin No. 707* - KR-24-0008-E

South Africa authorised official, Mr Johan De Goede, immediately requested an explanation from the exporter company Hongjin Corporation through their South African vessel agent Hanill Shipping, why DED applications were received late.

Full cooperation by the vessel agent as well as by the exporting company Hongjin Corporation was received during the entire investigation. A satisfactory explanation was provided (letter attached) by the exporting company Hongjin Corporation why the unavoidable situation occurred.

Considerations:

1) Both the Vessels *No 707 Hong Jin* and *Southern Ocean* submitted its required Advance Request to Enter Port (AREP) applications prior to entering the SA EEZ and in which their catches were declared.

2) Both Vessels *No 707 Hong Jin* and *Southern Ocean* applied for and were issued with the necessary permits to possess, land, sell Toothfish as required under South African legislation.

3) Both Vessels *No 707 Hong Jin* and *Southern Ocean* were timeously and fully inspected by the Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE) Fishery Control Officers. Inspection reports were submitted to CDS and is available online. All catches were verified by the DFFE Fishery Control Officers when the containers were packed.

4) Letter of explanation provided by exporter company Hongjin Corporation.

Decision:

Given the explanation provided by Hongjin Corporation, required domestic permits issued, notifications timeously received, port inspections properly conducted by Fishery Control Officers during the entire offloads, landing and catch verifications conducted, the authorised South African official was confident that the DEDs should be issued, albeit late. There was no intent from the Hongjin Corporation to delay DED applications, in fact all attempts were made to get their Bill of Ladings etc. timeously issued by the shipping lane well in advance.

The matters were satisfactorily explained and addressed accordingly. The vessels agent was made aware of the challenges and CCAMLR requirements for these products in attempt to avoid similar situations in future.

Further Action: No further actions required

Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)”

182. SCIC noted that the delay in receiving Bill of Ladings resulted in delayed applications for the *Dissostichus* Export Documents (DEDs) and the toothfish had departed South Africa at the time these DED applications were received. South Africa proceeded with the late issuance of the DEDs after an investigation was conducted and the matters were explained satisfactorily by Korean exporters. SCIC noted the seriousness of the matter and reached a common understanding on a compliance status of non-compliant (Level 2).

183. In its response to the compliance report identified as item 20 in Appendix I for Spain, the EU provided the following:

‘Under previous versions of the e-CDS application, for the validation of DED/DREDS it was possible to obtain the catch document in pdf and therefore to export/re-export *Dissostichus* spp. consignments without completion of step 4 “Export State Confirmation”. Following updates in the e-CDS application, the 4 DREDS concerned were notified as “Items Pending Action”.

Even though these DREDS were still pending completion of step 4, due to administrative error they were understood as having been validated by the authorities and export was allowed to proceed. We have since completed step 4 for these DREDS, which is why they have a validation date after the declared export date. Given the improvements in the e-CDS application since these issues occurred, it will now be evident when a DED/DRED has not been validated, preventing this from happening in the future. Moreover, the competent authorities have been reminded of the importance of ensuring that consignments of *Dissostichus* spp. are not exported without completed and validated DED/DREDS and to take the necessary actions to prevent this to happen in the future.

Further Action: no further action required

Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)’

184. SCIC recalled the implementation of moratorium on compliance assessments put in place for DED and DREDS older than two years to address the administrative matter associated with completing documents identified through the e-CDS upgrade (SCIC-2023, paragraph 90). SCIC noted that the four Spanish *Dissostichus* re-export documents (DREDS) identified as non-compliant were identified in this administrative process, however, were less than two years old. SCIC reached a common understanding on a compliance status of minor non-compliant (Level 1) for Spain.

185. In its response to the compliance report identified as item 21 in Appendix I, the United States of America provided the following:

‘This was an administrative error which was only brought to our attention when the new interface for the e-CDS was implemented in May 2023. The shipment documented under this DRED was accompanied by a DRED but lacked the Export Government Authority Validation. Given the improvements to the e-CDS it will now be evident when a DED/DRED has not been validated, preventing this from happening in the future.

Further Action: No further action needed

Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)’

186. SCIC reached a common understanding on a compliance status of minor non-compliant (Level 1) proposed by the United States of America.

187. In its response to the compliance report identified as item 22 in Appendix I, Uruguay provided the following:

‘Se revisó el período julio 2023 a junio 2024 y se completaron 101 DED. El 50 % de los DED que no se completaron a tiempo se refieren a cargas menores a 1000 kg procedentes de barcos de arrastre. Los retrasos se explican por la falta de personal dedicado y retrasos en el envío de la documentación verificable por parte de las empresas y representantes legales (información detallada de exportador e importador). En relación a la falta de personal, durante el año 2024 se incorporó más personal y asistieron a los cursos de capacitación.

The July 2023–June 2024 period was reviewed: 101 DEDs were completed. 50% of the DEDs that were not completed in time correspond to cargoes of less than 1000 kg from trawlers. These delays can be attributed to the shortage of dedicated staff and to delays by companies and legal representatives in the submission of verifiable documentation (detailed exporter and importer information). As to the staff shortage, additional staff has been engaged and they attended training courses earlier in the year.

Further Action: Paralelamente se comunicó a las empresas que se exigirá mayor puntualidad con la documentación. Uruguay ha solicitado asistencia a FAO para revisar y mejorar los procedimientos relativos a las Medidas del Estado Rector del Puerto.

Also, companies were informed that deadlines for the submission of documentation will be more strictly enforced. Uruguay has requested assistance from FAO to review and improve the procedures relating to the Port State Measures Agreement.

Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)’

188. SCIC noted that 50% of the Uruguayan DEDs identified as non-compliant were exports less than one tonne. Furthermore, SCIC noted that the officials responsible for implementing the CDS in Uruguay are facing human resource challenges, which is complicated with administrative issues, and increasing documentation and workloads leading to delayed processing times of DEDs. SCIC reached a common understanding on a compliance status of non-compliant (Level 2).

#### Conservation Measure 10-09

189. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-09, paragraph 2, by the Panamanian vessels *Frio Aegean* (items 23 and 24 of Appendix I), *Frio Marathon* (item 25 of Appendix I), *Frio Oceanic* (item 26 of Appendix I), and *Procyon* (item 27 of Appendix I), and the Ukrainian vessel *More Sodruzhestva* (item 28 of Appendix I) which requires 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.

190. In its response to the compliance report identified as item 23 in Appendix I for the *Frio Aegean*, Panama provided the following:

‘Panama confirms that the information provided by the CCAMLR Secretariat, according to the date of the notification received and the possible date of the activity reported by the vessel *FRIO AEGEAN*, is correct; and the vessel has been informed of the obligation to comply with the time limits for submitting the format for notification of resources regulated by the Commission, both to the Secretariat and to the Authority. However, in

the confirmation form reported by the vessel, the actual date of transshipment reported did comply with the established time (74h 43m). Therefore, Panama considers a preliminary status of Compliant.

Preliminary Status: Compliant'

191. In its response to the compliance report identified as item 24 in Appendix I for the *Frio Aegean*, Panama provided the following:

'Panama confirms that the information provided by the CCAMLR Secretariat, according to the date of the notification received and the possible date of the activity reported by the vessel *FRIO AEGEAN*, is correct; and the vessel has been informed of the obligation to comply with the time limits for submitting the format for notification of resources regulated by the Commission, both to the Secretariat and to the Authority. However, in the confirmation form reported by the vessel, the actual date of transshipment reported did comply with the established time (72h 53m). Therefore, Panama considers a preliminary status of Compliant.

Preliminary Status: Compliant'

192. In its response to the compliance report identified as item 25 in Appendix I for the *Frio Marathon*, Panama provided the following:

'Panama confirms that the information provided by the CCAMLR Secretariat, according to the date of the notification received and the possible date of the activity reported by the vessel *FRIO MARATHON*, is correct; and the vessel has been informed of the obligation to comply with the time limits for submitting the format for notification of resources regulated by the Commission, both to the Secretariat and to the Authority. However, in the confirmation form reported by the vessel, the actual date of transshipment reported did comply with the established time (103h 14m). Therefore, Panama considers a preliminary status of Compliant.

Preliminary Status: Compliant'

193. In its response to the compliance report identified as item 26 in Appendix I for the *Frio Oceanic* Panama provided the following:

'Panama confirms that the information provided by the CCAMLR Secretariat, according to the date of submission and the possible date of the notification reported by the vessel *FRIO OCEANIC*, is correct; and has informed the vessel of the obligation to comply with the time limits for the submission of notifications to both the Secretariat and the Authority, of the activities within the area regulated by the Commission. In view of the fact that in the activity confirmation report, the actual date and time of the transshipment also occurred with less time than the established time limit (69h 56m), Panama considers an evaluation of minor non-compliance (Level 1) that can be corrected by the vessel.

Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)'

194. In its response to the compliance report identified as item 27 in Appendix I for the *Procyon*, Panama provided the following:

‘Panama confirms that the information provided by the CCAMLR Secretariat, according to the date of the notification received and the possible date of the activity reported by the vessel *PROCYON*, is correct; and the vessel has been informed of the obligation to comply with the time limits for submitting the format for notification of resources regulated by the Commission, both to the Secretariat and to the Authority. However, in the confirmation form reported by the vessel, the actual date of transshipment reported did comply with the established time (72h 14m). Therefore, Panama considers a preliminary status of Compliant.

Preliminary Status: Compliant’

195. SCIC noted that in responses to items 23, 24, 25 and 27, of Appendix I the transshipment occurred 72 hours after the notification was sent, however, the notified start of the transshipments was less than 72 hours from when the notification was sent. SCIC reiterated that notifications to transshipment must be transmitted at least 72 hours in advanced of the intended transshipment start time. SCIC also noted the response to item 26 of Appendix I assigned the compliance status of minor non-compliant (Level 1). SCIC reached a common understanding on a compliance status of minor non-compliant (Level 1) for all five cases for Panama.

196. SCIC noted Ukraine’s response to the compliance report identified as item 28 in Appendix I circulated in COMM CIRC 24/94 and noted that upon receiving the information the Secretariat identified that there was a data entry error when entering the transshipment information. SCIC reached a common understanding on a compliant status of compliant proposed by Ukraine.

197. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-09, paragraph 3, by the Norwegian vessels *Antarctic Provider* and *Saga Sea* (item 29 of Appendix I) and the Uruguayan vessel *Ocean Azul* (item 30 of Appendix I) 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.

198. In its response to the compliance report identified as item 29 in Appendix I for the *Antarctic Provider* and *Saga Sea*, Norway provided the following:

‘Investigations have confirmed that the vessel did not provide the notification to the Secretariat at least 2 hours in advance of the intended transshipment operation due to a human error.

Further Action: No Further Action required

Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)’

199. SCIC reached a common understanding on a compliance status of minor non-compliant (Level 1) for the Norwegian vessels *Antarctic Provider* and *Saga Sea* proposed by Norway.

200. In its response to the compliance report identified as item 30 in Appendix I for the *Ocean Azul*, Uruguay provided the following:

‘Existe intención de cumplimiento de la MC 10-09. Según el informe del observador se pasó una ecosonda al *Elena Ndume*.

Willingness to comply with CM 10-09 is confirmed. According to the observer's report, an echo sounder was transhipped to the *Helena Ndume*.

Further Action: Se advirtió a la empresa sobre el incumplimiento. Debe mejorar el procedimiento en situaciones semejantes en el futuro.

The company received a warning of non-compliance. The company must improve procedures in case similar situations arise in the future.

Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)'

201. SCIC reached a common understanding on a compliance status of minor non-compliant (Level 1) for the Uruguayan vessel *Ocean Azul* proposed by Uruguay.

202. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-09, paragraph 5, by the Norwegian vessels *Antarctic Provider* and *Saga Sea* (item 31 of Appendix I) requiring that each Contracting Party provide confirmation of transshipment to the Secretariat within three (3) working days of any of its vessels having transhipped within the Convention Area.

203. In its response to the compliance report identified for the *Antarctic Provider* and *Saga Sea*, Norway provided the following:

'Investigations have shown that the confirmation for the transshipment of crew and provisions was not provided.

However, the notified transshipment was not conducted due to bad weather.

Further Action: No Further Action required

Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)'

204. SCIC reached a common understanding on a compliance status of minor non-compliance (Level 1) for the Norwegian vessels *Antarctic Provider* and *Saga Sea* proposed by Norway.

205. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 10-09, paragraph 8, by the Vanuatuan vessel *Hai Feng 718* (item 32 of Appendix I) 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.

206. In its response to the compliance report for the *Hai Feng 718*, Vanuatu provided the following:

'Prior Notification was sent on the 3rd of February 2024

Preliminary Status: Compliant'

207. SCIC reached a common understanding on a compliance status of additional information required for the Vanuatuan vessel *Hai Feng 718*, and requested the Secretariat to follow up with Vanuatu to clarify the date the notification was transmitted.

## Conservation Measure 22-07

208. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 22-07, paragraph 8, by the United Kingdom vessel *Argos Georgia* which requires the vessel to report in accordance with CM 23-07 the total benthos recovered in a daily period in item 33, Appendix I.

209. In its response to the draft compliance report for the *Argos Georgia*, the United Kingdom had provided the following:

‘The UK investigated this potential infringement.

On 19 December the FV *Argos Georgia* landed a small amount of Vulnerable Marine Ecosystem (VME) indicator species. This was correctly recorded on the C2 report and submitted to the CCAMLR Secretariat for the relevant period. This information was unfortunately not included on the daily catch and effort report due to human error.

Given the information was recorded on the C2 data submission, we conclude that the vessel did not intentionally omit the VME reporting on the daily catch report.

Further Action: None

Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)’

210. SCIC reached a common understanding on a status of minor non-compliant (Level 1) for the United Kingdom vessel *Argos Georgia* proposed by the United Kingdom.

211. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 22-07, paragraph 9, by the Russian vessel *Alpha Crux* (items 34, 35, 36 and 37 of Appendix I) and the Uruguayan vessel *Proa Pioneer* (items 38 and 39) which states that a VME Risk Area shall remain closed for any fishery until reviewed by the Scientific Committee and management actions are determined by the Commission.

212. In its response to the draft compliance report identified as item 34 in Appendix I for the *Alpha Crux*, Russia had provided the following:

‘Российская сторона провела детальное расследование данных случаев. В виду повреждения файлов на носителе информации компьютера на судне, координаты ряда VME risk area отображались некорректно, что привело к непредумышленной установке ярусов в пределах VME risk area. Одновременно это не снимает ответственности судовладельца. Судовладельцу рекомендовано обеспечить установку на компьютеры надежное антивирусное программное обеспечение, дублирование информационных баз. Status Minor Non-compliant.

The Russian Federation has conducted a detailed investigation into these cases. Due to corrupted files on the ship's computer storage media, the coordinates of several VME risk areas were displayed incorrectly, resulting in the unintentional deployment of longlines within the VME risk area. At the same time, this does not remove the shipowner's responsibility. The shipowner was recommended to ensure the installation of reliable anti-virus software on computers and the duplication of information databases.

Status: Minor non-compliant.



Further Action:

Устранение технических пробелов.

Addressing technical gaps.

Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)

213. In its response to the draft compliance report identified as item 35 in Appendix I for the *Alpha Crux*, Russia had provided the following:

‘Российская сторона провела детальное расследование данных случаев. В виду повреждения файлов на носителе информации компьютера на судне, координаты ряда VME risk area отображались некорректно, что привело к непредумышленной установке ярусов в пределах VME risk area. Одновременно это не снимает ответственности судовладельца. Судовладельцу рекомендовано обеспечить установку на компьютеры надежное антивирусное программное обеспечение, дублирование информационных баз. Status Minor Non-compliant.

The Russian Federation has conducted a detailed investigation into these cases. Due to corrupted files on the ship's computer storage media, the coordinates of a number of VME risk areas were displayed incorrectly, resulting in the unintentional deployment of longlines within the VME risk area. At the same time, this does not remove the shipowner's responsibility. The shipowner was recommended to ensure the installation of reliable anti-virus software on computers and the duplication of information databases.

Status: Minor non-compliant.

Further Action:

Устранение технических пробелов

Addressing technical gaps

Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)

214. In its response to the draft compliance report identified as item 36 in Appendix I for the *Alpha Crux*, Russia had provided the following:

‘Российская сторона провела детальное расследование данных случаев. В виду повреждения файлов на носителе информации компьютера на судне, координаты ряда VME risk area отображались некорректно, что привело к непредумышленной установке ярусов в пределах VME risk area. Одновременно это не снимает ответственности судовладельца. Судовладельцу рекомендовано обеспечить установку на компьютеры надежное антивирусное программное обеспечение, дублирование информационных баз. Status Minor Non-compliant.

‘The Russian Federation has conducted a detailed investigation into these cases. Due to corrupted files on the ship's computer storage media, the coordinates of a number of VME risk areas were displayed incorrectly, resulting in the unintentional deployment of longlines within the VME risk area. At the same time, this does not remove the

shipowner's responsibility. The shipowner was recommended to ensure the installation of reliable anti-virus software on computers and the duplication of information databases.

Status: Minor non-compliant.

Further Action:

Устранение технических пробелов.

Addressing technical gaps.

Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)'

215. In its response to the draft compliance report identified as item 37 in Appendix I for the *Alpha Crux*, Russia had provided the following:

‘Российская сторона провела детальное расследование данных случаев. В виду повреждения файлов на носителе информации компьютера на судне, координаты ряда VME risk area отображались некорректно, что привело к непредумышленной установке ярусов в пределах VME risk area. Одновременно это не снимает ответственности судовладельца. Судовладельцу рекомендовано обеспечить установку на компьютеры надежное антивирусное программное обеспечение, дублирование информационных баз. Status Minor Non-compliant.

The Russian Federation has conducted a detailed investigation into these cases. Due to corrupted files on the ship's computer storage media, the coordinates of a number of VME risk areas were displayed incorrectly, resulting in the unintentional deployment of longlines within the VME risk area. At the same time, this does not remove the shipowner's responsibility. The shipowner was recommended to ensure the installation of reliable anti-virus software on computers and the duplication of information databases.

Status: Minor non-compliant.

Further Action:

Устранение технических пробелов

Addressing technical gaps.

Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)'

216. SCIC noted that in responses to items 34, 35, 36 and 37, of Appendix I the software issues experienced at sea had been resolved to prevent future reoccurrence. SCIC also noted the fishing in these VME closed areas is a serious issue and reached a common understanding on a compliance status of non-compliant (Level 2) for all items.

217. In its response to the draft compliance report identified as item 38 in Appendix I for the *Proa Pioneer*, Uruguay had provided the following:

‘Dos periodos de pesca dentro áreas de riesgo VME:

1) Lance 16: 21 dic 2023 Lat 74.17S-112.79W;

2) Lance 19: 22 dic 2023 Lat 74.17S-112.79W.

La presencia de organismos fue muy baja y la afectación mínima.

Two fishing periods within VME risk areas:

1) Haul 16: 21 Dec 2023 Lat 74.17S–112.79W;

2) Haul 19: 22 Dec 2023 Lat 74.17S–112.79W.

Very low presence of organisms; impact was minimal.

Further Action:

Se advierte a la empresa sobre el incumplimiento y se condiciona renovación de la licencia de pesca.

The company was issued a warning of non-compliance and conditions were imposed for the renewal of the fishing licence.

Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)’

218. In its response to the draft compliance report identified as item 39 in Appendix I for the *Proa Pioneer* Uruguay had provided the following:

‘Dos periodos de pesca dentro áreas de riesgo VME:

1) Lance 16: 21 dic 2023 Lat 74.17S-112.79W;

2) Lance 19: 22 dic 2023 Lat 74.17S-112.79W.

La presencia de organismos fue muy baja y la afectación mínima.

Two fishing periods within VME risk areas:

1) Haul 16: 21 Dec 2023 Lat 74.17S–112.79W;

2) Haul 19: 22 Dec 2023 Lat 74.17S–112.79W.

Very low presence of organisms; impact was minimal.

Further Action:

Se advierte a la empresa sobre el incumplimiento y se condiciona renovación de licencia.

The company was issued a warning of non-compliance and conditions were imposed for the renewal of the fishing licence.

Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)’

219. SCIC considered the responses to items 38 and 39, of Appendix I and noted that the crew tried to set the fishing gear around the VME closed areas. SCIC reached a common understanding on a compliance status of non-compliant (Level 2) for both items.

Conservation Measure 22-08

220. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 22-08, paragraph 1, prohibits fishing in exploratory fisheries shallower than 550 m by the Russian vessel *Alpha Crux* in item 40, Appendix I.

221. In its response to the draft compliance report for the *Alpha Crux*, Russia had provided the following:

‘После рассмотрения отчета наблюдателя в части возможного случая несоблюдения МС 22-08 не подтверждается информация о наличии несоответствия в данных постановки яруса судном. Комментарий наблюдателя не отражает процедуру заполнения формы С2 при занесении данных о постановке ярусов на свалах с резким перепадом глубин и учетом смещения ярусов под воздействием подводного течения.

After reviewing the observer's report regarding possible non-compliance with CM 22-08, the information on the inconsistency in vessel longline setting data is not confirmed. The observer's comment does not reflect the procedure for completing the C2 Form when entering longline deployment data for places with a drastic depth difference and does not reflect the allowance for the shift of longlines due to underwater currents.

Further Action: не требуется

Not required

Preliminary Status: Compliant’

222. SCIC considered the additional explanation by Russia that the location the fishing took place had a number of seamounts which created difficulties in calculating depth, in addition to pull of the current on the fishing gear.

223. Russia suggested SCIC assign the compliance status of ‘Additional information required’ and noted that investigation into the matter is ongoing and they will provide an update to SCIC. Several Members urged Russia to make all possible efforts to provide additional information on this incident during the meeting of CCAMLR-43, noting this issue should be able to be clarified through available data sources including VMS data and national observer records. These Members further noted their concern with proposed compliance status of ‘Additional information required’ without providing an agreed deadline for the submission of additional information and would be willing for a compromised approach.

224. SCIC did not reach consensus on the compliance status for the Russian vessel *Alpha Crux*, in item 40, Appendix I.

#### Conservation Measure 23-04

225. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 23-04, paragraph 3, which requires the total target catch must be reported by species and the total by-catch must be reported by species or to the lowest taxonomic level possible by the Russian vessel *Alpha Crux* in items 41 and 42 of Appendix I.

226. In its response to the draft compliance report for the *Alpha Crux* Russia in item 41 of Appendix I had provided the following:

‘После рассмотрения отчета наблюдателя российская сторона сообщила в Секретариат и назначающей стране-члену о неточностях, как только они выявлены. В отчете (logbook) международного наблюдателя указано 3 потерянных яруса. Координаты по всем ярусам указаны. В отчете по итогам рейса включен еще один потерянный ярус. 27 августа 2024 года получен комментарий корейской стороны. Однако ответ не проясняет расхождения с ранее предоставленной международным наблюдателем информации. Тем не менее возникли дополнительные вопросы по данной проблеме, которые требуют урегулирования сторонами.

After reviewing the observer's report, the Russian Federation informed the Secretariat and the Appointing Member State of inaccuracies as soon as they were identified. The International Observer's report (logbook) indicated three (3) lost longlines. Coordinates for all longlines are provided. One more lost longline is included in the final cruise report. A comment from Korea was received on 27 August 2024. However, the response did not clarify the discrepancy with the information previously provided by the International Observer. Nonetheless, additional issues have arisen on this matter that need to be addressed by the parties.

Further Action: Требуется дальнейшие консультации с корейской стороной.

Further consultations with Korea are required.

Preliminary Status: Additional information required’

227. In its response to the draft compliance report for the *Alpha Crux*, Russia in item 42 of Appendix I had provided the following:

‘После рассмотрения отчета наблюдателя российская сторона сообщила в Секретариат и назначающей стране-члену о неточностях 29 мая 2024 года.

By-catch data for each line was recorded by both observers on a special form that was kept on the vessel. These forms are saved and can be presented. No evidence of intentional discards of by-catch species was provided. 27 августа 2024 года получен ответ корейской стороны. Тем не менее возникли дополнительные вопросы по данной проблеме, которые требуют урегулирования сторонами.

After reviewing the observer's report, the Russian Federation informed the Secretariat and the Appointing Member State of inaccuracies on 29 May 2024. Both observers recorded by-catch data for each line on a special form kept on the vessel. These forms are saved and can be presented. No evidence of intentional discards of by-catch species was provided. A reply from Korea was received on 27 August 2024. Nonetheless, additional issues have arisen on this matter that need to be addressed by the parties.

Preliminary Status: Additional information required'

228. Russia provided an update on their intersessional engagement with Korea on the matter and noted that their investigations verified the data recorded in the vessel's logbook but could not verify the information recorded in the observer's logbook.

229. Korea confirmed that consultations with Russia have been occurring, and noted these were needed to continue on the matter. Korea supported the proposed compliance status of 'Additional information required', and committed to also provide updates on the matter.

230. Several Members, noting that there appeared to be sufficient information available to determine a compliance status, recalled their concerns with applying a compliance status of 'Additional information required' without providing an agreed deadline for the submission of additional information and urged the relevant Members to make all possible efforts to provide additional information on this incident during the meeting of CCAMLR-43, and no later than 1 February 2025.

231. SCIC did not reach consensus on the compliance status for the Russian vessel *Alpha Crux* in items 41 and 42, Appendix I.

#### Conservation Measure 25-02

232. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 25-02, paragraph 6, regarding the prohibition of dumping of offal and discards while longlines are being set by the Russian vessel *Alpha Crux* in item 43 of Appendix I.

233. In its response to the draft compliance report for the *Alpha Crux*, Russia had provided the following:

‘По данному вопросу проведено Несмотря на наличие расхождений по ряду позиций в отчете наблюдателя по итогу рейса к судовладельцу применен ряд санкций:

Отстранен капитан судна от возможности участия в рейсах в АНТКОМ;

Часть команды судна отправлена на проверку квалификационным требованиям;

Компания прекратила трудовые отношения с директором, отвечавшим за данный рейс.

проведено тщательное расследование.

Despite the discrepancies on many items in the Observer's Cruise Report, several sanctions were applied to the shipowner:

- The ship's Master was suspended from the opportunity to participate in CCAMLR cruises.
- Part of the vessel's crew was referred for a qualification review.
- The company terminated its employment contract with the Director in charge of the voyage.

A thorough investigation has been carried out.

Further Action: Не требуются.

Not required

Preliminary Status: Non-compliant (Level 2)'

234. SCIC reached a common understanding on a compliance status of non-compliant (Level 2) proposed by Russia.

235. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 25-02, paragraph 8, by the New Zealand vessel *Janas* (item 44 of Appendix I) and the Russian vessel *Alpha Crux* (item 45 of Appendix I) which requires a streamer line to be deployed during longline setting.

236. In its response to the draft compliance report for the *Janas* (item 44 of Appendix I), New Zealand had provided the following:

‘As per the requirements of CM 25-02 paragraph 8, the *Janas* had a streamer line deployed. However, during the setting of line 108, the streamer line became tangled around the rudder.

The crew responded quickly, and the streamer line was tied to the stern before it was cut whilst they deployed the spare streamer line. The cut streamer line was then pulled in by hand.

New Zealand officials believe that the *Janas* crew took all reasonable steps to ensure they remained compliant under CM 25-02 during this incident. However, during the period that these steps were taken, some magazines were set in absence of a streamer line.

Further Action: No further action required

Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)'

237. SCIC reached a common understanding on a compliance status of minor non-compliant (Level 1) proposed by New Zealand.

238. In its response to the draft compliance report for the *Alpha Crux* (item 45 of Appendix I), Russia had provided the following:

‘A thorough investigation was conducted into this matter.

Two streamer lines were regularly used during vessel cruise.

One streamer line was deployed only due to heavy ice conditions.

Further Action: Требуется дополнительные консультации с корейской стороной по содержанию отчета.

Additional discussions with Korea regarding the report's content are necessary.

Preliminary Status: Additional information required’

239. Several Members, noting that there appeared to be sufficient information available to determine a compliance status, recalled their concerns with applying a compliance status of ‘Additional information required’ without providing an agreed deadline for the submission of additional information and urged the relevant Members to make all possible efforts to provide additional information on this incident during the meeting of CCAMLR-43, and no later than 1 February 2025.

240. SCIC did not reach consensus on the compliance status for the Russian vessel *Alpha Crux* in item 45 of Appendix I.

241. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 25-02, Annex A, paragraph 3, by the French vessel *Sainte Rose* (item 46 of Appendix I) and the Russian vessel *Alpha Crux* (item 47 of Appendix I) which requires the streamer line be a minimum of 150 m in length.

242. In its response to the draft compliance report for the *Sainte Rose* (item 46 of Appendix I), France had provided the following:

‘One of the observers on board during this campaign confirmed that the streamer lines complied with CCAMLR obligations. The reference to streamer lines measuring 120m is a typing error. There is no compliance issue.

Preliminary Status: Compliant’

243. SCIC reached a common understanding on a compliance status of compliant proposed by France.

244. In its response to the draft compliance report for the *Alpha Crux* (item 47 of Appendix I), Russia had provided the following:

‘По данному вопросу проведено расследование. При подготовке судно в рейс осуществлялись стандартные промеры the streamer line и их длина была не меньше 150 метров. В конфигурацию стримерных линий не вносились изменения. Повреждения на стримерных линиях (если имелись) возможны в результате обрыва во льдах. По данному вопросу, как и по отчету наблюдателя в целом существует ряд замечаний.

Несмотря на наличие расхождений по ряду позиций в отчете наблюдателя по итогу рейса к судовладельцу применен ряд санкций:



Отстранен капитан судна от возможности участия в рейсах в АНТКОМ;

Часть команды судна отправлена на проверку квалификационным требованиям;

Компания прекратила трудовые отношения с директором, отвечавшим за данный рейс.

This matter has been investigated. During the preparation of the vessel for the voyage, the standard measurements of the streamer lines were taken, and their length was not less than 150 metres. No changes were made to the configuration of the streamer lines. Damage to the streamer lines (if any) is possible as a result of breaking in the ice. There are many comments on this issue, as well as on the observer's report in general.

Despite the discrepancies on many items in the Observer's Cruise Report, several sanctions were applied to the shipowner:

- The ship's Master was suspended from the opportunity to participate in CCAMLR cruises.
- Part of the vessel's crew was referred for a qualification review.
- The company terminated its employment contract with the Director in charge of the voyage.

Further Action: Требуется дальнейшие консультации с корейской стороной.

Further consultations with Korea are required.

Preliminary Status: Additional information required'

245. Several Members, noting that there appeared to be sufficient information available to determine a compliance status, recalled their concerns with applying a compliance status of 'Additional information required' without providing an agreed deadline for the submission of additional information and urged the relevant Members to make all possible efforts to provide additional information on this incident during the meeting of CCAMLR-43, and no later than 1 February 2025.

246. SCIC did not reach consensus on the compliance status for the Russian vessel *Alpha Cruz* in item 47 of Appendix I.

247. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 25-02, Annex A, paragraph 4, which requires streamers be branched each comprising of two strands of a minimum of 3 mm diameter, by the Korean vessel *Sunstar* in item 48, Appendix I.

248. In its response to the draft compliance report for the *Sunstar*, Korea had provided the following:

'All vessels under the operation of TNS industries, including the *Sunstar*, use bright green plastic tube of 4mm diameter as branch streamers in accordance with paragraph 4 of Annex A of CM25-02. The vessels use (PP) 9mm(3S/T) ropes as streamer lines and 4mm tubes as branch streamers. The gear diagrams registered to CCAMLR websites

indicate the vessels do not use ropes whose diameters are 3mm or less. Therefore, the 1.5 mm polypropylene tubes indicated in the observer's report have never been used in any of the TNS vessels.

During the steaming into the Convention Area for its operation for the 2023/24, two observers-SISO and Korean national-on board the Sunstar checked the size and specifications of the streamer lines and verified the compliance with Annex A of CM 25-02.

Also, after its trip, the vessel entered the port of Punta Arenas at 19:30 (UTC), February 14, 2024 and was inspected by the Chilean authority at 12:30 (UTC), February 15, 2024 in accordance with paragraph 5 of CM10-03, who confirmed the vessel's compliance with all the relevant CCAMLR CMs.

The operator contacted the Designating Member (South Africa) and received clarifications that the Observer's Cruise Report submitted to the Secretariat on June 1 had been incomplete, and they submitted another report to the Secretariat on August 14 that contained the correct information on the size and specification of the streamer ropes and tubes.

Further Action: No further action required

Preliminary Status: Compliant'

249. SCIC reached a common understanding on a compliance status of compliant proposed by Korea.

#### Conservation Measure 26-01

250. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 26-01, paragraph 8, prohibiting the dumping or discharging of offal or discards south of 60°S by the Chilean vessel *Puerto Ballena* (item 49 of Appendix I), the Namibian vessel *Helena Ndume* (item 50 of Appendix I), the United Kingdom vessel *Argos Georgia* (item 52 of Appendix I), the Uruguayan vessels *Ocean Azul* (item 53, Appendix I) and *Proa Pioneer* (item 54, Appendix I) and the Russian vessel *Alpha Crux* (item 51, Appendix I).

251. In its response to the compliance report for the *Puerto Ballena* identified as item 49 in Appendix I, Chile provided the following:

'In relation to this case, we can point out that, although the Catch by set ("Haul Catch") form of the C2 forms associated with the vessel *PUERTO BALLENA* indicates the discard of species south of 60° S (Columns G and H), in the "Comments" field (Column N) of the mentioned form it is specified that each of the discards were processed in a crusher to later be stored in a retention pond. The retention ponds were emptied during the navigation of the vessel north of 60°, on its return transit to a Chilean port.

This is corroborated by the statement included in the Campaign Report sent to CCAMLR and prepared by the scientific observers on board the vessel. In point 6.3 of such report, regarding the treatment of fish waste, it indicates: "the waste of unprocessed

fish and by-catch fauna was crushed and stored in tanks to then be thrown into the sea outside the CCAMLR Area.”

Given the above, this finding would not correspond to a non-compliance, since the discard carried out by the *Puerto Ballena* vessel was outside the CCAMLR Area.

Preliminary Status: Compliant’

252. In its response to the compliance report for the *Helena Ndume* identified as item 50 in Appendix I, Namibia provided the following:

‘Namibia consulted the vessel management and it appears misunderstanding of the word discarding and retention on completing C2 data form. The fish caught was supposed to be recorded as retained. The fish was grounded to offal and only released north of 60S as per CM 26-1, paragraph 8. The Ukrainian International Scientific Observer reported this in his report that was submitted to CCAMLR Secretariat.

Further Action: The Right Holder investigation report into the matter attached.

Namibia will conduct pre-season training session for the next fishing season on all CM to be complied with at all times.

Preliminary Status: Compliant’

253. In its response to the compliance report for the *Argos Georgia* identified as item 52 in Appendix I, the United Kingdom provided the following:

‘The UK investigated this potential infringement.

For the period in question the UK reviewed the SISO observer report, which indicated there were no discards within the Convention Area.

The vessel’s internal system for reporting to its shore-based operators confirmed that the discards were retained for later release outside of the Convention Area, as per the usual practice. However, this data was incorrectly entered as discarded in the relevant C2 report. As soon as the operators became aware of the issue, the C2 data was amended to correctly reflect the retention of all discards. The operator has been reminded to be vigilant when entering data into the C2 report.

Further Action: None

Preliminary Status: Compliant’

254. In its response to the compliance report for the *Ocean Azul* identified as item 53 in Appendix I, Uruguay provided the following:

‘Descarte de productos orgánicos al sur Lat 60S, 11 dic 2023-28 ene 2024. Descarta 39220 ind, 33 ton aprox. 11 especies. Error en las anotaciones en el formulario C2 al no incluir como retenidas las especies a macerar y descartar posteriormente. Según el informe del observador: El vertido de desechos fue el día 08/02/2024, comenzó a las

15:15 hora UTC, latitud 60°00S-longitud 090° 06,4W y finalizó el mismo día a las 18:30 hora UTC, latitud 59°45,7S-longitud 089°24,2W, el vertido total fue de 64 m3.

Discarding of organic matter south of Lat 60S, 11 Dec 2023–28 Jan 2024. Discard of 39 220 ind[ividuals], 33 tonnes approx. 11 species. Error when completing the C2 Form: species to be macerated and subsequently discarded were not recorded as retained. According to the observer's report, the discharge of discards took place on 08/02/2024, starting at 15:15 UTC, at 60°00S-090° 06.4W, ending the same day at 18:30 UTC, at 59°45.7S-089°24.2W. The discharge totalled 64 m3.

Further Action: Se advierte a la empresa sobre el incumplimiento y se condiciona la renovación de la licencia de pesca.

The company was issued a warning of non-compliance and conditions were imposed for the renewal of the fishing licence.

Preliminary Status: Non-compliant (Level 2)'

255. In its response to the compliance report for the *Proa Pioneer* identified as item 54 in Appendix I, Uruguay provided the following:

‘Descarte de productos orgánicos al sur Lat 60S. 19 dic 2023-25 ene 2024. Descarta 481 ind, 1763kg de *Dissostichus mawsoni*. Posible error en la anotación del formulario C2 al no incluir los individuos que fueron almacenados para descarte posterior como “retenidos”. El capitán declara que no hubo descarte fuera de la zona habilitada.

Discarding of organic matter south of Lat 60S. 19 Dec 2023–25 Jan 2024. Discard of 481 ind[ividuals], 1763 kg of *Dissostichus mawsoni*. Possible error when completing the C2 Form: fish that may have been stored for later discard would not be recorded as “retained”. The captain declared that there was no discarding outside authorised areas.

Further Action: La empresa fue advertida y se condiciona renovación de la licencia de pesca.

The company was issued a warning and conditions were imposed for the renewal of the fishing licence.

Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)'

256. SCIC requested the Scientific Committee Chair to advise on the completion of the fine-scale catch and effort reports and the declaration of discards north or south of 60° South. SCIC noted the advice to consider modifying the fine-scale catch and effort report forms. COLTO suggested that modification of the instructions be considered as an alternative.

257. SCIC reached a common understanding on a compliance status of Compliant to items 49, 50, and 52 as proposed by the respective Members and agreed to a revision of the compliance status of item 54 of Appendix I to Compliant. SCIC reached a common understanding on a compliance status of Non-compliant (Level 2) for item 53 of Appendix I as proposed by Uruguay.

258. In its response to the compliance report for the *Alpha Crux* identified as item 51 in Appendix I, Russia provided the following:

‘Несмотря на наличие расхождений по ряду позиций в отчете наблюдателя по итогу рейса к судовладельцу применен ряд санкций:

Отстранен капитан судна от возможности участия в рейсах в АНТКОМ;

Часть команды судна отправлена на проверку квалификационным требованиям;

Компания прекратила трудовые отношения с директором, отвечавшим за данный рейс.

A thorough investigation was conducted into this matter.

In general offal discarding was not take place during setting or during hauling.

70% offal and discards was crash to disposal for port side setting and hauling. And 30% offal and discards was packed in bags and stored in the freezer or fish hold for disposal on shore. For each identified fact, sanctions are applied to the ship owner.

Further Action: Не требуются

Not required

Preliminary Status: Non-compliant (Level 2)’

259. SCIC noted the further explanation from Russia that sanctions applied to the vessel resulted in all crew removed from the *Alpha Crux* except the mechanics, with the vessel Master as the individual with ultimate responsibility of the vessel receiving a ban from participating in future CCAMLR fishing activities.

260. SCIC reached a common understanding on a compliance status of Non-compliant (Level 2) proposed by Russia.

#### Conservation Measure 31-01

261. 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 United Kingdom vessels *Argos Georgia* (item 55 of Appendix I), *Argos Helena* (item 56 of Appendix I) and *Nordic Prince* (item 57 of Appendix I).

262. In its response to the draft compliance report for the *Argos Georgia* (item 55 of Appendix I), *Argos Helena* (item 56 of Appendix I) and *Nordic Prince* (item 57 of Appendix I) the United Kingdom had provided the following:

‘The UK rejects the assertions contained in COMM CIRCs 24/61 and 24/70, concerning the compliance of the named vessels with CM 31-01.

COMM CIRCs 22/39, 22/51, 22/69, 23/39 and 24/69 set out the UK's consistent position in regards 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.

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 terms on which CM 41-02 was to be re-adopted at CCAMLR42 were consistent with the best available science and in accordance with the CCAMLR decision rules.

In relation to CM 31-01, this CM 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 Convention or any Conservation Measure, including Conservation Measure 31-01.

For the information of Members, the UK has operated the South Georgia toothfish fishery consistently with all relevant CCAMLR CMs including, but not limited to, CM 10-02, CM 10-04, CM 10-05 and CM 23-01.

Further Action: None

Preliminary Status: Compliant'

263. Argentina made the following statement:

‘Argentina considers that there is a serious breach of Conservation Measure 31-01 by the vessels *Argos Georgia*, *Argos Helena* and *Nordic Prince*, which is why the vessels should be listed as Non-compliant at level 3.’

264. The United Kingdom reiterated that they have already set out their position on CM 31-01 and consider the three vessels compliant with CM 31-01.

265. Russia expressed its support for the position stated by Argentina, noting that the regulation of toothfish fished in Subarea 48.3 is exercised by the Commission. Russia noted that the Commission did not reach consensus on the catch limit for Subarea 48.3 in 2023 and due to this CM 41-02 was not extended. Russia expressed regret that consensus to assign a status of non-compliance (Level 3) for these cases was blocked.

266. Some Members expressed the opinion that differences in interpretation of CM 31-01 should not stop CCAMLR from adopting a conservation measure setting a catch limit in Subarea 48.3 based upon best available science. These Members expressed their frustration on the repeated refusal of adopting such a conservation measure.

267. China expressed concerns that the issues have repeated over years. China indicated that all concerned fishing activities should be assessed against CM 31-01, and failure to reach

consensus on conservation measures setting a catch limit by the Commission should not be used as an excuse for conducting illegal fishing. China urged SCIC to take effective and efficient actions to end these persistent, serious violations, which have undermined the objective of the Convention.

268. Argentina made the following statement:

‘Argentina wishes to reiterate, as it has been saying for a long time, that it agrees with the comments made regarding the importance of working towards the approval of a conservation measure on this issue. In this regard, it considers that work must continue to achieve consensus to approve a conservation measure that enables the fishing of Patagonian toothfish in Subarea 48.3, but until the measure is approved, it is appropriate that no fishing activity be carried out without a conservation measure that enables it.’

269. The United States made the following statement:

‘Members’ differences should not prevent us from working together toward our common goal of setting a toothfish catch limit in Subarea 48.3, based on the recommendations of the Scientific Committee and relying upon the best available science. 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 reluctance this year.

Like other Members, we believe that CCAMLR should adopt a Conservation Measure establishing catch limits, by-catch limits, mitigation measures, data collection and reporting, and other requirements for toothfish fishing in 48.3. We know that different Members have different reasons for wanting a Conservation Measure. The United States has the same position regarding this matter for the past season that we have had in previous years.’

270. SCIC did not reach consensus on the compliance status on items 55, 56 and 57 of Appendix I noting the strong divergent views by Members.

#### Conservation Measure 31-02

271. SCIC considered the implementation by the Norwegian vessels *Antarctic Endurance* (item 58 of Appendix I), *Antarctic Sea* (item 59 of Appendix I), and *Saga Sea* (item 60 of Appendix I) of CM 31-02, paragraph 1, stating that vessels shall remove their fishing gear from the water by the notified closure date and time, and the implementation of CM 31-02, paragraph 4 that states a vessel shall notify the Secretariat should the vessel appear likely to be unable remove all its fishing gear from the water by the notified closure date and time.

272. In its response to the draft compliance report for the *Antarctic Endurance* (item 58 of Appendix I), *Antarctic Sea* (item 59 of Appendix I), and *Saga Sea* (item 60 of Appendix I), Norway had provided the following:

‘Prior to the 2023/24 fishing season the CCAMLR Secretariat issued COMM CIRC 23/123 CCAMLR operational fishery management for krill fisheries in the 2023/24 season (all areas). Paragraph 5.3 of this COMM CIRC states that “the Secretariat will notify the closure of a fishery by COMM CIRC, which will also be sent by email to

Fishery Update Contacts and vessels notified and licensed to participate in the applicable fishery.” The procedure described in COMM CIRC 23/123 is consistent with the practice that has been followed for many years.

The closure was notified via COMM CIRC 24/53 of 16 May where the last paragraph states that “This closure notice has been issued as outlined in COMM CIRC 23/123 and in accordance with CM 23-01, paragraph 7, and CM 31-02.” The Secretariat has confirmed that COMM CIRC 24/53 was issued to Contracting Parties, but it was not sent separately to the individual vessels. Hence, the closure notification process was not in accordance with the procedure outlined in COMM CIRC 23/123 and not consistent with previous years’ practice.

Unfortunately, due to a public holiday in Norway, followed by a weekend, COMM CIRC 24/53 did not come to the attention of Norwegian authorities until early morning (UTC) of 20 May. Thus, the *Antarctic Endurance* was unaware of the closure notice at the time of closure and was not able to follow up accordingly. As soon as Norwegian authorities became aware of the closure notice, the vessel was instructed to stop fishing immediately. It was confirmed that the vessel stopped fishing and retrieved the nets once the information was received.

Norway has reviewed and improved its internal procedures to ensure that this does not reoccur.

Further Action: No further action required.

Preliminary Status: Compliant’

273. The Norway noted that the continued fishing was because the Secretariat did not email COMM CIRC 24/53 - SC CIRC 24/41 regarding the closure of the krill fishery in Subarea 48.1 to the vessels in the fishery which was noted in COMM CIRC 23/123 - SC CIRC 23/107 regarding the CCAMLR operational fishery management for krill fisheries in the 2023/24 season.

274. Russia noted that the fishing activities of the *Antarctic Endurance*, *Antarctic Sea*, and *Saga Sea* continued after the Flag State was notified of the fishery closure and this would be a basis to consider the vessels for inclusion on the CP-IUU Vessel List as per CM 10-06, and is a serious violation of CM 31-02 and should be assigned a status of seriously, frequently or persistently Non-compliant (Level 3). As such, Russia asked the Secretariat why the vessels were not included in the Draft CP-IUU Vessel List. The Secretariat clarified that they did not include the vessel on the Draft CP-IUU Vessel List due to the submission of the report on delayed fishing gear retrieval from Subarea 48.1 (COMM CIRC 24/58) and other mitigating factors which prevented a clear assessment that these vessels would meet the test for inclusion.

275. China and Russia recalled that the Secretariat fulfilled its obligations and issued a closure notice to all Contracting Parties in accordance with the requirements of CM 23-01, paragraph 7, and noted that vessels of other Members participating in this fishery did not receive an email from the Secretariat either, but ceased fishing as the fishery closed. Given the significant amount of krill, 4327 tonnes, harvested from the 3 Norwegian vessels after the fishery closure, China and Russia recommended that the proceeds associated to the catches after the closure should be seized and contributed to establish a special fund in CCAMLR.



276. Norway stated that it would take its responsibility as a Flag State and would agree to change the status from Compliant to Minor non-compliant (Level 1).

277. New Zealand noted that CM 31-02, paragraph 6, requires the investigation into the late gear retrieval to assess whether all reasonable efforts were made to remove the fishing gear from the water by the notified closure date and time or as soon as possible after the notification that it would appear the vessels will be unable to remove the fishing gear from the water by the closure. Additionally, New Zealand noted the vessel did not take all reasonable efforts to remove the gear by the notified closure date and time, but once made aware of the fishery closure the gear was removed. Acknowledging Norway's recognition of Flag State responsibility in relation to this CM, New Zealand and the United Kingdom suggested a compliance status of Minor non-compliant (Level 1) as suggested by Norway was appropriate given the mitigating circumstances described.

278. Ukraine noted in cases of possible non-compliance with Conservation Measure 31-02 by Norwegian vessels *Antarctic Endurance*, *Antarctic Sea* and *Saga Sea*, that Norway provided comprehensive explanations of the circumstances that led to exceeding the authorised fishing period by these vessels. These circumstances have been confirmed and should be taken into account, and we therefore consider that non-compliance (Level 1) is appropriate in assessing this case. Ukraine noted the transparency and flexibility shown by Norway in considering this precedent.

279. Some Members noted the proposal by the Secretariat in CCAMLR-43/19 to amend CM 23-01 to prevent this from happening in the future (paragraphs 110-111).

280. SCIC did not reach consensus on the compliance status on items 58, 59 and 60 of Appendix I noting the strong divergent views of Members.

#### Conservation Measure 41-09

281. SCIC considered the implementation of CM 41-09, paragraph 6, by the Uruguayan vessel *Ocean Azul* (item 61 of Appendix I) which requires the vessel to cease fishing in an SSRU for the remainder of the season when the catch of *Macrourus* spp. taken by a single vessel in any two 10-day periods in any SSRU exceeds 1 500 kg in each 10-day period and exceeds 16% of the catch of *Dissostichus* spp. by that vessel in that SSRU.

282. In its response to the draft compliance report for the *Ocean Azul* Uruguay had provided the following:

‘Se excede la pesca de 1500kg de *Macrourus* spp. en periodo de 10 días por SSRU. Total de 4 oportunidades de incumplimiento, donde el *Ocean Azul* debió abandonar la pesca en área 88.1-I. Se reconoce incumplimiento.

The catch of 1500 kg of *Macrourus* spp. in a 10-day period per SSRU was exceeded. 4 compliance issues caused the *Ocean Azul* to stop fishing in Subarea 881 I. Non-compliance was acknowledged.

Further Action: La empresa fue advertida y se condiciona renovación de la licencia de pesca.

The company was issued a warning and conditions were imposed for the renewal of the fishing licence.

Preliminary Status: Non-compliant (Level 2)’

283. SCIC reached a common understanding on a compliance status of Non-compliant (Level 2) proposed by Uruguay.

Conservation Measure 91-05

284. SCIC considered the implementation by the Namibian vessel *Helena Ndume* (items 62 and 63 of Appendix I), the Russian vessel *Alpha Crux* (item 64 of Appendix I) and the Spanish vessel *Tronio* (item 65 of Appendix I) of CM 91-05, paragraph 24, which requires Flag States to notify the Secretariat prior to entry of their fishing vessels into the RSRMPA.

285. In its response to the draft compliance report for the *Helena Ndume* (items 62 and 63 of Appendix I) Namibia had provided the following:

‘Namibia can report that the vessel experienced communication blackout during these periods that affected the emails as well. This was beyond the control of the captain and the reports was submitted as soon as communication was re-established.

Further Action: Pre-season training on all CM for all vessel management and crew for total compliance for upcoming fishing season.

Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)’

286. SCIC reached a common understanding on a compliance status of Minor non-compliant (Level 1) proposed by Namibia.

287. In its response to the draft compliance report for the *Alpha Crux* (item 64 of Appendix I) Russia had provided the following:

‘Российская сторона рассмотрела данный случай и установила, что ввиду технической ошибки с судна уведомление направлено с задержкой. В этой связи проведен инструктаж по вопросам системы мониторинга.

The Russian Federation examined the case and found that the notification was sent with a delay due to a technical error on the part of the ship. In this regard, a briefing on the monitoring system has been conducted.

Further Action: Не требуется.

Not required

Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)’

288. SCIC Reached a common understanding on a compliance status of Minor non-compliant (Level 1) proposed by Russia.

289. In its response to the draft compliance report for the *Tronio* (item 65 of Appendix I) for Spain, the EU had provided the following:

‘According to preliminary enquiries, the prior entry notification was not sent in a timely manner due to human error. The competent authorities have engaged with the Master and vessel owner regarding the importance of compliance with the prior entry notification requirement and have instructed them to take extra care when sending through entry and exit notifications for the RSR MPA SRZ.

Further Action: no further action required

Preliminary Status: Minor non-compliant (Level 1)’

290. SCIC noted that the EU had provided a revised response to the draft compliance report on this matter in COMM CIRC 24/104, further noting that the vessel sent its movement notification prior to entry into the MPA, and that a revised preliminary compliance status of Compliant had been proposed.

291. SCIC reached a common understanding on a compliance status of Compliant.

#### CCAMLR Scheme of International Scientific Observation

292. SCIC considered the implementation by the Russian vessel *Alpha Crux* (item 66 of Appendix I) of the Text of the CCAMLR Scheme of Scientific Observation, Part D, paragraph (b) (i), which states that the owner, Master, agent, and crew of a vessel on which a scientific observer is deployed shall not offer a scientific observer, either directly or indirectly, any gratuity, gift, favour, loan, or anything of monetary value, except for meals, accommodations or salary when provided by the vessel.

293. In its response to the draft compliance report for the *Alpha Crux* (item 66 of Appendix I) Russia had provided the following:

‘Российская сторона изучила информацию в отношении наличия на борту судна текста Меры по сохранению 26-01. Текст Мер по сохранению АНТКОМ на русском языке имелся на борту судна.

Российская сторона детально рассмотрела вопросы, обозначенные в отчете международного научного наблюдателя в отношении возможных неправомερных действий необозначенного представителя команды судна в должности навигатора (navigator). Исходя из представленных данных предположительно идентифицировано единственное лицо в данной должности, которое является гражданином Республики Корея, который был трудоустроен в период рейса и по его завершению убыл с судна. В ходе рейса международный наблюдатель не обращался к капитану судна и не информировал о таких действиях со стороны члена команды судна. Тем не менее, в виду необходимости установления всех обстоятельств дела предполагается продолжить взаимодействие с корейской стороной.

Russian Federation examined the information regarding the availability of the text of Conservation Measure 26-01 on board the vessel. The text of the CCAMLR conservation measures in Russian was available on the ship. The Russian Federation has considered in detail the issues identified in the International Scientific Observer's report regarding possible misconduct by an undisclosed ship crew member in the Navigator role. Based on the reported data, the only person in that position was presumably a citizen of the Republic of Korea, employed for the cruise period and left the vessel at the end of it. During the cruise, the International Observer did not contact the ship's captain or report such actions by a vessel crew member. Nonetheless, further cooperation with Korea is planned, given the need to establish all the circumstances of the case.

Further Action: Дальнейшая коммуникация между страной, назначавшей наблюдателя и принимающей стороной для установления всех обстоятельств.

Further communication between the country that designated the observer and the host country to establish all the circumstances.

Preliminary Status: Additional information required'

294. SCIC noted the explanation that Russia was investigating the matter but as the individual in question who allegedly offered the bribe to the observer may be a Korean national, Russia is having difficulty identifying them. Russia reiterated individuals in Russia would be prosecuted for bribery or attempted bribery of an observer.

295. Korea made the following statement:

'As the Designating Member, Korea has engaged in several consultations with Russia to assist the Flag State in investigating the matter, and we acknowledge that the Flag State has diligently carried out its investigation. As a result of our own inquiry, we found that no Korean nationals were involved in the issue but we could not specify the "navigator" indicated in his report. As a SISO designating member, Korea is actively working to strengthen protocols to address similar situations, including incidents of attempted bribery. Korea would also like to emphasise the importance of fostering an onboard environment where observers can perform their duties safely and without interference.'

296. Some Members expressed their concerns of this report of an alleged bribe, underscoring the seriousness of such a situation, and highlighted the need to ensure the integrity of the SISO and to safeguard observers, and requested Russia to continue its investigations to identify the individual or circumstances associated with the allegation and request that SCIC receive an update. These Members further urged Russia to make all possible efforts to provide additional information to the meeting of CCAMLR-43, and no later than 1 February 2025.

297. SCIC did not reach consensus on the compliance status for the Russian vessel *Alpha Crux* in item 66 of Appendix I.

298. SCIC considered the implementation by the Russian vessel *Alpha Crux* (item 67 of Appendix I) of the Text of the CCAMLR Scheme of Scientific Observation, Part D, paragraph

(b) (ii), which states that the owner, Master, agent, and crew of a vessel on which a scientific observer is deployed shall not intimidate, or interfere with the duties of a scientific observer.

299. In its response to the draft compliance report for the *Alpha Crux* (item 67 of Appendix I) Russia had provided the following:

‘A thorough investigation was conducted into this matter.

It is unclear from the observer's report how International Observer was able to identify a threat against him in a conversation between Members of the vessel's crew in a foreign language in his absence.

The International Observer was located in the first mate's quarter, which indicates respect for his status. This observer's quarter door had a lock and a matching key.

No unauthorised persons were allowed access to this cabin.

During the vessel cruise, not a single case of crew members refusing to assist the International Observer was recorded. The National observer was also not informed about the Korean observer's problems with TOA processing and biological sampling.

Any requests (verbal or written) from the International Observer to the Russian captain for additional personnel and his refusal were not recorded. In view of the differences in approaches regarding the discrepancies in the content of the observer's report, it is proposed to continue the discussion with representatives of the Republic of Korea.  
Status Compliant

Further Action: Не требуется

Not required

Preliminary Status: Compliant’

300. Korea and Russia noted that the observer did not directly see the fight, and Russia noted that there could have been a misunderstanding in hearing the word ‘observer’ as it sounds similar to another word when spoken in the Russian language. Russia noted that the observer was provided the appropriate conditions to secure themselves in their personal room and they could have been removed from the vessel if requested.

301. Korea made the following statement:

‘In this incident, Korea engaged in multiple discussions with Russia, during which the observer clarified that there was no direct intimidation towards him, but he felt unsafe due to a loud altercation between crew members outside his room. As noted in Russia's responses, the observer confirmed that he did not actually witness the fight. The designating authority provided the observer clear instructions to report any safety-related emergencies right away. However, the designating authority only became aware of the incident after the observer submitted his trip report.

Unfortunately, the consultations between Korea and Russia did not lead to a clear resolution, and our own investigation did not uncover further evidence to support the

allegation despite our significant concerns. Nonetheless, Korea would like to stress the importance of ensuring safe conduct on board, given the unique challenges of the operating environment on board. We also emphasise the need to create an onboard atmosphere where observers can remain and carry out their duties without any form of intimidation and the importance of ensuring observers are absolutely safe under any circumstances. As a Designating Member, Korea will work closely with all Flag State Members to ensure the safety of observers.'

302. The UK recalled the obligation not to intimidate or interfere with the duties of an observer and reiterated its view that these obligations had not been met, given the observer had reported that he felt threatened and unsafe. The UK noted that whilst the exact details of what happened may not be entirely clear, on no account could the evidence support a status of 'Compliant' and that observers have a right to expect CCAMLR to take reported concerns and issues seriously. In such circumstances the UK considered these issues to amount to serious non-compliance (Level 3).

303. Many Members noted that regardless of whether the observer saw the fight, or misheard the word observer it noted that a serious fight occurred on the vessel which resulted in a crew member being stabbed in the abdomen. The Members noted that there is also a safety of life at sea concern for the crew member, and a report under CM 10-02, paragraph 9, should have been submitted.

304. Some Members expressed that regardless of what occurred on the vessel, the observer reported that he felt unsafe.

305. Some Members queried the previous practice of SCIC in assigning the status 'Additional information required' to compliance issues. The Chair expressed her view that this status had, in general, previously been used where SCIC required further information to assign a status, rather than in instances where the relevant Member did not have the information to provide to SCIC for consideration.

306. Many Members reiterated the evidentiary value of observer reports which are made following deployment and expressed their concerns with questions on the veracity of the report to undermine the facts reported. These Members also noted that where observer safety was concerned, such questions could further risk the safety of observers.

307. Many Members noted that the role of an observer is to observe and record what is occurring on a vessel and for the SISO to work that we rely on our trained observers to make observations, most of which occur in real time.

308. Some Members noted that the WCPFC has adopted minimum standards and guidelines under their regional observer program that include a requirement for the observer provider to formally debrief observers shortly after disembarking a vessel, maintaining the integrity of the observer statement and ensuring the safety of the observer after the completion of their post. These Members suggested CCAMLR consider development of such a procedure.

309. SCIC did not reach consensus on the compliance status for the Russian vessel Alpha Crux in item 67 of Appendix I.

310. SCIC considered the implementation by the Russian vessel *Alpha Crux* (item 68 of Appendix I) of the Text of the CCMALR Scheme of Scientific Observation, Part D, paragraph (b) (iv), which states that the owner, Master, agent, and crew of a vessel on which a scientific observer is deployed shall not interfere with or prevent the observer from communicating with the Designating Member, including by preventing the scientific observer from having access to the vessel's communication equipment.

311. In its response to the draft compliance report for the *Alpha Crux* (item 68 of Appendix I) Russia had provided the following:

‘Российская сторона детально рассмотрела вопросы, обозначенные в отчете международного научного наблюдателя, в том числе и затрагивающие проблемы коммуникации. По итогам рассмотрения установлено следующее. Предоставление услуг связи, несмотря на наличие договоров между судовладельцем и компанией-оператором связи имело определенные сбои, что могло влиять на качество связи. Однако наблюдатель имел свободный доступ к судовому компьютеру для коммуникации в служебных целях. Функция электронной почты на борту судна *ALPHA-CRUX* работала исправно. Все электронные письма на борту судна были отправлены лично их авторами. Отправка электронных писем в Национальный научно-исследовательский институт рыболовства осуществлялась корейским наблюдателем самостоятельно и установить причины сбоев в переписке с этим институтом не представляется возможным. Статус выполнение.

The Russian Federation has considered the issues identified in the International Scientific Observer's report, including communication problems. As a result of the review, it was determined as follows. Despite agreements between the shipowner and the communication operator company, communication services suffered from certain failures, which could affect the quality of communication. However, the observer had full access to the ship's computer to facilitate official communications. Electronic mail on board the *ALPHA-CRUX* was functioning as intended. All emails on board the ship were personally sent by their authors. The Korean observer sent emails to the National Fisheries Research Institute independently, and it is not possible to determine the reasons for the breakdown in correspondence with that institute.

Status: Compliant.

Further Action: НЕ требуется

Not required

Preliminary Status: Compliant’

312. SCIC noted the explanation provided by Korea that the issue may have been due to the email domain used by one of the two relevant authorities to whom the observer submitted his weekly reports as emails were still being received by the other authority.

313. SCIC reached a common understanding on a compliance status Compliant proposed by Russia.

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

314. SCIC considered IUU fishing activity and trends in 2023/24 in the Convention Area and IUU Vessel lists as reported in CCAMLR-43/14 Rev.1. 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 2023/24.

315. SCIC considered the information in CCAMLR-43/BG/18 Rev. 1 which provides an overview of potential methods and opportunities to improve awareness of activities occurring within the CAMLR Convention Area.

316. China sought to clarify the meaning of the term Maritime Domain Awareness in the context of this paper. SCIC noted that the term Maritime Domain Awareness in the context of this paper meant awareness of activity related to monitoring fishing to ensure compliance with CCAMLR conservation measures and the detection and deterrence of illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing and fishing related activities in the CAMLR Convention Area and included this information in a footnote in CCAMLR-43/BG/18 Rev. 1.

317. SCIC expressed support for efforts to improve capabilities to better monitor activities occurring within the Convention Area including the resources and information provided in Appendix I of BG/18 to allow Member vessels on various missions to contribute to efforts to detect and deter IUU fishing and monitor compliance of fishing activity.

318. SCIC considered the Concept Note contained in Appendix I of BG/18. The United States announced that it intended to pilot that approach and that the US Coast Guard icebreaker *Polar Star* would be conducting a surveillance patrol and report vessel sighting information during its mission to and from McMurdo Station during the upcoming season.

### Current level of IUU fishing

319. SCIC considered CCAMLR-43/BG/11 Rev. 1 which outlines CCAMLR's collaboration with INTERPOL throughout 2023 and 2024 to identify and deter illegal, unreported, and unregulated (IUU) fishing activities, supported through a grant of €60 000 provided by the EU (EU Project 101092707-CCAMLRsupport2022).

320. SCIC thanked the EU for providing this funding and welcomed this collaboration with INTERPOL, noting the threat posed by transnational organised crime to the objective of CCAMLR.

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

322. Uruguay expressed its willingness to further investigate the listing of a vessel Master of Uruguayan nationality in relation to the South African flagged vessel *El Shaddai*.

323. The European Union provided SCIC with an update on the actions taken against Spanish nationals linked to the IUU-listed vessels *Cobija* and *El Shaddai*. In relation to the *El Shaddai*, the EU noted that several attempts had been made during the intersessional period to obtain



information from the Flag State about the identity of the fishing Master, and that some information had been received on the first day of CCAMLR-43, which would be followed up on. As regards the vessel *Cobija*, the EU noted that one of the nationals involved with the vessel not included on the list in Table 1 (CCAMLR-43/BG/19) and provided SCIC with an update on the actions taken against the Master and owner of the vessel, and against its legal representative. Fines were imposed on both individuals, as well as the impossibility of obtaining loans, subsidies, or public aid for a period of five years, and disqualification from exercising or carrying out fishing activities for a period of three years.

324. SCIC noted that the Secretariat had experienced significant difficulty compiling Table 1 due to often encountering inconclusive information and that information gaps could be greatly reduced through further engagement between Contracting Parties on relevant investigations and circulation of the results, as required by CM 10-08 and where relevant.

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

326. SCIC welcomed additional input from Contracting Parties on ways to improve information, resources, and mechanisms available to improve information sharing and enhance analysis/investigation to fully implement CM 10-08.

## IUU Vessel Lists

### NCP-IUU Vessel List

327. SCIC considered the Provisional NCP-IUU Vessel List for 2024/25.

328. SCIC considered a statement from the Islamic Republic of Iran requesting the removal of the vessel *Koosha 4* from the NCP-IUU Vessel List. SCIC also noted that the Islamic Republic of Iran had provided the Secretariat information containing images and a video of a vessel purported to be the *Koosha 4* in the process of being scrapped, which was provided to SCIC for their awareness.

329. SCIC noted the efforts that the Islamic Republic of Iran had taken in attempt to satisfy the requirements of paragraph 18 of CM 10-07.

330. Some Members expressed the view that SCIC should delay the removal of the *Koosha 4* from the NCP-IUU Vessel List for 2024/25 until a definitive confirmation of the scrapping of the *Koosha 4* is received.

331. SCIC noted that no consensus was achieved for the removal of the *Koosha 4* from the NCP-IUU Vessel List for 2024/25.

332. SCIC requested that the Secretariat continue to reach out to the Islamic Republic of Iran for further information on the purported decommission of the *Koosha 4* or information that could otherwise satisfy the requirements set out in Conservation Measure 10-07.

333. The EU recalled that previously the Islamic Republic of Iran had sought to have the *Koosha 4* delisted under CM 10-07, paragraph 18(iii) on the basis that its ownership had changed. The EU noted that in order for SCIC to remove the *Koosha 4* from the NCP-IUU Vessel List on that basis, the Islamic Republic of Iran need to provide proof that the vessel has changed ownership, including beneficial ownership if known to be distinct from the registered ownership, and to establish the previous owner no longer has any legal, financial, or real interests in the vessel, or exercises control over it and that the new owner has not participated in IUU fishing.

#### CP-IUU Vessel List

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

335. SCIC expressed its condolences for the victims of the sinking of the *Argos Georgia*.

336. Argentina made the following statement:

‘Argentina would like to clarify the reason for including the vessels *Argos Georgia*, *Argos Helena* and *Nordic Prince* in the list of vessels fishing illegally. It is very clear that this is illegal fishing because there is no conservation measure that allows such fishing, as required by Conservation Measure 31-01. On the other hand, Argentina would like to express its concern about the future consequences of this non-compliance. Conservation measure 31-01 was adopted in 1986, with the aim of preventing Subarea 48.3 from being excluded from the Convention and its multilateral order. This Conservation Measure, which the United Kingdom and another country now want to relativize in terms of its application, establishes, both in its letter and its spirit, all the conditions for fishing for Patagonian toothfish in Subarea 48.3, including a catch limit, based on the best scientific data available, approved by consensus and not unilaterally. Also in that same year, paragraph 53 of the Commission's report states that Conservation Measure 7/V, which is now 31-01, would allow the Commission at its 1987 meeting to set catch limits for the 1987/88 season as an obligatory measure, and that such a recommendation would make it possible to proceed in a similar manner for subsequent seasons. This measure was respected by all parties since 31-01 came into force, since there was always a Conservation Measure, 41-02, which established catch limits and other conditions for fishing for Patagonian toothfish in Subarea 48.3. That was the case until a few years ago, when one party did not give consensus so that this Conservation Measure could be re-adopted. Now, since there is no conservation measure that enables fishing, fishing should not take place. And this was understood by almost all countries, since several countries that fished there stopped doing so because they understand that it is not appropriate to fish, and those who imported that fish stopped importing it, also because there is a failure to comply with Conservation Measure 31-01.

The relativization of the obligation of a conservation measure worries us because of the fact that illegal fishing is taking place at this moment, but also as a precedent for the future. We wish to highlight that, in the same way that 31-01 determines guidelines for

fishing and then requires other conservation measures, so does, for example, Conservation Measure 21-02, which regulates exploratory fisheries, and on the basis of which the Commission adopts specific conservation measures in different subareas every year. If the Commission were to accept the UK's argument on the relativization of 31-01 as valid, then by analogy the adoption of a conservation measure for exploratory fisheries would not matter either, since countries would be free to take unilateral measures, which would result in a serious erosion of the Convention.'

337. The United Kingdom made the following statement:

'The UK has previously set out its position on this issue, most recently in Comm Circ 24/69. It has also been extensively discussed in previous meetings of both SCIC and the Commission.

The UK entirely refutes any assertion that the UK vessels operating within Subarea 48.3 can be characterised as illegal, unreported or unregulated, including under 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 referred to in paragraph 5 of CM10-06 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, consistent with the Convention.'

338. The Russian Federation made the following statement:

'The UK's flagged vessels *Argos Georgia*, *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 (COMM CIRC 24/47, COMM CIRC 24/61) and current status for the *Argos Georgia*.'

339. Norway expressed the view that this situation represented a failure of CCAMLR, not one particular Member and that the absence of an agreed upon Conservation Measure for a particular Subarea did not imply a prohibition of fishing in that Subarea. Norway further expressed the view that the purpose of a Conservation Measure is to add an additional regulatory layer, not to permit an action.

340. Ukraine noted that they did not support the inclusion of the *Argos Georgia*, *Argos Helena* and *Nordic Prince* in the Contracting Party IUU Vessel List.

341. Argentina made the following statement:

'Argentina's concern is related to the fact that there are interpretations of conservation measures that seek to relativize their obligatory nature, which would allow those parties that want to fish in a certain subarea to simply block the consensus to do so, and take unilateral measures claiming that they are broadly complying with some stipulations of the Convention.

Regarding the United Kingdom's claim to apply unilateral measures in Subarea 48.3, Argentina reiterates that the Chairman's statement of 1980 does not authorise the United Kingdom to take this type of measure. This is because the statement, in its point 5, authorises some countries to take measures on their islands within the Convention Area in cases where State sovereignty is recognised by all Contracting Parties. The only islands in which their State sovereignty is not recognised by all the Contracting Parties are the South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, because there is a sovereignty dispute between the United Kingdom and Argentina, which means that at least Argentina does not recognise the sovereignty of the United Kingdom and the United Kingdom does not recognise the sovereignty of Argentina. The unilateral measures of the United Kingdom cannot be justified on the basis of International Law, either, since when there is a sovereignty dispute the parties to that dispute are obliged not to take unilateral measures that may affect the issue. In this regard, Argentina recalls and reaffirms that in Subarea 48.3 only the multilateral regime of the Convention is applicable.'

342. The UK rejected the statement by Argentina and recalled its previous statements in regard to the Chairman's Statement of 1980.

343. China expressed concern with regard to the implications of continued fishing in Subarea 48.3 under this circumstance, noting that if the interpretation by Norway that fishing is allowed without catch limits set by the Commission were acceptable for SCIC, that interpretation should be applicable to all Members.

344. SCIC noted that no consensus was achieved for the inclusion of the UK-flagged vessels *Argos Georgia*, *Argos Helena*, and *Nordic Prince* on the Proposed CP-IUU Vessel List.

345. South Africa provided a statement (Appendix IV) expressing the view that the shortcomings identified by the DPP as set out in COMM CIRC 24/96 have been addressed as have the concerns previously raised by Members. South Africa expressed the view that the conditions as they stand are sufficient to demonstrate compliance with paragraph 14(iv) of CM 10-06 and that the permit and license conditions have been revised to now clearly define where on the High seas fishing is permitted to enable a successful prosecution by the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP). South Africa further stated that although Braxton was not criminally prosecuted and its Patagonian toothfish right was not cancelled, its fishing right has effectively been suspended since the IUU listing, rendering Braxton unable to fish for itself or any other Right Holder, resulting in significant financial losses which ought to act as a strong deterrent to any repeated contravention.

346. Many Members thanked South Africa for the information provided, noted the steps that had been taken by the South Africa to address the circumstances that lead to the listing of the vessel *El Shaddai* on the Contracting Party IUU Vessel List, and expressed their support for removing the vessel from the CP-IUU Vessel List pursuant to CM 10-06, paragraph 14 (iv).

347. Some Members expressed concern that the steps taken by South Africa were not sufficient to ensure that the vessel *El Shaddai* would not be involved with IUU fishing activities in the future.

348. South Africa provided a further statement (Appendix V) reiterating the steps that had been taken with regard to *El Shaddai* and containing additional details on this matter. South

Africa again requested that SCIC endorse the delisting of the vessel *El Shaddai* from the Contracting Party IUU Vessel List.

349. The EU thanked South Africa for the information provided but expressed disagreement with the notion that financial losses resulting from the inclusion of *El Shaddai* on the Contracting Party IUU Vessel List could be considered a sanction, noting that the imposition of sanctions is a Flag State responsibility. The EU noted that it would have been preferable if civil or administrative proceedings had been initiated against the vessel operator once the criminal prosecution was unsuccessful. The EU expressed concern that the revised permit conditions still are not sufficiently clear with respect to where and under what circumstances fishing would be permitted within the Convention Area. The EU expressed willingness to continue to engage in dialogue with South Africa concerning the status of the *El Shaddai* but considered that the conditions for the removal of this vessel from the Contracting Party IUU Vessel List were not presently fulfilled.

350. SCIC could not reach consensus on the removal of the *El Shaddai* from the CP-IUU Vessel List and recommended that this matter be considered by CCAMLR-43.

351. South Africa thanked those Members who supported their de-listing request and the EU for its continued willingness to discuss the matter.

352. Russia expressed concern that some of the mandatory conditions for removal of the *El Shaddai* from the CP-IUU Vessel List presented by the EU goes beyond the requirements of the relevant conservation measures.

### **Fishery notifications**

353. SCIC considered the Secretariat's report on fishery notifications for the 2024/25 season ([CCAMLR-43/BG/09 Rev. 1](#)).

354. Some Members requested the exclusion of the three UK-flagged vessels, *Argos Georgia*, *Argos Helena* and *Nordic Prince* from all fishery notifications, noting the vessels' inclusion on the Draft CP-IUU Vessel List for 2024/25. Russia noted that in relation to the *Argos Georgia*, Members shall immediately inform the Secretariat regarding the replacement in case of *force majeure* in accordance with paragraph 11 of CM 21-02, but UK did not fulfill this obligation. Russia further urged Norway to remove a fishery notification for fishing vessels which were involved in fishery in closed area in previous season.

355. Some Members expressed that Norway's non-compliance was minor and that they did not agree that it constituted IUU fishing.

356. The UK noted that it would comply with requirements of paragraph 11 of CM 21-02 in respect of a replacement vessel for the *Argos Georgia* and then made the following statement:

'The UK has several serious concerns over the two Russian vessel notifications for the upcoming Ross Sea toothfish fishery. As we expressed last year, we have seen repeated compliance issues and there remain outstanding a number of investigations in respect of Russian-flagged vessels.

Just this year, we have been considering numerous compliance issues relating to the FV *Alpha Crux* - some of which have been addressed and some of which require further investigation. In respect of the latter, we would hope that the outcome of these further investigations will be considered by SCIC next year.

Russia has also notified for the FV *Yantar 31*. This vessel has previously experienced very high catch rates which have yet to be explained by Russia. The sister vessel *Yantar 35*, owned and operated by the same company, also experienced significantly high catch rates and subsequently had its data quarantined – again Russia has failed to provide any information or analyses to explain these extraordinarily high catch rates. We also note in SC CCAMLR 33 para 5.75 none of the 1 792 tags released by the *Yantar 35* in subareas 48.5, 88.1 and 88.2 have been recaptured. In CCAMLR 35/BG/29 Rev. 1 the Russian delegation stated that a decision to suspend the shipowner from participating in fishing activities in the CCAMLR Convention Area was made – however this operator – Orion Co Ltd – is listed as the current owner/operator of *Yantar 31*.

Given these serious compliance issues we cannot support the inclusion of these vessels in the Ross Sea toothfish fishery in the upcoming season.’

357. The Russian Federation answered that their notifications followed all CM requirements and that during the CCEP evaluation they speak openly about all compliance issues raised and the UK concerns are unjustified.

358. Some Members noted that there was no agreement that the UK vessels fishing in Subarea 48.3 were engaged in IUU fishing. They recalled that the root-cause of this very challenging situation is the undermining of the science basis for CCAMLR decisions for a catch limit for Subarea 48.3, and urged Members to continue to work to build a consensus for a catch limit for that area.

359. Argentina made the following statement:

‘Argentina aligns itself with the previous point regarding the importance and need for a conservation measure in Subarea 48.3 to end the illegal fishing that has been taking place there for three seasons. Illegal fishing occurs due to non-compliance with Conservation Measure 31-01. In this regard, we would like to point out that in the same inspection report carried out by the United Kingdom on UK vessels, this Conservation Measure appears as mandatory. The report erroneously states that vessels comply with this Conservation Measure, when they do not, because 31-01 requires a conservation measure such as 41-02. For this reason, we hope to have a conservation measure for Patagonian toothfish fishing in Subarea 48.3 in order to end the illegal fishing that has been taking place for three seasons in this Subarea.

We also emphasise that, beyond the reason why there is no conservation measure, if there is no conservation measure, we cannot fish.’

360. Some Members noted that Russia has taken responsibility for some issues in the CCEP, but that they remained concerned at the number of serious unresolved compliance issues. They expressed concern over the repeated serious compliance issues and remaining outstanding investigations in respect of Russian-flagged vessels. Those Members urged Russia to undertake to complete the investigations and provide additional information to this meeting as a matter of

urgency, in order to demonstrate that Russia can exercise effective control over its vessels, comply with CCAMLR's rules, and the SISO observers can be deployed safely.

361. The UK recalled its previously stated positions on these issues.

362. Many Members recalled that, under Conservation Measures 21-02 and 21-03, the only grounds for rejecting a vessel notification are its inclusion in the IUU vessel list, non-compliance with the CCAMLR notification fee procedures, the submission of relevant documents such as FOPs and VME Impact Assessments, or a formal withdrawal by the Member. It was also noted that, in accordance with paragraph 11 of CM 21-02, vessel replacements due to legitimate operational reasons or *force majeure* must be immediately reported to the Secretariat.

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

364. The Secretariat presented a report on gear details in fishery notifications ([CCAMLR-43/12](#)), which highlighted the discrepancies between gear descriptions published on the CCAMLR website and those provided in Fisheries Operations Plans (FOPs) and Vulnerable Marine Ecosystem (VME) assessments. Several Members expressed their appreciation for the Secretariat's report and indicated their intention to improve the accuracy of the fishing gear data submitted.

365. SCIC endorsed the Secretariat's recommendations that:

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

366. SCIC requested that the Secretariat further develop the detail in the instructions provided to Members on how and when to submit or update information related to fishing gear details as part of the notification procedures, including worked examples of the required technical information or diagrams.

### **Advice from the Scientific Committee to SCIC**

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

#### **Scientific observers**

368. The Chair of the Scientific Committee highlighted the significant value of data recorded by scientific observers, recalled the ongoing Scientific Committee discussions surrounding the krill fishery management strategy, and noted the need to ensure any additional data collection consider the prioritisation of these requirements. The Chair of the Scientific Committee further

noted the importance of identification and collection accurate data by scientific observers to better understand the fisheries and ongoing issues, such as the by-catch of small fish and larvae and the incidental mortality associated with fishing.

369. SCIC and the Chair of the Scientific Committee discussed comments on the proposals to require 100% SISO observer coverage on all krill vessels and new fisheries. The Chair of the Scientific Committee recalled ongoing discussions to explore and assess the differences between national and SISO observers in terms of data collection. The Chair of the Scientific Committee noted that the guidelines for SISO observers are clear to follow and prioritise the work of the Scientific Committee and its working groups, and recognised the need to ensure consideration is given to the existing workload when responding to requests.

370. China queried the difference between the data collected by national scientific observers and those collected by international scientific observers given both national scientific observers and international scientific observers follow the same scientific requirements and protocols. The Chair of the Scientific Committee replied that international scientific observers carry out more work including marine mammal sightings and monitoring. The Chair of the Scientific Committee noted that in response to future additional requirements, it might be necessary to consider means of deploying a second observer. In addition, the Chair of the Scientific Committee indicated there were concerns over the independence of the national scientific observer.

371. China asked the Chair of the Scientific Committee to provide an update to SCIC as to the status of fishing in Division 58.4.1 and 58.4.2, noting these areas have previously been considered 'data-poor'. The Chair of the Scientific Committee confirmed that there has not been any new information provided regarding the status of research fishing in these areas, further noting that data has not been collected within these areas since 2018, hence the data gap. The Chair of the Scientific Committee highlighted that the Scientific Committee will continue its efforts to collect data in this area to inform future research.

372. In response to the questions from Australia, the Chair of the Scientific Committee in his second visit advised that the Scientific Committee considered in relation to Australia, Korea and Japan's proposal (CCAMLR-43/38) but did not provide particular recommendations to SCIC. The Chair of the Scientific Committee recalled that in 2022 and 2023 the Scientific Committee discussed that there is confusion in the application of 21-02 paragraph 6 (iii) as well as the application of such research plans and referred, inter alia, to recommendations from 2023 that the Commission (i) consider a new Annex to CM 21-02, specifying the requirements for finfish research plans under CM 21-02, paragraph 6(iii) (Attachment A), and (ii) amend the title of CM 24-01, Annex 24-01/A, Format 2 to remove the reference to CM 21-02 (Attachment B), to resolve the confusion (SC-CAMLR-42).

373. The Russian Federation requested a clarification from the Chair of the Scientific Committee on whether the fisheries that have not been carried on for the previous two seasons should be considered as a new fishery in accordance with paragraph 1 (iii) of Conservation Measure 21-01.

374. The Chair of the Scientific Committee stated that there were not any particular recommendations from the Scientific Committee in this regard in 2024, but that these areas do not meet the requirements of a new fishery under Conservation Measure 21-01 as these areas



have had catch and effort data submitted prior to the last two seasons, and a current conservation measure as an exploratory fishery.

#### Discards

375. SCIC and the Chair of the Scientific Committee discussed the reporting of discards south of 60°S in the fine-scale catch and effort (C2 longline fisheries) data form, noting that catch that is discarded at the point of harvest should be reported as 'discarded' and catch that is retained, even if it is retained only for discard north of 60°S should be reported as 'retained'. SCIC considered that while the instructions for completing the C2 data form is relatively clear, the data field descriptions on the forms themselves could be misinterpreted. SCIC recognised the implications that incorrect reporting as a result of misinterpretation of requirements relating to the reporting of discards may have on these data, and subsequent evaluations of compliance. SCIC noted that clarifying the instructions or data field descriptions in the C2 data form to distinguish between catch may help to alleviate these inconsistencies. SCIC recommended the Commission recommend that the Scientific Committee and its relevant working groups consider clarifying the instructions in the commercial data manual concerning the reporting of discarded and retained catches.

#### Late gear removal

376. Russia sought clarification from the Chair of the Scientific Committee as to the impacts incurred as a result of the overrun of catch after the closure of the *Euphausia superba* fishery in Subarea 48.1, and whether additional analyses had been undertaken on the relevant C1 data.

377. The Chair of the Scientific Committee noted that there had not been discussion on this topic during their meeting thus far. The Scientific Committee recognises the importance and complexity of the issue. The Chair of the Scientific Committee further noted that the proposed strategy to progress the KFMA could mitigate such issues in the future.

#### Harmonisation Symposium

378. Korea recalled the report of the Harmonisation Symposium (CCAMLR-43/29) and the recommendations agreed, and requested the Chair of the Scientific Committee confirm whether consideration had been given to these during their meeting. The Chair of the Scientific Committee noted that while some of the recommendations had been discussed in part, further deliberations will occur in detail at the Commission.

#### **Consideration of the Second Performance Review**

379. SCIC considered the final report of the Second Performance Review (PR2) (CCAMLR-43/06) which provided a summary of actions taken since CCAMLR-XXXVII.

SCIC, along with the Commission and Scientific Committee, were encouraged to identify any additional actions not already provided in the summary.

380. SCIC thanked the Secretariat for compiling the report, noted the value of tracking progress on the recommendations listed in PR2 on an annual basis, and recognised those who contributed to the progress to date.

381. SCIC noted specific areas where progress has been made and noted that Recommendation 11 (ii) regarding (CCEP) could actually be listed as completed. SCIC also highlighted areas where proposals continue to be submitted, and those where particular outstanding items should be considered (e.g., Recommendations 7 (MPAs), 4(iii) (ATCM participation), and 12 (Transhipments) of PR2).

### **Other business**

382. SCIC considered CCAMLR-43/31, which provided a detailed proposal for a third performance review ('PR3') to be conducted during the 2024–2025 intersessional period, with presentation of the PR3 report to CCAMLR-44.

383. SCIC thanked the EU and its Member States for this proposal and noted the value that previous reports (PR1 and PR2) and their recommendations had provided, highlighting that these have proven to be of great value to CCAMLR.

384. Some Members expressed the view that additional details regarding the scope, structure and timeline of the proposed PR3 would be beneficial. China suggested that the third performance review be comprehensively evaluated against the Convention, in particular Article II, and the review panel includes two external experts, at least one industry representative. In this sense, China was of the view that a detailed terms of reference for the proposed PR3 should be developed which would take time.

385. SCIC did not reach consensus to endorse the proposal for a third performance review to be conducted during the 2024–2025 intersessional period.

386. SCIC considered CCAMLR-43/BG/40 submitted by ASOC, which brought developments relevant to fishing vessel and environmental safety to the attention of SCIC.

387. ASOC made the following statement:

'In recent years, ASOC has brought to the attention of SCIC developments relevant to fishing vessel and environmental safety adopted by the International Maritime Organization. A number of new guidelines and now regulations have been adopted in recent years that are of direct relevance to fishing vessels operating in the CCAMLR Area, including requirements for safe navigation and voyage planning that will be mandatory for all fishing vessels over 24m in length from 1st January 2026.

ASOC would like to highlight the need for CCAMLR Resolutions 23 and 34 to be updated to reflect these new developments. Furthermore, we wish to draw attention to ongoing work by the IMO to address the threat from marine plastic litter including the marking of fishing gear and the reporting of lost or discharged fishing gear. I would also

like to reiterate ASOC's recommendation that CCAMLR develop its own action plan to reduce all sources of plastics and microplastics. Finally, ASOC recommends that CCAMLR consider including the management of gray water from fishing vessels in the future workplan, including discussion of current practices and ultimately consideration of the need for regulation of untreated gray water.'

388. SCIC noted the information presented by ASOC in CCAMLR-43/BG/40.

389. SCIC endorsed a proposal to add a standing item to its agenda for future meetings under any other business. Under this new agenda item, SCIC will consider the various tasks assigned to the Secretariat, both under conservation measures and through report text, and prioritise and possibly eliminate some tasking given projected budgetary constraints.

390. The Chair welcomed nominations for a new SCIC Chair for 2025-2026. Korea nominated Adam Berry. This nomination was seconded by the United States and endorsed by SCIC. SCIC congratulated Mr Berry on his election as the next SCIC Chair.

391. The Chair welcomed nominations for Vice-Chair of SCIC, however none were received.

392. The Chair thanked all delegates, as well as the interpreters and Secretariat staff, for their efforts for a productive meeting. SCIC also expressed its appreciation to the Secretariat and thanked the Chair for her constructive and efficient leadership throughout the meeting and thanked her for her tenure as SCIC Chair.

### **Close of the meeting**

393. The Chair reflected that it had been a privilege to chair the meeting during her tenure, and thanked the delegates for their patience, professionalism and expertise. She also thanked the Secretariat, interpreters, Congress Rental and other support staff for their contribution to a productive meeting.

394. SCIC expressed its sincere appreciation to Ms. Engelke-Ros for her excellent chairmanship during a difficult meeting for SCIC, and for her cooperative, patient and good-humoured leadership during her time as Chair.

### Compliance Issues 2023/24

Reference number	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat
01	New Zealand		<p><b>CM 10-03, paragraph 1</b>, requires Contracting Parties to undertake inspections of all fishing vessels carrying <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. which enter their ports.</p> <p>The inspection report for the <i>San Aotea II</i> for the inspection undertaken by New Zealand on 12 March 2024 in Timaru, New Zealand, not that the vessel's last port call was Dunedin on 11 March 2024 due to an unscheduled emergency.</p> <p>No port inspection report was submitted for <i>San Aotea II</i>'s port call in Dunedin.</p> <p>In response to a request for further information New Zealand stated:  "The port call into Dunedin on 11 March 2024 was an unscheduled emergency stop due to one of the crew requiring urgent medical assistance.  They were only docked long enough for the crew member to disembark before continuing their pre-planned schedule to Timaru."</p>
02	Chile	<i>Puerto Ballena</i>	<p><b>CM 10-03, paragraph 4</b>, 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>Puerto Ballena</i> for the inspection undertaken by New Zealand on 3 Jan 2024 noted that they vessel entered port without submission of the Port Inspection Report Part A (Annex 10-03/A).</p> <p>Additional information in the email submission noted the following which was reported by the inspector to the government official:  <i>"There was an issue with the vessel failing to provide us Part A 48 hours prior to entering port.  When I boarded it an hour after it coming alongside it had not been completed.  I asked the Master to have Part A completed and a Spanish version was completed electronically and printed by the crew.  I have attached it. I marked it with the date and time I received it and signed it.  I made the Master aware of my concerns that they had breached 10/03 and he wrote a statement in Spanish at my suggestion. The explanation as I understood it was that it was a communication error and overlooked due</i></p>

Reference number	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat
			<p><i>to having to offload an injured crew member. The crew member had cut off two fingertips. He was driven to the hospital by the shipping agent. Although in need of medical attention it was certainly not an emergency at that point."</i></p> <p>And in the government official's submission to the Secretariat they also noted:  <i>"Slight issue with lack of required notification but this is an internal NZ issue which we have remedied, the safety of crew member was paramount in this situation"</i></p>
03	Korea, Republic of		<p><b>CM 10-03, paragraph 5</b>, requires that inspections shall be conducted within 48 hours of port entry.</p> <p>The Panamanian-flagged vessel <i>Procyon</i> entered the Korean port of Busan at 06:00 16 Sep 2023 and was inspected at 10:00 18 Sep 2023.</p> <p>Time delay of inspection after the 48-hour deadline: 4 hours</p>
04	Uruguay		<p><b>CM 10-03, paragraph 5</b>, requires that inspections shall be conducted within 48 hours of port entry.</p> <p>The Uruguayan-flagged vessel <i>Ainoha</i> entered the Uruguayan port of Montevideo at 2100 28 Oct 2023 and was inspected at 1100 31 Oct 2023.</p> <p>Time delay of inspection after the 48-hour deadline: 14 hours</p>
05	France		<p><b>CM 10-03, paragraph 8</b>, 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 French-flagged vessel <i>Sainte Rose</i> occurred on 08 March 2024 by French port officials and the transmission of the port inspection report occurred on 16 April 2024. The fishing activity occurred in Division 58.4.2 and Subareas 88.1 and 88.2.</p> <p>Time delay of transmission after the 30-day deadline: 9 days</p>
06	South Africa		<p><b>CM 10-03, paragraph 8</b>, 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 Secretariat identified the port inspection report by South Africa for the Korean-flagged vessel <i>Southern Ocean</i> which corresponded with the issuance of DCD KR-24-0009-E had not been submitted. The Secretariat emailed the South African CCEP Contacts on 9 July 2024 requesting a copy of the port inspection report.</p>

Reference number	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat
			<p>The port inspection report was submitted on 29 July 2024 reporting the inspection on 10 March 2024.</p> <p>Time delay of transmission after the 30-day deadline: 111 days</p>
<b>CM 10-04</b>			
07	Chile	<i>Antarctic Endeavour</i>	<p><b>CM 10-04, paragraph 13</b>, 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 21 Mar 2024 0225 UTC for the <i>Antarctic Endeavour</i> entry into Subarea 48.1 notifying the entry time of 20 Mar 2024 0126 UTC.</p> <p>Time delay after the 24-hour deadline: 59 minutes</p>
08	France	<i>Albius</i>	<p><b>CM 10-04, paragraph 13</b>, 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 1 Aug 2023 1300 UTC for the <i>Albius</i> entry into Subarea 58.6 notifying the entry time of 31 Jul 2023 0812 UTC.</p> <p>Time delay after the 24-hour deadline: 4 hours 48 minutes</p>
09	France	<i>Albius</i>	<p><b>CM 10-04, paragraph 13</b>, 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 02 Oct 2023 0635 UTC for the <i>Albius</i> entry into Division 58.5.1 notifying the entry time of 01 Oct 2023 0400 UTC.</p> <p>Time delay after the 24-hour deadline: 2 hours 35 minutes</p>
10	France	<i>Sainte Rose</i>	<p><b>CM 10-04, paragraph 13</b>, 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>Sainte Rose</i> for entry into Subarea 48.1. The Secretariat requested a movement notice from the French VMS Contact Officers on 04 Feb 2024 2313 UTC.</p> <p>A movement notification was provided to the Secretariat 05 Feb 2024 0803 UTC for the <i>Sainte Rose</i> entry into Subarea 48.1 notifying the entry time of 02 Feb 2024 1030 UTC.</p>

Reference number	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat
			Time delay after the 24-hour deadline: 45 hours 33 minutes
11	Korea, Republic of	<i>Greenstar</i>	<p><b>CM 10-04, paragraph 13</b>, 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 16 Apr 2024 0949 UTC for the <i>Greenstar</i> entry into Subarea 48.1 notifying the entry time of 13 Apr 2024 2245 UTC.</p> <p>The Secretariat identified the missing entry notification and requested it from Korea on 16 Apr 2024. Korea provided the following explanation along with the notification:  The <i>Greenstar</i> regarded she was still in the 88.3 when she was entering the subarea 48.1.  That is why she reported that she exited the CCAMLR from the 88.3 in the below email. It was our mistake. The office also has a responsibility to monitor our vessel’s movement and to educate our crews.  However, the office failed to monitor her movement during the weekend. We apologize for this mistake.</p> <p>Time delay after the 24-hour deadline: 35 hours 04 minutes</p>
12	Spain	<i>Tronio</i>	<p><b>CM 10-04, paragraph 13</b>, 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>Tronio</i> for the exit from Division 58.4.4a and entry into Division 58.4.4b at approximately 0916 UTC 28 Oct 2023.</p> <p>The Secretariat contacted Spain to clarify the movement notices provided by <i>Tronio</i> in the 2023/24 season. Spain advised the Secretariat that they had investigated the matter and found that the Master of the vessel used the SSRU Map in CM 41-01 and reported movements based upon the SSRUs listed.</p>
13	United Kingdom	<i>Nordic Prince</i>	<p><b>CM 10-04, paragraph 13</b>, 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 Apr 2024 1444 UTC for the <i>Nordic Prince</i> entry into Subarea 48.3 notifying the entry time of 13 Apr 2024 1533 UTC.</p> <p>The Secretariat identified the missing entry notification and requested it from the United Kingdom on 18 Apr 2024.</p> <p>Time delay after the 24-hour deadline: 95 hours 11 minutes</p>

Reference number	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat
<b>CM 10-05</b>			
14	Argentina		<p><b>CM 10-05, paragraph 6</b>, 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><b>CM 10-05, paragraph 7</b>, 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 e-CDS without the verification provided by a government official at section 5 of the DED template ("step 4: Export state confirmation" in e-CDS). Without this validation the import State will not have access to the document in the e-CDS.</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. The identified DED accounts for &lt;1% of Argentina's exports and &lt;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>
15	Chile		<p><b>CM 10-05, paragraph 6</b>, 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 e-CDS without the verification provided by a government official at section 5 of the DED template ("step 4: Export state confirmation" in e-CDS). Without this validation the import State will not have access to the document in the e-CDS.</p> <p>Analysis of the e-CDS data has identified Chile validated 75 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 2.6 % of Chile's exports and 1.5 % of all CDS exports.</p> <p>The time difference between the export and validation for the identified documents are:</p>



Reference number	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat
			<p>5 DEDs were issued between 1 - 2 days after declared export date  68 DEDs were issued between 6 - 10 days after declared export date  1 DED was issued between 11 - 20 days after declared export date  1 DED was issued between 51 - 100 days after declared export date</p> <p>A list of individual DED document numbers are available as an attachment to this record on the website.</p>
16	France		<p><b>CM 10-05, paragraph 6</b>, 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 e-CDS without the verification provided by a government official at section 5 of the DED template (“step 4: Export state confirmation” in e-CDS). Without this validation the import State will not have access to the document in the e-CDS.</p> <p>Analysis of the e-CDS data has identified France validated 3 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 1 % of France's exports and &lt;1 % of all CDS exports.</p> <p>The time difference between the export and validation for the identified documents are:  2 DEDs were issued between 11 - 20 days after declared export date  1 DED was issued between 21 - 50 days after declared export date</p> <p>A list of individual DED document numbers are available as an attachment to this record on the website.</p>
17	Netherlands		<p><b>CM 10-05, paragraph 6</b>, 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 e-CDS without the verification provided by a government official at section 5 of the DED template (“step 4: Export state confirmation” in e-CDS). Without this validation the import State will not have access to the document in the e-CDS.</p>

Reference number	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat
18	Peru		<p>Analysis of the e-CDS data has identified the Kingdom of the Netherlands validated 2 DREDS after the declared export date. Therefore, these shipments did not have a completed DRED available to accompany them at the time of export.</p> <p>The identified DREDS account for 13 % of Kingdom of the Netherlands' exports and &lt;1 % of all CDS exports.</p> <p>The time difference between the export and validation for the identified documents are:  1 DRED was issued between 3 - 5 days after declared export date  1 DRED was issued between 11 - 20 days after declared export date</p> <p>A list of individual DED document numbers are available as an attachment to this record on the website.</p>
19	South Africa		<p><b>CM 10-05, paragraph 6</b>, 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 e-CDS without the verification provided by a government official at section 5 of the DED template (“step 4: Export state confirmation” in e-CDS). Without this validation the import State will not have access to the document in the e-CDS.</p> <p>Analysis of the e-CDS 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.</p> <p>The identified DEDs account for 6 % of Peru's exports and &lt;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>A list of individual DED document numbers are available as an attachment to this record on the website.</p>

Reference number	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat
			<p>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 e-CDS without the verification provided by a government official at section 5 of the DED template ("step 4: Export state confirmation" in e-CDS). Without this validation the import State will not have access to the document in the e-CDS.</p> <p>Analysis of the e-CDS data has identified South Africa validated 18 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 38 % of South Africa's exports and &lt;1 % of all CDS exports.</p> <p>The time difference between the export and validation for the identified documents are:  8 DEDs were issued between 6 - 10 days after declared export date  10 DEDs were issued between 21 - 50 days after declared export date</p> <p>A list of individual DED document numbers are available as an attachment to this record on the website.</p>
20	Spain		<p><b>CM 10-05, paragraph 6</b>, 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 e-CDS without the verification provided by a government official at section 5 of the DED template ("step 4: Export state confirmation" in e-CDS). Without this validation the import State will not have access to the document in the e-CDS.</p> <p>Noting CCAMLR-42, paragraph 90, SCIC advised a moratorium on compliance assessments should be put in place for DED and DREDs older than two years, recognising that this is an administrative matter.</p> <p>Analysis of the e-CDS data has identified Spain validated 4 DREDs after the declared export date. Therefore, these shipments did not have a completed DRED available to accompany them at the time of export. The identified DREDs account for 2 % of Spain's exports and &lt;1 % of all CDS exports.</p>

Reference number	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat
21	United States of America		<p>The time difference between the export and validation for the identified documents are:  3 DREDS were issued between 201 - 300 days after declared export date  1 DREDS was issued between 501 - 600 days after declared export date</p> <p>A list of individual DRED document numbers is available as an attachment to this record on the website.</p> <p><b>CM 10-05, paragraph 6</b>, 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 e-CDS without the verification provided by a government official at section 5 of the DED template ("step 4: Export state confirmation" in e-CDS). Without this validation the import State will not have access to the document in the e-CDS.</p> <p>Noting CCAMLR-42, paragraph 90, SCIC advised a moratorium on compliance assessments should be put in place for DED and DREDS older than two years, recognising that this is an administrative matter.</p> <p>Analysis of the e-CDS data has identified the United States of America validated 1 DRED after the declared export date. Therefore, this shipment did not have a completed DRED available to accompany it at the time of export.  The identified DRED account for &lt;1 % of the United States of America's exports and &lt;1 % of all CDS exports.</p> <p>The time difference between the export and validation for the identified documents are:  1 DRED was issued between 501 - 600 days after declared export date</p> <p>A list of individual DED document numbers are available as an attachment to this record on the website.</p>
22	Uruguay		<p><b>CM 10-05, paragraph 6</b>, 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</p>

Reference number	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat
			<p>DRED is not completed nor validated in the e-CDS without the verification provided by a government official at section 5 of the DED template ("step 4: Export state confirmation" in e-CDS). Without this validation the import State will not have access to the document in the e-CDS.</p> <p>Analysis of the e-CDS data has identified Uruguay validated 31 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 29 % of Uruguay's exports and &lt;1 % of all CDS exports.</p> <p>The time difference between the export and validation for the identified documents are:  10 DEDs were issued between 1 - 2 days after declared export date  8 DEDs were issued between 3 - 5 days after declared export date  9 DEDs were issued between 6 - 10 days after declared export date  3 DEDs were issued between 11 - 20 days after declared export date  1 DED was issued between 21 - 50 days after declared export date</p> <p>A list of individual DED document numbers is available as an attachment to this record on the website.</p>
<b>CM 10-09</b>			
23	Panama	<i>Frio Aegean</i>	<p><b>CM 10-09, paragraph 2</b>, 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 1032 UTC 04 Apr 2024 from the <i>Frio Aegean</i> notifying its intention to tranship Krill and fuel with the <i>Sejong</i> at 0700 UTC 7 Apr 2024.</p> <p>Time difference: 68 hours 28 minutes</p>
24	Panama	<i>Frio Aegean</i>	<p><b>CM 10-09, paragraph 2</b>, 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 1243 UTC 13 Apr 2024 from the <i>Frio Aegean</i> notifying its intention to tranship fuel with the <i>Shen Lan</i> at 1200 UTC 16 Apr 2024.</p> <p>Time difference: 71 hours 17 minutes</p>

Reference number	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat
25	Panama	<i>Frio Marathon</i>	<p><b>CM 10-09, paragraph 2</b>, 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 1531 UTC 13 July 2023 from the <i>Frio Marathon</i> notifying its intention to tranship krill with the Sejong at 1030 UTC 16 July 2023.</p> <p>Time difference: 66 hours 59 minutes</p>
26	Panama	<i>Frio Oceanic</i>	<p><b>CM 10-09, paragraph 2</b>, 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 1654 UTC 24 Feb 2024 from the <i>Frio Oceanic</i> notifying its intention to tranship krill with the Sejong at 1400 UTC 27 Feb 2024.</p> <p>Time difference: 69 hours 06 minutes</p>
27	Panama	<i>Procyon</i>	<p><b>CM 10-09, paragraph 2</b>, 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 1247 UTC 22 Apr 2024 from the <i>Procyon</i> notifying its intention to tranship Krill with the Fu Xing Hai at 1100 UTC 25 Apr 2024.</p> <p>Time difference: 70 hours 13 minutes</p>
28	Ukraine	<i>More Sodruzhestva</i>	<p><b>CM 10-09, paragraph 2</b>, 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 1937 UTC 23 Jan 2024 from the <i>More Sodruzhestva</i> notifying its intention to tranship fuel with the Antarctic Provider at 1800 UTC 26 Jan 2024.</p> <p>Time difference: 70 hours 23 minutes</p>
29	Norway		<p><b>CM 10-09, paragraph 3</b>, states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 2 hours in advance from the transhipment of items other than harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p>

Reference number	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat
			<p>The Secretariat received notification from the Norwegian-flagged vessel the <i>Antarctic Provider</i> on 1601 UTC 29 Mar 2024 their intended transshipment of crew and provisions with the <i>Saga Sea</i> at 1630 UTC 29 March 2024.</p> <p>Time difference: 29 minutes</p>
30	Uruguay	<i>Ocean Azul</i>	<p><b>CM 10-09, paragraph 3</b>, states that each Flag State shall notify the Secretariat at least 2 hours in advance from the transshipment of items other than harvested marine living resources, bait or fuel.</p> <p>The Secretariat received a notification on 12 Dec 2023 0838 UTC from the <i>Ocean Azul</i> notifying its intention to tranship spare parts with the <i>Helena Ndume</i> on 12 Dec 2023 1000 UTC.</p> <p>Time difference: 1 hour 22 minutes</p>
31	Norway		<p><b>CM 10-09, paragraph 5</b>, 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 notification from the Norwegian-flagged vessel the <i>Antarctic Provider</i> on 1601 UTC 29 Mar 2024 their intended transshipment of crew and provisions with the <i>Saga Sea</i> at 1630 UTC 29 March 2024.</p> <p>No confirmation was provided for this transshipment by the <i>Antarctic Provider</i>, <i>Saga Sea</i> or Norway.</p>
32	Vanuatu	<i>Hai Feng 718</i>	<p><b>CM 10-09, paragraph 8</b>, 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 <i>Hai Feng 718</i> confirming its transshipment of Krill and Fuel with the <i>Hua Xiang 9</i> from 07 - 08 Feb 2024.</p> <p>No prior notification was provided.</p>
<b>CM 22-07</b>			
33	United Kingdom	<i>Argos Georgia</i>	<p><b>CM 22-07, paragraph 8</b>, states that vessels shall report in accordance with CM 23-07 total benthos recovered in a daily period.</p> <p>In the C2 report for the <i>Argos Georgia</i> for December 2023 8.1 specimens of VME indicators reported on 19 December 2023. The corresponding daily catch and effort report did not report catches of any VME species</p>

Reference number	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat
34	Russian Federation	<i>Alpha Crux</i>	<p><b>CM 22-07, paragraph 9</b>, states that a VME Risk Area shall remain closed for any fishery until reviewed by the SC and management actions are determined by the Commission.</p> <p>CM 22-07, paragraph 2 (v), defines a ‘Risk Area’ of having a 1 n mile radius from the midpoint of the line segment for which 10 or more VME indicator units are recovered. CCAMLR's VME registry is available here: <a href="https://www.ccamlr.org/en/document/data/ccamlr-vme-registry">https://www.ccamlr.org/en/document/data/ccamlr-vme-registry</a></p> <p>The <i>Alpha Crux</i> reported in C2 data for 24 Dec 2023 on haul 9 line which intersected with the VME risk area "CCAMLR_VMERiskArea_881" which has a latitude of 72.321 S and 176.272 E.</p> <p>A map is attached to this CCEP record which illustrates the fishing inside the VMS risk area. Map legend - black is the set line, green is haul line, blue is VME midpoint segments</p>
35	Russian Federation	<i>Alpha Crux</i>	<p><b>CM 22-07, paragraph 9</b>, states that a VME Risk Area shall remain closed for any fishery until reviewed by the SC and management actions are determined by the Commission.</p> <p>CM 22-07, paragraph 2 (v), defines a ‘Risk Area’ of having a 1 n mile radius from the midpoint of the line segment for which 10 or more VME indicator units are recovered. CCAMLR's VME registry is available here: <a href="https://www.ccamlr.org/en/document/data/ccamlr-vme-registry">https://www.ccamlr.org/en/document/data/ccamlr-vme-registry</a></p> <p>The <i>Alpha Crux</i> reported in C2 data for 27 Dec 2023 on haul 15 setting and hauling a line which intersected with the VME risk area "CCAMLR_VMERiskArea_881" which has a latitude of 72.321 S and 176.272 E. A C2 VME segment midpoint was also reported within the VME risk area.</p> <p>A map is attached to this CCEP record which illustrates the fishing inside the VMS risk area. Map legend - black is the set line, green is haul line, blue is VME midpoint segments</p>
36	Russian Federation	<i>Alpha Crux</i>	<p><b>CM 22-07, paragraph 9</b>, states that a VME Risk Area shall remain closed for any fishery until reviewed by the SC and management actions are determined by the Commission.</p> <p>CM 22-07, paragraph 2 (v), defines a ‘Risk Area’ of having a 1 n mile radius from the midpoint of the line segment for which 10 or more VME indicator units are recovered. CCAMLR's VME registry is available here: <a href="https://www.ccamlr.org/en/document/data/ccamlr-vme-registry">https://www.ccamlr.org/en/document/data/ccamlr-vme-registry</a></p> <p>The <i>Alpha Crux</i> reported in C2 data for 3 Jan 2024 on haul 26 setting a line which intersected with the VME risk area "CCAMLR_VMERiskArea_881" which has a latitude of 72.321 S and 176.272 E. A C2 VME segment midpoint was also report within the VME risk area.</p>



Reference number	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat
			A map is attached to this CCEP record which illustrates the fishing inside the VMS risk area. Map legend - black is the set line, green is haul line, blue is VME midpoint segments
37	Russian Federation	<i>Alpha Crux</i>	<p><b>CM 22-07, paragraph 9</b>, states that a VME Risk Area shall remain closed for any fishery until reviewed by the SC and management actions are determined by the Commission.</p> <p>CM 22-07, paragraph 2 (v), defines a ‘Risk Area’ of having a 1 n mile radius from the midpoint of the line segment for which 10 or more VME indicator units are recovered. CCAMLR's VME registry is available here: <a href="https://www.ccamlr.org/en/document/data/ccamlr-vme-registry">https://www.ccamlr.org/en/document/data/ccamlr-vme-registry</a></p> <p>The <i>Alpha Crux</i> reported in C2 data for 4 Jan 2024 on haul 29 setting and hauling which intersected with the VME risk area "CCAMLR_VMERiskArea_881" which has a latitude of 72.321 S and 176.272 E. Three C2 VME midpoints were also reported with the VME risk area.</p> <p>A map is attached to this CCEP record which illustrates the fishing inside the VMS risk area. Map legend - black is the set line, green is haul line, blue is VME midpoint segments</p>
38	Uruguay	<i>Proa Pioneer</i>	<p><b>CM 22-07, paragraph 9</b>, states that a VME Risk Area shall remain closed for any fishery until reviewed by the SC and management actions are determined by the Commission.</p> <p>CM 22-07, paragraph 2 (v), defines a ‘Risk Area’ of having a 1 n mile radius from the midpoint of the line segment for which 10 or more VME indicator units are recovered. CCAMLR's VME registry is available here: <a href="https://www.ccamlr.org/en/document/data/ccamlr-vme-registry">https://www.ccamlr.org/en/document/data/ccamlr-vme-registry</a></p> <p>The <i>Proa Pioneer</i> reported in C2 data for 21 Dec 2023 on haul 16 setting and hauling a line which intersected with the VME risk area "CCAMLR_VMERiskArea_882_205028" which has a latitude of 74.17 S and 112.7933 W. A C2 VME midpoint was also reported with the VME risk area.</p> <p>A map is attached to this CCEP record which illustrates the fishing inside the VMS risk area. Map legend - black is the set line, green is haul line, blue is VME midpoint segments</p>
39	Uruguay	<i>Proa Pioneer</i>	<p><b>CM 22-07, paragraph 9</b>, states that a VME Risk Area shall remain closed for any fishery until reviewed by the SC and management actions are determined by the Commission.</p> <p>CM 22-07, paragraph 2 (v), defines a ‘Risk Area’ of having a 1 n mile radius from the midpoint of the line segment for which 10 or more VME indicator units are recovered. CCAMLR's VME registry is available here: <a href="https://www.ccamlr.org/en/document/data/ccamlr-vme-registry">https://www.ccamlr.org/en/document/data/ccamlr-vme-registry</a></p>

Reference number	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat
			<p>The <i>Proa Pioneer</i> reported in C2 data for 22 Dec 2023 on haul 19 setting and hauling a line which intersected with the VME risk area "CCAMLR_VMERiskArea_882_205028" which has a latitude of 74.17 S and 112.7933 W.</p> <p>A map is attached to this CCEP record which illustrates the fishing inside the VMS risk area. Map legend - black is the set line, green is haul line, blue is VME midpoint segments</p>
<b>CM 22-08</b>			
40	Russian Federation	<i>Alpha Crux</i>	<p><b>CM 22-08, paragraph 1</b>, prohibits fishing in exploratory fisheries for <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. other than for scientific research purposes in depths shallower than 550 m.</p> <p>The SISO observer on the Russian flagged <i>Alpha Crux</i> from 16 Nov 2023 to 5 Mar 2024 reported in observer trip report number 2518, the following:</p> <p>In Part 10 – “At 09:50 (UTC) on December 17, 2023, a tow was initiated from 491m in SET.4, and subsequently, the depth and tow location were adjusted to reflect a tow from 563m.”</p>
<b>CM 23-04</b>			
41	Russian Federation	<i>Alpha Crux</i>	<p><b>CM 23-04, paragraph 3</b>, requires the total target catch must be reported by species and the total by-catch must be reported by species or to the lowest taxonomic level possible (e.g. species or genus).</p> <p>The SISO observer on the Russian flagged <i>Alpha Crux</i> from 16 Nov 2023 to 5 Mar 2024 reported in observer trip report number 2518, the following:</p> <p>In Part 10 – “Although 86 sets of deployment and retrieval were recorded, a total of 87 sets were actually carried out. The first deployment occurred on December 11, 2023, at 15:30 (UTC), followed by retrieval starting at 19:15 (UTC) of the same day. However, due to damage to the main line, rendering all lines unable to be retrieved, the set was deleted without reporting the loss.”</p> <p>Section 7.2 of the Commercial Data Collection Manual – Longline Fisheries – Version 2023, instructs the procedure for reporting in the C2 data when gear has been lost.</p> <p>The Secretariat was notified as per SISO, Part A, paragraph h, of communications on 29 May 2024 between Russia (the Receiving Member) and Korea (the Designating Member) of discrepancies identified by Russia in the observer report which relate to this compliance issue. The Secretariat has not been notified by either party that they were unable to resolve such issues, as required by SISO, Part A, paragraph h.</p>

Reference number	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat
42	Russian Federation	<i>Alpha Crux</i>	<p><b>CM 23-04, paragraph 3</b>, requires the total by-catch must be reported by species or to the lowest taxonomic level possible (e.g. species or genus).</p> <p>The SISO observer on the Russian flagged <i>Alpha Crux</i> from 16 Nov 2023 to 5 Mar 2024 reported in observer trip report number 2518, the following:</p> <p>In Part 4 – “CHW gathered at one location at the hauling station and transported to the restaurant for consumption.(Figure 3) The weight and quantity were not recorded. In some sets, intentional exclusion of by-catch was observed. This practice was not discouraged by the Russian captain and crew.”</p> <p>Figure 2 contains a photo of by-catch</p> <p>Figure 3 contains a photo of <i>Chionobathyscus dewitti</i> (Dewitt's icefish) in a tank with the caption “CHW edible”</p> <p>Figure 4 photo caption states “By-catch deliberate dropout”</p> <p>In Part 10 – “The investigation into by-catch species was not properly conducted. Intentionally, without confirming the quantity or weight, by-catch either deliberately stripped off during fishing operations or brought into the processing area was either ground up and discharged or released intact without inspection. When intentionally discarding by-catch species, neither the Russian captain, Russian navigator, nor any Russian crew members intervened. Regarding CHW, it was not sent to the processing area for consumption but was stored on the mid-deck and utilized for consumption without its quantity or weight being measured. It was also noted that the details of the Observed Haul Catch related to by-catch were arbitrarily altered without the knowledge of the”</p> <p>The Secretariat was notified as per SISO, Part A, paragraph h, of communications on 29 May 2024 between Russia (the Receiving Member) and Korea (the Designating Member) of discrepancies identified by Russia in the observer report which relate to this compliance issue. The Secretariat has not been notified by either party that they were unable to resolve such issues, as required by SISO, Part A, paragraph h.</p>
<b>CM 25-02</b>			
43	Russian Federation	<i>Alpha Crux</i>	<p><b>CM 25-02, paragraph 6</b>, prohibits the dumping of offal and discards while longlines are being set.</p> <p>The SISO observer on the Russian flagged <i>Alpha Crux</i> from 16 Nov 2023 to 5 Mar 2024 reported in observer trip report number 2518, the following:</p>

Reference number	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat
			In Part 6 in response to the question “On what percentage of sets did offal discarding take place during setting?” the observer reported “1.15”
			Figure 15 photo caption states: “On setting the line was disposal offal”
44	New Zealand	<i>Janas</i>	<p><b>CM 25-02, paragraph 8</b>, requires a streamer line to be deployed during longline setting.</p> <p>The SISO observer on the New Zealand-flagged <i>Janas</i> from 14 Nov 2023 to 15 Feb 2024 reported in observer trip report number 2455, the following:</p> <p>“Whilst setting line 108, it was noted that the vessel had backed up into tori line (and the line caught in the propeller) prior to setting. There was no tori line during setting from mag 1 – 5, the crew quickly responded to the incident and assembled another.”</p>
45	Russian Federation	<i>Alpha Crux</i>	<p><b>CM 25-02, paragraph 8</b>, requires a streamer line to be deployed during longline setting.</p> <p>The SISO observer on the Russian flagged <i>Alpha Crux</i> from 16 Nov 2023 to 5 Mar 2024 reported in observer trip report number 2518, the following:</p> <p>Part 6.1 – “The first set did not deploy streamer lines due to heavy ice conditions.”</p>
46	France	<i>Sainte Rose</i>	<p><b>CM 25-02, Annex A, paragraph 3</b>, states that the streamer line shall be a minimum of 150 m in length.</p> <p>The SISO observer on the French-flagged <i>Sainte Rose</i> from 26 Nov 2023 to 7 Mar 2024 reported in observer trip report number 2500, the following:</p> <p>“Streamer line length (m): 120m The streamer achieved a horizontal extent of 60 m, calculated with the number of visible aerial lines. The streamer line is a polypropylene 10mm of 120 meters long. Streamers are PEBD double 6mm from 1 to 8 meters long with 3 meters apart.”</p>
47	Russian Federation	<i>Alpha Crux</i>	<p><b>CM 25-02, Annex A, paragraph 3</b>, states that the streamer line shall be a minimum of 150 m in length.</p> <p>The SISO observer on the Russian flagged <i>Alpha Crux</i> from 16 Nov 2023 to 5 Mar 2024 reported in observer trip report number 2518, the following:</p> <p>In Figure 11: Configuration of bird scaring lines, the streamer line length (m) is reported as 70.</p>

Reference number	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat
48	Korea, Republic of	<i>Sunstar</i>	<p><b>CM 25-02, Annex A, paragraph 4</b>, states that the streamers must be branched each comprising of two strands of a minimum of 3 mm diameter.</p> <p>The SISO observer on the Korean-flagged <i>Sunstar</i> from 26 Oct 2023 to 14 Feb 2024 reported in observer trip report number 2506, the following:</p> <p>“The total streamer length deployed by the vessel was 157m, made up of 1.5mm polypropylene line that consisted of 10 single streamers joined at intervals of 4.5m, Figure 16”</p>
<b>CM 26-01</b>			
49	Chile	<i>Puerto Ballena</i>	<p><b>CM 26-01, paragraph 8</b>, prohibits the dumping 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 02 Dec 2023 to 03 Feb 2024 the <i>Puerto Ballena</i> reported in their C2 data discarding south of 60°S 4 659 individuals (6 665.92 kg) across 22 different species.</p>
50	Namibia	<i>Helena Ndume</i>	<p><b>CM 26-01, paragraph 8</b>, prohibits the dumping 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 13 Dec 2023 to 29 Jan 2024 the <i>Helena Ndume</i> reported in their C2 data discarding south of 60°S 10 108 individuals (5 224.73 kg) across 6 different species.</p>
51	Russian Federation	<i>Alpha Crux</i>	<p><b>CM 26-01, paragraph 8</b>, prohibits the dumping or discharging of offal or discards south of 60°S.</p> <p>All fishing effort for the <i>Alpha Crux</i> within the Convention Area occurred south of 60°S in Subarea 88.1</p> <p>The SISO observer on the Russian flagged <i>Alpha Crux</i> from 16 Nov 2023 to 5 Mar 2024 reported in observer trip report number 2518, the following:</p>

Reference number	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat
			<p>In Part 1 – “70% offal and discards was 분쇄한 뒤 port side setting and hauling to disposal, 30% offal and discards was packed in bags and stored in the freezer or fish hold for disposal on shore”</p> <p>In Part 4 – “70% offal and discards was crash to disposal for port side setting and hauling The quantity and weight were not recorded.”</p> <p>In Part 6 in response to the question “On what percentage of sets did offal discarding take place during setting?” the observer reported “1.15”</p> <p>In Part 6 in response to the question “On what percentage of sets did offal discarding take place during hauling?” the observer reported “70”</p> <p>In Part 8 – “70% offal and discards was crash to disposal for port side setting and hauling, 30% offal and discards was packed in bags and stored in the freezer or fish hold for disposal on shore.”</p> <p>Figure 14 contains a photo taken by the observer of offal disposed on ice</p> <p>Figure 15 photo caption states: “On setting the line was disposal offal”</p>
52	United Kingdom	<i>Argos Georgia</i>	<p><b>CM 26-01, paragraph 8</b>, prohibits the dumping 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 09 Dec 2023 to 01 Jan 2024 the <i>Argos Georgia</i> reported in their C2 data discarding south of 60°S 3 835 individuals (5 404.94 kg) across 6 different species.</p>
53	Uruguay	<i>Ocean Azul</i>	<p><b>CM 26-01, paragraph 8</b>, prohibits the dumping 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 11 Dec 2023 to 28 Jan 2024 the <i>Ocean Azul</i> reported in their C2 data discarding south of 60°S 39 220 individuals (33 082.02 kg) across 11 different species.</p>

Reference number	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat
54	Uruguay	<i>Proa Pioneer</i>	<p><b>CM 26-01, paragraph 8</b>, prohibits the dumping 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 19 Dec 2023 to 25 Jan 2024 the <i>Proa Pioneer</i> reported in their C2 data discarding south of 60°S 481 individuals (1 763.75 kg) of <i>Dissostichus mawsoni</i>.</p>
<b>CM 31-01</b>			
55	United Kingdom	<i>Argos Georgia</i>	<p>As stated in COMM CIRCs 24/61 and 24/70: 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 Georgia</i> was identified fishing for <i>Dissostichus eleginoides</i> in Subarea 48.3 in 2024 which Comm Circs 24/61 and 24/70 allege is contrary to CM 31-01</p> <p>A response from the United Kingdom has been circulated in COMM CIC 24/69</p> <p>This event is considered further on the Draft IUU Vessel List (COMM CIRC 24/68).</p>
56	United Kingdom	<i>Argos Helena</i>	<p>As stated in COMM CIRCs 24/61 and 24/70: 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 2024 which Comm Circs 24/61 and 24/70 allege is contrary to CM 31-01</p> <p>A response from the United Kingdom has been circulated in COMM CIC 24/69</p> <p>This event is considered further on the Draft IUU Vessel List (COMM CIRC 24/68).</p>
57	United Kingdom	<i>Nordic Prince</i>	<p>As stated in COMM CIRCs 24/61 and 24/70: 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>

Reference number	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat
			<p><i>Nordic Prince</i> was identified fishing for <i>Dissostichus eleginoides</i> in Subarea 48.3 in 2024 which Comm Cires 24/61 and 24/70 allege is contrary to CM 31-01</p> <p>A response from the United Kingdom has been circulated in COMM CIC 24/69</p> <p>This event is considered further on the Draft IUU Vessel List (COMM CIRC 24/68).</p>
<b>CM 31-02</b>			
58	Norway	<i>Antarctic Endurance</i>	<p><b>CM 31-02, paragraph 1</b>, states that following notification by the Secretariat of the closure of a fishery, all vessels in the area subject to the closure notice, shall remove their fishing gear from the water by the notified closure date and time.</p> <p><b>CM 31-02, paragraph 4</b>, states that a vessel or vessel shall notify the Secretariat should the vessel appear likely to be unable remove all its fishing gear from the water by the notified closure date and time and the vessel shall make all reasonable efforts to remove all its fishing gear from the water as soon as possible.</p> <p>In COMM CIRC 24/53 the Secretariat notified that the trawl fishery for <i>Euphausia superba</i> in Subarea 48.1 will close at 2359 h UTC on 18/05/2024.</p> <p>Following the closure of the fishery C1 data for the <i>Antarctic Endurance</i> reported 17 unique trawls of two nets from 00:00 19 May 2024 to 10:00 20 May 2024 with a green weight <i>Euphausia superba</i> catch of 2 106 749 kg.</p> <p>Continuous trawl vessels report a “unique trawl” for every two hour period the net is in the water. The net setting and hauling date and time is also reported in the C1 data. The net was set before the closure date and hauled at 10:00 on 20 May 2024.</p> <p>A report on the delayed gear retrieval was provided by Norway in COMM CIRC 24/58</p>
59	Norway	<i>Antarctic Sea</i>	<p><b>CM 31-02, paragraph 1</b>, states that following notification by the Secretariat of the closure of a fishery, all vessels in the area subject to the closure notice, shall remove their fishing gear from the water by the notified closure date and time.</p> <p><b>CM 31-02, paragraph 4</b>, states that a vessel or vessel shall notify the Secretariat should the vessel appear likely to be unable remove all its fishing gear from the water by the notified closure date and time and the vessel shall make all reasonable efforts to remove all its fishing gear from the water as soon as possible.</p>



Reference number	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat
			<p>In COMM CIRC 24/53 the Secretariat notified that the trawl fishery for <i>Euphausia superba</i> in Subarea 48.1 will close at 2359 h UTC on 18/05/2024.</p> <p>Following the closure of the fishery C1 data for the <i>Antarctic Sea</i> reported 9 unique trawls of two nets and 1 trawl of one net from 00:00 19 May 2024 to 19:22 19 May 2024 with a green weight <i>Euphausia superba</i> catch of 1 077 404 kg.</p> <p>Continuous trawl vessels report a “unique trawl” for every two hour period the net is in the water. The net setting and hauling date and time is also reported in the C1 data. The net was set before the closure date and hauled at 19:22 on 19 May 2024.</p> <p>A report on the delayed gear retrieval was provided by Norway in COMM CIRC 24/58</p>
60	Norway	<i>Saga Sea</i>	<p><b>CM 31-02, paragraph 1</b>, states that following notification by the Secretariat of the closure of a fishery, all vessels in the area subject to the closure notice, shall remove their fishing gear from the water by the notified closure date and time.</p> <p><b>CM 31-02, paragraph 4</b>, states that a vessel or vessel shall notify the Secretariat should the vessel appear likely to be unable remove all its fishing gear from the water by the notified closure date and time and the vessel shall make all reasonable efforts to remove all its fishing gear from the water as soon as possible.</p> <p>In COMM CIRC 24/53 the Secretariat notified that the trawl fishery for <i>Euphausia superba</i> in Subarea 48.1 will close at 2359 h UTC on 18/05/2024.</p> <p>Following the closure of the fishery C1 data for the <i>Saga Sea</i> reported 16 trawls of two nets and 1 trawl of one net from 00:00 19 May 2024 to 10:00 20 May 2024 with a green weight <i>Euphausia superba</i> catch of 1 143 056 kg.</p> <p>Continuous trawl vessels report a “unique trawl” for every two hour period the net is in the water. The net setting and hauling date and time is also reported in the C1 data. The net was set before the closure date and hauled at 10:00 on 20 May 2024.</p> <p>A report on the delayed gear retrieval was provided by Norway in COMM CIRC 24/58</p>
<b>CM 41-09</b>			
61	Uruguay	<i>Ocean Azul</i>	<p><b>CM 41-09, paragraph 6</b>, If the catch of <i>Macrourus</i> spp. taken by a single vessel in any two 10-day periods in any SSRU exceeds 1 500 kg in each 10-day period and exceeds 16% of the catch of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. by that vessel in that SSRU, the vessel shall cease fishing in that SSRU for the remainder of the season.</p>

Reference number	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat
			<p>Two breaches of the move-on rule were identified for the <i>Ocean Azul</i> in Small Scale Research Unit 88.1 I. The C2 data reported the following:</p> <p>For ten day period starting 21 Dec 2023  <i>Macrourus</i> spp. total: 2 053.60 kg  <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. total: 2 877.97 kg  <i>Macrourus</i> spp. percentage of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. catch: 71.36%</p> <p>For ten day period starting 01 Jan 2024  <i>Macrourus</i> spp. total: 2 189 kg  <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. total: 5 858.23 kg  <i>Macrourus</i> spp. percentage of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. catch: 37.37%</p> <p><i>Move-on rule now triggered, vessel should have left SSRU 88.1_I</i></p> <p>For ten day period starting 11 Jan 2024  <i>Macrourus</i> spp. total: 4 245 kg  <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. total: 6 951.92 kg  <i>Macrourus</i> spp. percentage of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. catch: 61.06%</p> <p>For ten day period starting 21 Jan 2024  <i>Macrourus</i> spp. total: 4 635.50 kg  <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. total: 11 360.59 kg  <i>Macrourus</i> spp. percentage of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. catch: 40.80%</p>
<b>CM 91-05</b>			
62	Namibia	<i>Helena Ndume</i>	<p><b>CM 91-05, paragraph 24</b>, requires Flag States to notify the Secretariat prior to entry of their fishing vessels into the MPA.</p> <p>A movement notification for the <i>Helena Ndume</i> was provided on 15 Dec 2023 0210 UTC which notified entry into RSR MPA SRZ on 14 Dec 2023 2240 UTC.</p> <p>Time difference: 3 hours 30 minutes after entry</p>
63	Namibia	<i>Helena Ndume</i>	<p><b>CM 91-05, paragraph 24</b>, requires Flag States to notify the Secretariat prior to entry of their fishing vessels into the MPA.</p>

Reference number	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat
			<p>A movement notification for the <i>Helena Ndume</i> was provided on 19 Dec 2023 0141 UTC which notified entry into RSR MPA GPZ(i) on 18 Dec 2023 2143 UTC.</p> <p>Time difference: 3 hours 58 minutes after entry</p>
64	Russian Federation	<i>Alpha Crux</i>	<p><b>CM 91-05, paragraph 24</b>, requires Flag States to notify the Secretariat prior to entry of their fishing vessels into the MPA.</p> <p>A movement notification for the <i>Alpha Crux</i> was provided on 14 Dec 2023 0517 UTC which notified entry into RSR MPA SRZ on 14 Dec 2023 0137 UTC.</p> <p>Time difference: 3 hours 40 minutes after entry</p>
65	Spain	<i>Tronio</i>	<p><b>CM 91-05, paragraph 24</b>, requires Flag States to notify the Secretariat prior to entry of their fishing vessels into the MPA.</p> <p>A movement notification for the <i>Tronio</i> was provided on 26 Dec 2023 1614 UTC notifying entry into RSR MPA SRZ on 26 Dec 2023 0340 UTC.</p> <p>A revision was provided on 26 Dec 2023 1955 UTC notifying entry time as 26 Dec 2023 0447 UTC.</p> <p>Time difference between when the Secretariat was first notified and the final movement time: 11 hours 27 minutes after entry</p>
66	Russian Federation	<i>Alpha Crux</i>	<p><b>Text of the CCAMLR Scheme of International Scientific Observation, Part D, paragraph (b) (i)</b>, states that the owner, Master, agent, and crew of a vessel on which a scientific observer is deployed shall not offer a scientific observer, either directly or indirectly, any gratuity, gift, favour, loan, or anything of monetary value, except for meals, accommodations or salary when provided by the vessel.</p> <p>The SISO observer on the Russian flagged <i>Alpha Crux</i> from 16 Nov 2023 to 5 Mar 2024 reported in observer trip report number 2518, the following:</p> <p>In Part 10 – “During the investigation period of the vessel, on January 10, 2024, attempts were made to communicate with the Russian captain regarding CCAMLR Conservation Measure 26-01, but it was not properly conveyed. Subsequently, a request was made to the National Institute of Fisheries Science to receive</p>

Reference number	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat
			<p>the latest version of Conservation Measure 26-01 via email. However, the email was not delivered to the Korean observer, only confirmed by the Russian captain. A few days later, the navigator suggested twice that they could pretend not to know about the fishing situation on the vessel if a bribe of \$10,000 to \$20,000 was provided. Both offers were naturally declined.”</p>
67	Russian Federation	<i>Alpha Crux</i>	<p><b>Text of the CCAMLR Scheme of International Scientific Observation, Part D, paragraph (b) (ii)</b>, states that the owner, Master, agent, and crew of a vessel on which a scientific observer is deployed shall not intimidate, or interfere with the duties of a scientific observer.</p> <p>The SISO observer on the Russian flagged <i>Alpha Crux</i> from 16 Nov 2023 to 5 Mar 2024 reported in observer trip report number 2518, the following:</p> <p>In Part 10 – “On January 1, 2024, while Russian crew members were gathering in the wheelhouse and drinking, a physical altercation ensued. During the altercation, verbal abuse and physical violence were exchanged, with the word "OBSERVER" being mentioned twice. Shortly afterward, while the Korean observer was sleeping, a Russian crew member opened the door to their quarters, stepped inside, observed quietly for 1-2 minutes, then left. Upon investigation, it was found that during the altercation, a Russian processor, who was assisting the Korean observer with biological sampling, was stabbed in the abdomen by another Russian crew member. Subsequently, the Russian processor was incapacitated, rendering them unable to perform their duties. As a result, the Korean observer was left alone to handle TOA processing and biological sampling. Requests for additional personnel from the Russian captain were met with refusal.”</p> <p>The Secretariat was notified as per SISO, Part A, paragraph h, of communications on 29 May 2024 between Russia (the Receiving Member) and Korea (the Designating Member) of discrepancies identified by Russia in the observer report which relate to this compliance issue. The Secretariat has not been notified by either party that they were unable to resolve such issues, as required by SISO, Part A, paragraph h.</p>
68	Russian Federation	<i>Alpha Crux</i>	<p><b>Text of the CCAMLR Scheme of International Scientific Observation, Part D, paragraph (b) (vii)</b>, states that the owner, Master, agent, and crew of a vessel on which a scientific observer is deployed shall not interfere with or prevent the observer from communicating with the Designating Member, including by preventing the scientific observer from having access to the vessel’s communication equipment.</p> <p>The SISO observer on the Russian flagged <i>Alpha Crux</i> from 16 Nov 2023 to 5 Mar 2024 reported in observer trip report number 2518, the following:</p>

---

Reference number	Party	Vessel	Implementation summary – Secretariat
			In Part 10 – “The communication methods onboard the vessel were limited to wired telephone and email, but the email function was not operating properly. While emails sent to the Resource Management Authority were successfully transmitted, emails sent to the National Fisheries Research Institute were inexplicably failing to send for reasons unknown.”

---

**Proposed Non-Contracting Party IUU Vessel List 2024/25 (Conservation Measure 10-07)**

**No changes recommended by SCIC to the existing [2023/24 NCP IUU Vessel List](#)**

**Proposed Contracting Party IUU Vessel List 2024/25 (Conservation Measure 10-06)**

**No changes recommended by SCIC to the existing [2023/24 CP IUU Vessel List](#)**

### **Statement by the Delegation of South Africa**

South Africa made the following statement:

‘The *El Shaddai* is currently listed on the CCAMLR IUU fishing vessel list, following alleged unlawful fishing in the Southern Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement (SIOFA) area 51 and CCAMLR closed areas.

When these transgressions from 2015 and 2016 came to the attention of the Department in August 2020, the Department conducted a comprehensive investigation in respect thereof. The findings of this investigation were presented to the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP) for a decision regarding the prosecution of Braxton Security Services as the owner of the vessel.

On 18 April 2023 the DPP advised the Department that it had decided not to prosecute Braxton. On 19 June 2023 the DPP provided his full complete assessment of the evidence and shortcomings of the case. A copy is attached as appendix 1.

In his decision not to prosecute the, DPP advised, amongst others, that the permit conditions attached to the Braxton Patagonian Toothfish permit issued in terms of Section 13 of the Marine Living Resources Act did not clearly define where on the High seas Braxton was permitted to fish. In addition, it was stated that there were no conditions attached to Braxton’s high seas vessel license issued in terms of Section 41 of the Marine Living Resources Act explaining the permissible and impermissible fishing areas.

During October 2023, South Africa attended CCAMLR 42, SCIC and Commission meetings where South Africa representatives provided an overview of the actions undertaken by South Africa in respect of the *El Shaddai*. South Africa formally requested and motivated for the removal of the vessel from the contracting party IUU vessel list as per conservation measure 10-06 paragraph 14 (ii) and (iv).

South Africa’s motivation was based on the actions taken by the country following the decision not to prosecute Braxton due to unclear permit conditions relating to where the vessel was and was not permitted to fish. These actions included:



- inclusion of a comprehensive set of license conditions as part of the high seas fishing licenses.
- a complete review of the Patagonian Toothfish permit conditions clearly stipulating applicable international measures including those under CCAMLR.
- updating the Department 's vessel monitoring system to specifically include RFMO boundaries, so that it could be immediately determined when a vessel might be fishing inside a closed area for example.
- engagement with owners, rights holders and representatives of the *El Shaddai*, clearly explaining the nature of the contraventions and the seriousness of the conduct.
- commitment to the amendment of the Marine Living Resources Act.

At SCIC meetings last year some member countries indicated that the delisting of the *El Shaddai* would be more appropriately considered under conservation measure 10-06 paragraph 14 (iv) and not conservation measure 10-06 paragraph 14 (ii) as it was believed by members that South Africa had not taken effective action in response to the IUU activities, as no prosecution had occurred, and no sanctions were imposed. Concerns were also raised, amongst others, as to whether the measures which South Africa has taken was sufficient to ensure the vessel would not again engage in IUU fishing and that the High Seas license and fishing permit conditions submitted by South Africa remained unclear, including their application to the CCAMLR area. It was subsequently noted that there was an insufficient basis to remove the vessel from the contracting party IUU vessel list.

Consensus was not reached to remove the *El Shaddai* from the contracting party IUU vessel list at the CCAMLR 42.

Despite this the SCIC members encouraged South Africa to continue to explore avenues by which enforcement action could be pursued, including administrative and civil action against the vessel owner and invited South Africa to report back to this SCIC on further changes affected to the conditions of the high seas licenses and fishing permits and on amendments to the relevant legislation to demonstrate that the requirements of CM 10-06 (ii) and (iv) now have been met.

On return from the CCAMLR 42 engagements, South Africa extensively explored all avenues by which action could be pursued and accordingly hereby wish to inform CCMLR and the contracting party members countries of such actions taken.

Amendments were made to the conditions of the high seas vessel license in line with input received from members. These conditions, amongst others, made it clear where fishing can take place, where it cannot take place and where additional authorizations are required before such fishing can take place. A copy of these updated license conditions is attached as appendix 2 and members are referred specifically to condition 2 which deals with fishing areas.

Conditions attached to Patagonian Toothfish permits were likewise revised and enhanced. These permit conditions now specifically state that permit holders may not fish in any area which is subject to a RFMO / international agreement or treaty, which is located outside of the Prince Edward islands EEZ, (without following the relevant notification and other rules and measures of that body), even if part of that area is located within the PEI-EEZ - in this instance the permit holder may only fish in that part of the area subject to an R FM O/ international agreement/ treaty, which is located within the Prince Edward Island EEZ. Links to available map services have also been incorporated. As with the license conditions, feedback received from members of CCAMLR was considered in updating these permit conditions and the conditions were vetted through our Legal Department. A copy of these updated conditions is attached as appendix 3 and members are referred specifically to condition 3 which deals with fishing areas. Comm 24-96

The Department monitors the movement of vessels via VMS and on an electronic system, the Oceans And Coast Information Management System (OCIMS) to specifically include RF MO boundaries, including those previously excluded like SIOFA FAO 51 so that vessels in these areas can be monitored by officials from the operations room.

These officials were also briefed and tasked to prioritize the monitoring of South African vessels operating within the CCAMLR area of competence as well as other RFMO's. The importance of closely monitoring and reporting the movement of these vessels whilst in these areas has been strongly emphasized and reinforced.

South Africa has also visited the Norwegian Government Trade Fisheries Department during April 2024 and is currently cooperating to improve marine domain awareness to detect, address, deter and prevent IUU fishing and related activities.

The Department has, over the years engaged extensively with the owners and representatives of the *El Shaddai*.

As members are aware the criminal prosecution avenue was unsuccessfully exhausted. Another option available to South Africa would be to commence an administrative process to cancel or suspend Braxton's Patagonian Fishing right, meaning that Braxton could only fish for other right holders on the *El Shaddai* if the vessel is delisted, but not for itself. The administrative process was considered but not pursued as South Africa was of the view that similar arguments relating to the interpretation and clarity of permit conditions would be raised. These administrative processes would therefore have been subject to the same constraints and vulnerabilities as a criminal case.

However, since the IUU listing of the vessel, the Department has not issued Braxton with a fishing permit to fish and as such this has in effect meant that Braxton's right has been suspended for some three years since its listing in 2021, which is one of the likely sanctions which would have been imposed had the administrative process been finalized as described above. In addition, Braxton was unable to fish on behalf of the four Right Holders for which they previously fished. These consequences of the IUU vessel listing caused Braxton to suffer financial harm over an extended period of time.

With this in mind the Department requested Braxton to provide financial statements to explain their estimated financial losses caused by the IUU vessel listing. Braxton was specifically requested to provide financial statements for the period of the CCAML and SIOFA infringements accompanied by a signed affidavit explaining its financial statements and projected losses. This affidavit is also required to explain and consider profits from the sale of the Patagonian Toothfish sold during the specific CCAMLR and SIOFA infringement. This was forwarded to parties in COMM CIRC 24-101.

The Department has embarked on a process to amend the Marine Living Resources Act which is the primary legislation in South Africa which governs fishing. In this regard, the Department has been cooperating and engaging with international partners including the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO).

Although this process has commenced, it is a lengthy process requiring Parliamentary approval and it is therefore unlikely to be finalized soon. However, in this process, members' comments made during CCAMLR 43 will be considered and appropriate references to relevant RFMOs and international laws will be included.

It should be noted that Section 42 of the act currently deals with the implementation of international conservation and management measures and subsection 4 thereof states that the minister may from time to time publish by notice in The Gazette particulars of any international conservation and management measures or international agreement concerning marine living resources. In addition Section 58 (2)(a) of the MLRA makes it an offence to contravene any international conservation or management measures. As such there are currently express references in the MLRA to international agreements. However, these provisions will, as indicated above, be further clarified with specific reference to RFMO's and where appropriate CCAMLR itself.

South Africa is of the view that the shortcomings identified by the DPP as set out above have been addressed as have concerns previously raised by members. The conditions now clearly specify where fishing is and is not permitted and Braxton has been repeatedly advised of the nature of the non-compliance and seriousness of the contraventions, including correct interpretation of the relevant RFMOs, which makes future transgression unlikely to take place. However, should there be a contravention of a conservation measure going forward, South Africa is of the view that the interpretational challenges faced by the DPP in the Braxton matter will not arise during prosecution and any other processes which may be instituted.

In addition, although Braxton was not criminally prosecuted and its Patagonian Toothfish right was not cancelled, its fishing right has effectively been suspended since the IUU listing, rendering Braxton unable to fish for itself or any other right holder, resulting in significant financial losses which ought to act as a strong deterrent to any repeated contravention.

In the light of above, South Africa hereby request CCAMLR to consider the removal of the *El Shaddai* from each IUU vessel list in terms of CM 10-06 (14)(iv).

We trust that you will find the above in order should you have any further inquiries please do not hesitate to contact us.'

### Statement by the Delegation of South Africa

South Africa made the following statement:

‘As members are aware, the *El Shaddai* was listed on the CCAMLR IUU Vessel List three years ago in 2021. At the SCIC meeting last year South Africa requested that the vessel be removed from the IUU Vessel List and explained what action it had taken both in respect of effective action and to guard against any future IUU fishing by a South African flagged vessel.

Australia then noted that the request should be in terms of paragraph 14(ii) of CM 10-06 and not 14(iv) as it was said that South Africa had not taken effective action because the prosecuting authority declined to prosecute. It was noted that under paragraph 14(ii) some actions were ongoing (such as amendments to licence and permit conditions) and it was therefore decided by SCIC that there was an insufficient basis to remove the vessel from the IUU list at that time.

Members requested South Africa do further work on the conditions and to report back on further actions taken including changes to licence and permit conditions and any civil or administrative action taken.

On 14 December 2023, South Africa responded by email to questions posed by members of SCIC around the licence and permit conditions. Correspondence in this regard was sent to Australia, the EU, Korea and the United States. South Africa advised that it had incorporated certain of the suggested amendments to the conditions and provided a response to each query. No response or follow up questions were received.

Following the lack of consensus at last year’s SCIC, COMM CIRC 24/96 was circulated to all members of the Commission on 18 September 2024 which detailed an exhaustive list of measures that South Africa had taken to date to guard against any future listing of a South African flagged vessel as well as advised why the administrative enforcement process was not formally followed.

South Africa had hoped that by circulating the extensive document to members 30 days prior to SCIC, any concerns which members had could be addressed upfront and prior

to the meeting. Unfortunately, no comments on the COMM CIRC were received by South Africa.

However, during this SCIC meeting on 15 October 2024, three questions were posed to South Africa which South Africa promptly responded to. The first question related to what the fines are for these types of offences if there is a successful prosecution, the second again related to why South Africa did not take administrative or civil action (which had already been answered in the Coms Circ) and the third was why there is still no explicit reference to SIOFA in the High Seas Vessel Licence conditions. All of these questions have been answered and an amended set of conditions provided to the EU which explicitly prohibits fishing in SIOFA areas.

After the meeting, the EU submitted extensive comments on the High Seas Licence Conditions and Patagonian Toothfish Permit Conditions most of which were unrelated to the specific transgression which led to the listing of *El Shaddai*.

South Africa has done its best to respond to the EU's extensive comments on permit and licence conditions in a very short space of time (less than 24 hours) and in the interests of good faith South Africa has also made, and agreed to make, certain further amendments to the Licence and Permit conditions.

This commitment and willingness by South Africa to further cooperate with the EU must be understood in light of the fact that amending permit conditions is not a quick exercise and it takes time to ensure that any proposed amendments do not result in unintended consequences having regard to SA's broader legal framework. Despite this, it is South Africa's view, the conditions as they stand are more than sufficient to demonstrate compliance with paragraph 14(iv) of CM 10.06 and have incorporated comments made by members at last year's SCIC.

Against this background, South Africa believes that it has cooperated extensively with members and is grateful for the guidance provided by members throughout this process. At this point South Africa is of the view that it has addressed the concerns raised by SCIC last year and done everything possible to guard against any future transgression and to ensure that if such transgression transpires appropriate punishment will follow.

In addition, South Africa has committed to amending its legislative framework to further clarify and broaden the framework with respect to internal agreements and measures during the current amendment process underway in conjunction with the FAO.

At this time it is South Africa's position that further amendments to the permit and licence conditions as proposed at this late stage by the EU ought not to be determinant on whether the delisting is supported or not. Conditions can always be improved and this is why South Africa updates all its conditions annually (it will be updated prior to next season starting 1 Dec – and which will consider the EU input received during this SCIC). South Africa believes that the conditions are now robust but despite this has committed to working with the EU to improve them where necessary.

Although South Africa has requested the removal of the vessel under paragraph 14(iv) and not 14(ii) of CM10-06, the EU again raised the issue of South Africa not cancelling Braxton's right under section 28 of the Marine Living Resources Act for non-compliance with a provision of that Act.

As members are aware, South Africa extensively explored all avenues by which action could be pursued as was described in comm circ 24\_96. The criminal prosecution avenue was unsuccessfully exhausted, as per the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP) detailed reasons provided in the comm circ 24\_96.

As indicated, another option available to South Africa would have been to commence an administrative process to cancel or suspend Braxton's Patagonian Fishing right (Under sec 28 of the MLRA), meaning that Braxton could only fish for other right holders on the *El Shaddai* if the vessel is delisted, but not for itself. The administrative process was considered but not perused as South Africa was of the view that similar arguments relating to the interpretation and clarity of permit conditions would be raised. These administrative processes would therefore have been subject to the same constraints and vulnerabilities as a criminal case. The EU disagrees and says that South Africa might be successful in the section 28 process to cancel the right if reliance instead of being placed on permit conditions, is placed on section 58(2) of the Marine Living Resources Act.

Section 58(2) is the offence provision and provides that Section 58. (2) Any person who contravenes—

(a) a provision of an international conservation and management measure inside or outside South African waters, or otherwise fails to comply with any provision of Part 7 of Chapter 3, by means of a vessel registered in the Republic; or

(b) the conditions imposed in a high seas fishing permit or high seas fishing vessel licence, shall be guilty of an offence and liable on conviction to a fine not exceeding three million rand.

shall be guilty of an offence and liable on conviction to a fine not exceeding three million rand.

It should be noted in that section 58(2) was heavily relied on in the criminal process and was included as a standalone charge in the criminal case. Nothing prevented the prosecutor from proceeding based on this discreet offence and excluding the offences relating to non-compliance with permit conditions. He however declined to do so in his view the permit conditions were unclear and had a bearing on Braxton's guilt. The Department raised the legal maximum that ignorance of the law was no excuse, yet this was not accepted because of the view which he took on the permit conditions. It is therefore South Africa's view, particularly in light of the prosecutor's decision, that the same arguments will be raised in any administrative proceedings and that any decision to cancel the right in terms of section 28 would be susceptible to a successful challenge if taken on review to the high court who would likely share the sentiments of the prosecutor as that document would form part of the record. This court process would take an estimated 3 years to conclude.

In addition, there was a sanction in the sense that Braxton was not issued permits to exercise its right for a three-year period which resulted in losses to the company. The Department could have issued such permits, nothing in law prevented this even while the criminal case was ongoing, and Braxton could have exercised its right on another vessel, but this did not happen. The right was effectively suspended.

However, as mentioned South Africa has not requested the removal of the vessel from the IUU list in terms of paragraph 14(ii) but rather 14(iv) as was suggested at last year's SCIC. The impression created at that SCIC was that removal could be requested under either paragraph and indeed that is how we understand paragraph 14.

In light of this, South Africa again formally requests the delisting of the *El Shaddai* with the support of all members.'



**Report of the Standing Committee on  
Administration and Finance 2024 (SCAF-2024)**



## Contents

	Page
<b>Opening of the meeting</b> .....	247
<b>Organisation of the meeting</b> .....	247
<b>Annual Financial Statements</b> .....	247
<b>Secretariat matters</b> .....	247
Executive Secretary's Report .....	247
Proposal for the Development of a CCAMLR Communications Strategy .....	248
Selection process for the Executive Secretary .....	248
<b>Capacity Building</b> .....	248
Activities of the General Capacity Building Fund (GCBF) .....	248
<b>Review of 2024 Budget, 2025 Draft Budget and 2026 Forecast Budget</b> .....	249
Review of 2024 Budget .....	249
Sustainable financing .....	249
Draft Budget for 2025 and forecast for 2026 .....	251
Recommendation .....	252
<b>Administrative issues</b> .....	252
Proposal for a third performance review .....	252
Code of Conduct .....	253
Distribution of circulars to Observers .....	254
Access to meeting documents / DOI .....	255
Headquarters meeting arrangements .....	255
<b>Other business</b> .....	256
<b>Adoption of the Report</b> .....	256
<b>Close of the meeting</b> .....	256
<b>Appendix I:</b> Terms of Reference for the CCAMLR Public Communications e-Group .....	257
<b>Appendix II:</b> Procedures for Recruitment and Appointment of the Executive Secretary .....	258
<b>Appendix III:</b> 2024 Revised Budget, Draft Budget for 2025 and Forecast Budget for 2026 .....	271
<b>Appendix IV:</b> Members' Contributions 2024, 2025, 2026 .....	274



**Report of the Meeting of the Standing Committee  
on Administration and Finance (SCAF-2024)**  
(Hobart, Tasmania, 16 to 18 October 2024)

**Opening of the meeting**

1. Ambassador M. Gowland (Argentina), in his first 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-43/03 which contains the 2023 Financial Statements. The 2023 Financial Statements were signed off by the Australian National Audit Office (ANAO) on 24 June 2024.
5. SCAF accepted the financial statements for year ended 31 December 2023 and recommended that the Commission adopt the audited financial statements for the 2023 financial year.

**Secretariat matters**

Executive Secretary's Report

6. The Executive Secretary presented CCAMLR-43/05, reporting on and highlighting the work of the Secretariat over the past year and on the Secretariat Strategic Plan 2023–2026.
7. SCAF accepted the report of the Executive Secretary and congratulated the Secretariat on the large amount of work undertaken in the year and the support offered to all Commission and Scientific Committee activities.
8. SCAF noted that as requested at CCAMLR-42 (SCAF-2023, paragraph 9) that the Secretariat was in the process of renewing the lease on the Headquarters Building for the period 2025–2030.
9. SCAF noted the importance of ensuring a comparable level of interpretation into all languages. Russia noted it was particularly relevant to improve the quality of interpretation to and from the Russian language.

10. Russia stressed the need for information about administrative and financial costs for the Secretariat of the consultation of the Executive Secretary with the Australian authorities on the application of the Headquarters Agreement as well as virtual HODS requested by CCAMLR-42 report (paragraphs 12.10 and 12.11).

#### Proposal for the Development of a CCAMLR Communications Strategy

11. The Secretariat introduced CCAMLR-43/26 Rev. 1 containing a proposal for the development of a Communications Strategy as identified in the 2023–2026 Strategic Plan. SCAF endorsed the Terms of Reference for an e-group to undertake this work (Appendix I).

#### Selection process for the Executive Secretary

12. The Secretariat introduced CCAMLR-43/07 which contains the draft procedures for the recruitment and appointment of the Executive Secretary.

13. Responding to a question from Germany the Executive Secretary confirmed that all interviews would be held in person in the first week of CCAMLR-44, allowing for all Heads of Delegation to participate in the interviews. The format of the interviews would be decided at the Heads of Delegation meeting.

14. SCAF endorsed the procedures with the amendment of the advertisement to include the statement that CCAMLR is an equal opportunity employer (Appendix II).

### **Capacity Building**

#### Activities of the General Capacity Building Fund (GCBF)

15. The Secretariat introduced CCAMLR-43/08. The paper presented the activities of the Fund during 2024, noting that there was one application for the general component of the GCBF and five applicants for the travel component in 2024, with combined travel support totalling A\$39 497.

16. SCAF thanked the Panel for the paper and noted:

- (i) the final report for the Uruguay project (COMM CIRC 24/23)
- (ii) the successful applications for travel assistance in 2024 and the successful applicant for the general component in 2024
- (iii) the request for voluntary contributions to the GCBF from Members.

17. Uruguay expressed its gratitude for the project that was financed by the GCBF.

18. SCAF endorsed the recommendation to the Commission to fund the Cap-DLISA project, and requested the Scientific Committee consider providing A\$15 000 from the GSCF to the GCBF towards the cost of the Cap-DLISA project.

19. SCAF endorsed the recommendation to the Commission to modify the Guidelines, to include the words ‘Please include a letter of support from at least one Member with your application’ to form item 7 within Schedule C, Application form for travel support to attend a meeting/workshop.

### **Review of 2024 Budget, 2025 Draft Budget and 2026 Forecast Budget**

20. The Secretariat introduced CCAMLR-43/04, noting that higher demands on the Secretariat and some costs rising at a faster rate than CPI are making it increasingly difficult to deliver long-term financial sustainability of the General Fund.

#### Review of 2024 Budget

21. SCAF commended the Secretariat’s ongoing efforts in achieving efficiency and cost savings to ameliorate the 2024 budgetary deficit, with many Members acknowledging that the Secretariat were making good use of the budgetary resources currently available to them.

22. The Secretariat reported that it was continuing to review its activities to generate cost efficiencies, but that some of these measures were exhausted or unsustainable.

23. SCAF noted that some Members currently have unpaid Member contributions for 2024 (Appendix IV), although no Members have outstanding contributions from prior financial years. The Secretariat reminded SCAF that late payments reduce the interest income available to CCAMLR, with an estimated annual budgetary impact of A\$30 000 to A\$35 000 at current interest rates. Some Members with outstanding contributions indicated either that they had been paid recently or would be paid very soon.

24. SCAF approved the revised budget for 2024 (Appendix III).

#### Sustainable financing

25. As its convenor, Argentina introduced the Report of the Sustainable Financing ICG (CCAMLR-43/09) noting that the Commission had requested it to identify sustainable financing options for increased cost recovery for fisheries management and other administrative activities in 2024 and provide a proposal to CCAMLR-43 (CCAMLR-42, paragraph 10.9). SCAF thanked Argentina and the Secretariat for undertaking the relevant analyses and recognised Members who had contributed to the work of the ICG.

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

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

27. Many Members stated that they could accept Option 1 or 1a. Brazil stated that it preferred Option 3, but in the spirit of compromise could accept Option 1a.

28. China thanked the ICG for its work and expressed its regret that its proposed option was not included in the options. China reiterated that its option, namely all the three elements of funding be increased in equal proportion, should be included as one of the options for the Commission's consideration. China emphasised that there are different interpretations of the Secretariat's calculations on fishery management costs, as the expenses are serving both rational use and protection activities of CCAMLR.-China noted that the significant increase in the workload of the Secretariat in recent years related to environmental issues rather than purely fishery management. Fishery benefit has already been fully considered in the fishing component of contributions. Since the term 'conservation' includes rational use, China considered that the Commission should take a balanced approach to ensure financial sustainability of the General Fund. Increasing the equal share of contributions is consistent with usual practice of international organisations and is more conducive to the sustainable financing of CCAMLR. China also encouraged a more effective use of special funds or other voluntary funds to supplement the general fund.

29. Russia noted that no justification for an increase in income to the General Fund was provided. It proposed the tasks of the Secretariat to be prioritised by the SC, SCIC and the Commission to properly manage the workload of the Secretariat staff, exploring options within the existing budget. Russia suggested that the Secretariat presents the list of staff members with the proposed staffing level to that end.

30. The Secretariat reported that it had improved its efficiencies and continued to look for such opportunities. These included the use of more automation and technological tools. Nevertheless, the Executive Secretary noted that the requests of the Scientific Committee and the Commission, the increases in scientific workload to support new scientific activity, the demands of increasing attendance at meetings, the increasing size and complexity of fisheries in the Convention Area, and the increasing requests from SCIC for compliance and fisheries management services continued to put increasing pressure on the Secretariat which it would not be able to continue to meet without additional income.

31. Many Members indicated the high importance that they placed on achieving sustainable financing for the work of the Commission, and their concern that this might not be achieved this year. They expressed flexibility to consider the various issues raised by other Members, including the option presented by China.



32. Russia pointed out that an appropriate sustainable financing solution needs to be elaborated. Russia considered fishery management as the main task of the Secretariat that should not necessarily provide supplementary income including through the notification fee.

33. Upon the request of SCAF, the Secretariat developed a paper (CCAMLR-43/BG/46) which included all the options presented in CCAMLR-43/09, plus one option expressing the proposal from China. SCAF referred the topic for further consideration to the Commission.

34. The Chair thanked all Members for their flexibility in discussing these issues.

#### Draft Budget for 2025 and forecast for 2026

35. The Secretariat presented the Draft Budget for 2025 (CCAMLR-43/04), noting that it included an additional A\$500 000 income delivered through a sustainable financing option, the appointment of new scientific staff in line with the Strategic Plan, replacement of the Executive Secretary and payment for an essential server upgrade from the General Fund so that the requirements of the Commission and Scientific Committee may be met. This delivered a balanced budget over the period 2025 to 2027, maintaining the General Fund balance around A\$500 000 as assumed in the 2023-2026 Strategic Plan (SCAF-2022, paragraph 46).

36. In the absence of consensus on a preferred sustainable financing approach, the Secretariat also prepared a revised Draft 2025 Budget (Appendices III and IV) in which the Commission's policy of zero real growth was applied for the calculation of the equal share of Members' contributions (CCAMLR-XXI, paragraph 3.28; CCAMLRXXXV, Annex 7, paragraph 30), an increase of 2.7% (Hobart June 2024 CPI).

37. Russia suggested that the Australia CPI be used instead of Hobart CPI, to reflect standard practice of using the national rather than local CPI. Australia CPI for June 2024 was 3.8%. Other Members considered it preferable to continue to apply the Hobart CPI as has been the Commission's past practice.

38. The European Union clarified that some EU Member States (Belgium, Germany and the Netherlands) have a domestic policy of zero nominal growth in Member contributions for international organisations. The European Union also recalled last year's decision on the need to increase the budget and encouraged all to engage actively in the intersessional process as this could contribute to finding consensus.

39. The Executive Secretary noted that in order to achieve this budget the costs of the server upgrade were transferred to the Asset Replacement Fund and the additional staff would not be appointed. He noted that this revised 2025 budget retained a deficit of around A\$170 000 and was not sustainable in the long term. He further noted that the restrictions in the budget would significantly impact the work of the Secretariat, and in the short term reduce its ability to service the needs of the Scientific Committee and Commission, in particular in relation to provision of science support to the development of state of the environment reporting and the krill fishery management approach and to the provision of analyses to support the work of SCIC. He proposed to liaise with the Chairs of the Commission and the Committees to establish the most appropriate prioritisation for its work.

40. Many Members stressed their strong concern at the implications of not agreeing a sustainable financing option and urged that SCAF take a decision accordingly. They noted with concern that not taking a decision would reduce the ability of the Secretariat to service the needs of the Scientific Committee and Commission, in particular the provision of science to support the development of the state of the environment reporting and the krill fishery management approach, and support to compliance work.

41. Russia noted that it would be appropriate to have recommendations from SCIC and the Scientific Committee on priorities to properly balance the workload of the Secretariat and to enable the Commission to achieve budgetary efficiency.

42. Regarding the General Science Capacity Fund, SCAF expressed its concern that with the 2025 planned expenditure there may be insufficient remaining funds to support scholarships beyond 2025.

#### Recommendation

43. SCAF agreed to forward the following issues for consideration by the Commission:

- The baseline draft budget for 2025 and 2026 presented as Appendices III and IV.
- Options for increased funding including the options presented in the paper (CCAMLR-43/BG/46)

#### Administrative issues

44. SCAF noted the website update provided in CCAMLR-43/BG/20.

45. The Secretariat introduced CCAMLR-43/06 (Performance Review 2 – summary of outcomes).

46. Russia noted that the outcomes of intersessional workshops and symposiums as informal events that do not represent findings of the Commission should be differentiated from CCAMLR's formal meetings.

47. Some Members noted that the Commission had agreed to organise intersessional workshops and the harmonisation symposium as a part of the formal agreed program of intersessional work of the Commission.

48. SCAF thanked the Secretariat for this paper and endorsed the recommended changes as they related to SCAF activities.

#### Proposal for a third performance review

49. The EU introduced CCAMLR-43/31 which outlines a proposal of the EU and its Member States for a third CCAMLR performance review (PR3).

50. China suggested that the PR3 should undertake a comprehensive evaluation of the implementation of the Objective of the Convention and that the review panel be composed of six experts, four nominated by CCAMLR Members and two other nominations, with at least one expert from the fishing industry for broad representation. China stressed that the report of PR3 would be of a recommendatory nature and would not be binding unless it is considered and adopted by the Commission.

51. Russia expressed the view that it might be beneficial to postpone a PR3, considering the progress of the PR2.

52. SCAF thanked the EU and its Member States for this paper and due to limitations of time, suggested further discussion take place at the Commission.

### Code of Conduct

53. Australia introduced CCAMLR-43/39 submitted by Australia, France, the Republic of Korea and the United States, which presents a draft Code of Conduct for CCAMLR events as requested by the Commission at CCAMLR-42 (paragraph 10.16). Australia on behalf of the co-proponents noted that the intention of the draft Code is to make clear expectations of individuals attending CCAMLR events (wherever they occur), to act with professionalism and respect for others. The Code outlines behaviours that are not acceptable at such events, including bullying, harassment (including sexual harassment), discrimination, retaliation, applying improper influence, and refusal to engage professionally. The Code also outlines a reporting procedure for individuals who experience or witness inappropriate behaviour at a CCAMLR event. Australia noted that at CCAMLR-42, some Members could not agree to a Code that included a remediation process and as such the revised Code does not include a remediation process. Australia stated that the revised Code provides the means for CCAMLR to agree the standards by which we expect delegates to behave and treat each other while we conduct our important business.

54. Many members thanked Australia, France, the Republic of Korea and the United States for the work done to develop this code. They reiterated the importance of CCAMLR to adhere to best practices of international organisations and considered it very timely to adopt the draft Code of Conduct. They expressed strong support for its implementation.

55. Some Members stated they could not agree to the Code of Conduct as they considered it to be of a political nature and that it exceeded the mandate of the Commission.

56. China was also of the view that there are existing channels and authorities handling such events and that delegates to CCAMLR meetings act as representatives of their respective governments, not subject to the governance of CCAMLR. Furthermore, it considered that CCAMLR enjoys friendly cooperation amongst its Members and is not demanding a code.

57. Russia stressed that good diplomatic traditions guarantee mutual respect, a professional, safe environment for work and that the draft as presented rather promoted internal policies of several states that are outside of internationally accepted practices. It considered that the proposed draft could set an undesirable ground for affecting the status of representatives of Members or organisations. With respect to the conditions of work, Russia noted as a matter of

priority the relevance to set a minimum and maximum temperature to be maintained in the hot country venues.

58. Many Members expressed their disappointment at this position, noting that they were aware of instances of intimidating behaviour that had occurred at CCAMLR meetings in the past, and that the Commission should be able to adopt such actions as it saw fit in furtherance of Article IX.h of the Convention. It was further noted that Codes of Conduct had been implemented in other international organisations of which all Members are a part. Belgium circulated the document ‘Code of Conduct to Prevent Harassment, Including Sexual Harassment, at UN System Events’ ([un.org/codeofconduct](http://un.org/codeofconduct)) as an example.

59. China stated that different international organisations have different natures and situations. The practice of other organisations should be borrowed with caution.

60. Responding to a request, the Secretariat confirmed that it had in place internal policies that covered several of the issues raised in the draft Code of Conduct in regard to the Secretariat staff.

61. Russia requested clarification from the Secretariat whether Standards of Conduct for the International civil service elaborated by the UN ICSC are met by internal policies.

62. Australia thanked Members for their support of the Code and noted it was disappointing to hear from two Members that there is no need for the Code of Conduct. Australia recalled SCAF’s agreement at CCAMLR-41 (2022) on the need to conduct this work. Australia noted that CCAMLR delegates had been subject to inappropriate and unprofessional behaviour in the past and this has been made clear at both SCAF and the Commission at CCAMLR-42 (2023). Through undertaking this work Australia and the co-proponents of the Code have been seeking to respond to this need identified by the membership. Australia noted the two Members’ views opposed to adopting a code and made a clarification for the meeting, that the Code is not a legal document nor imposed on Members and that definitions have been provided for terms in the Code. Australia noted it looked forward to further discussions on the Code at the Commission.

63. As consensus was not reached on the proposal, SCAF referred CCAMLR-43/39 to the Commission.

#### Distribution of circulars to Observers

64. The Secretariat introduced CCAMLR-43/27, which responded to a request at CCAMLR-42 (paragraphs 3.1 to 3.10) that the Secretariat analyse the various categories of information distributed through circulars, as well as create a list of Observer contacts and their status during the intersessional period.

65. SCAF thanked the Secretariat for the work completed in the intersessional period. Many Members supported the paper and recognised the proposal’s value to increase CCAMLR’s organisational transparency.

66. Russia expressed its view that the types of circulars included in the categories should be examined by the Commission. Russia was concerned that some important or confidential information might be included in circulars and could be sent to observers without approval by

the Members. The Secretariat responded that they would apply a high level of precaution to these categorisations and could put additional precautionary safeguards in place for a trial period.

67. As no consensus was reached on the proposal, SCAF referred CCAMLR-43/27 to the Commission for consideration, noting the points raised.

Access to meeting documents / DOI

68. The Secretariat introduced CCAMLR-43/25 which provides details of the Secretariat’s work to implement the Commission request at CCAMLR-41 (SCAF-2022, paragraph 10.13) for improved access to meeting documents. The paper described the project timeframe and Standard Operating Procedures that the Secretariat will use to assign Digital Object Identifiers (DOIs) and enhanced access to CCAMLR meeting documents.

69. SCAF thanked the Secretariat for the paper and endorsed the project workplan and Standard Operating Procedures. SCAF agreed to waive the requirement to expedite this process to clear the backlog of CCAMLR documents submitted prior to 2003, recognising that this would provide cost efficiencies for the Secretariat.

Headquarters meeting arrangements

70. The Secretariat introduced CCAMLR-43/28 which provides an update on Headquarters meeting arrangements, as requested at CCAMLR-41 (SCAF-2022, paragraph 73).

71. Some Members requested the details of Observer attendance figures and suggested that a limit on Observer numbers could be considered. In response the Secretariat provided the figures in Table 1.

Table 1: CCAMLR-43 registrations as at 17 October 2024

	CCAMLR-43		SC-CAMLR-43	
	Onsite	Online	Onsite	Online
Members	208	49	136	36
Acceding States	3	23	2	12
Non-Contracting Parties	4	1	1	0
Other Observers	48	18	43	15
Overall Attendance (excluding Secretariat and staff)	263	91	182	63

72. Noting that the issue of the numbers of in-person observers attending had been discussed by SCAF a number of times in the past, including in CCAMLR-42/23, some Members suggested that SCAF consider options for managing Observer in-person attendance and / or recouping costs associated with their attendance.

73. Some Members supported the recommendation CCAMLR-43/28, paragraph 11 that meeting timing could return to the approach taken prior to 2019 (that the meeting end on the first Friday in November). Other Members supported retaining the present arrangement as decided in 2019 (CCAMLR-38, paragraph 13.9) with the meetings closing on the last Friday in October.

74. As no consensus was reached, SCAF recommended arrangements for meeting dates remain unchanged from the system currently applied (CCAMLR-38, paragraph 13.9).

### **Other business**

75. No other business was noted.

### **Adoption of the Report**

76. SCAF adopted its report.

### **Close of the meeting**

77. SCAF thanked the Chair for being an excellent chair, and for his expert and sensitive guidance to the meeting.

78. The Chair closed the meeting.

**Terms of Reference for the  
CCAMLR Public Communications e-Group**

In the context of the CCAMLR Secretariat's Strategic Plan for 2023–2026, the Public Communications e-group will meet in the first half of each of 2025 and 2026 and undertake the following:

- (i) Consider core communications activities proposed by the Secretariat to enhance CCAMLR's public-facing website and inform its use within a broader strategic communication approach
- (ii) Elaborate a Communications Strategy, taking into account the draft in CCAMLR-43/26 Rev. 1, and related indicators to define and monitor public Communications impact; also taking financial implications into account.

## Procedures for Recruitment and Appointment of the Executive Secretary

### Recruitment Process

#### Process timeline

Placement of advertisements by Members and the Secretariat	No later than 1 February 2025
Deadline for submission of applications (including application form)	No later than 1200 h UTC Saturday 19 April 2025
Applications posted to password-protected page	In language of submission no later than Friday 25 April  Translations to follow by end May.
Endorsements by Members	No earlier than Friday 25 April and no later than Wednesday 7 May 2025
Notification by Members of 10 preferred applicants (in priority order) (reminder to be sent 2 weeks prior)	No later than Friday 18 July 2025
Shortlisted applicants notified	No later than Friday 15 August 2025

#### Advertisement

1. The proposed text for the advertisement for the post of Executive Secretary is given below. The advertisement will be placed on the CCAMLR website and highlighted on the homepage with a link to relevant supplementary information.
2. The approved advertisement will also be placed by the Secretariat through its international recruitment partner, appropriate websites and job search services, and in one international publication (The Economist).
3. Members may also additionally place the advertisement. Before doing so they should notify the Secretariat of their plans and confirm that the placement has not already been made by another Member.

#### Eligible applicants

4. Applicants must satisfy the following selection criteria:



- Be a citizen/national of a State Member of the Commission.
- Have experience of the operations of international, regional and/or intergovernmental organisations.
- Demonstrate a high level of managerial and leadership experience and proven competence, in such areas as:
  - the selection and management of administrative, technical and scientific staff.
  - the preparation of financial budgets and the management of expenditures.
  - the organisation of meetings and provision of Secretariat support for high-level committees.
- Demonstrate an ability to direct processes of change at the substantive and management levels within large institutions of national or international scope.
- Be familiar with Antarctic affairs.
- Be familiar with fisheries and/or ecosystem management.
- Demonstrate competency in the ability to lead and motivate a team of senior and mid-level managers in a multicultural setting, to set strategic direction and program priorities and effectively plan, mobilise and manage resources to deliver expected results.
- Possess a university degree, academic degree, or equivalent qualification.
- Professional competency in English is essential, with proficiency in at least one of the other three languages of the Commission desirable.

#### Submission of applications

5. Only complete applications that include a cover letter, a completed application form and a resumé or curriculum vitae, shall be accepted.
6. Applications must be submitted electronically to the Secretariat through the dedicated portal on the CCAMLR website accessed via the careers page. Only authorised Secretariat staff will have access to applications.
7. Information available to applicants on the CCAMLR portal will include:
  - The advertisement
  - Relevant dates and deadlines
  - The Job Description and list of duties of the Executive Secretary:
    - Is responsible overall for ensuring the effective and efficient operation of the Secretariat.
    - Institutes systematic strategic/corporate planning for the Secretariat, in

consultation with the Commission.

- Coordinates, supports and liaises with the Chairpersons of the Commission, Scientific Committee and its subsidiary bodies, the Standing Committee on Administration and Finance and the Standing Committee on Implementation and Compliance and any ad hoc groups established, in the management of their respective meetings and implementation of work programs for these meetings.
  - Manages the necessary preparations and follow-up for all CCAMLR meetings, including the intersessional work of the Secretariat, the Scientific Committee and its subsidiary bodies as well as for any ad hoc groups established.
  - Cooperates and liaises with international and other organisations on matters of relevance to CCAMLR and promotes the work of CCAMLR internationally.
  - Appoints and manages all scientific, technical and administrative staff necessary for CCAMLR to achieve its objective, implementing transparent recruitment procedures, appropriate staffing structures and management systems.
  - Creates an environment that promotes staff development and positive staff values and maximises their contribution to the organisation.
  - Develops and implements a performance assessment process for all staff members, including the Executive Secretary.
  - Oversees the collection, collation and dissemination of information on harvesting, illegal, unregulated and unreported fishing, catch documentation and other data as required and in accordance with the conservation measures and CCAMLR objectives, and provides for regular reports on the status of these data holdings to be made to the Commission and Scientific Committee.
  - Is responsible for the preparation of the financial budgets for expenditure and forecast budgets for the Commission's consideration and ensures that expenditure is in accordance with the approved budgets.
- Links to relevant standard documents (Convention text, Staff and Financial Regulations, Headquarters Agreement)
  - List of Member Contacts
  - Information on the application process including a link to the Standard Application Form and a link to the portal for lodgement and uploading of files

8. On receipt of a complete application the Secretariat will acknowledge receipt, advise the Chair of the lodgement of the application, and notify the relevant Member contact.

9. Each complete application received will be translated by the Secretariat into each of the official languages of the Commission and will be accessible to authorised representatives of CCAMLR Members. Translation will be limited to the body of the application (approximately 3500 words). All lists (projects; publications; awards etc) will be annexed and not translated.

## Member nominations

10. Each Member of the Commission may endorse candidates who have submitted applications by the due date. Members should not forward their endorsements, if any, until after the closing date for applications. It is not compulsory for Members to endorse applicants, however, should a Member choose to do so, the Member will cover the attendance costs of its nominees should that person, or persons, be shortlisted for interview.

## Ranking of applicants

11. From among applications received, each Member will notify the Chair through the Secretariat of its ten (10) preferred candidates in order of preference (1st for top preference, 2<sup>nd</sup> for second preference etc). The Secretariat will regularly remind Members of their obligation to undertake this ranking by the due date. Member rankings received after the deadline will not be considered.

12. The day after the due date for the submission of rankings, the Chair will aggregate individual applicants' rankings, awarding 10 points for a first preference, 9 points for a second preference etc. The Chair will record of all Members voting and not voting (Commission Rule 4(b)).

## Short list

13. The five candidates with the highest aggregate scores will be shortlisted for interview. If any shortlisted candidate withdraws their application, they will be replaced by the next ranked candidate. The Chair will arrange for Members to be informed of the results of the ranking and the candidates who have been selected for interview.

## Interview process

14. The Chair will arrange for Members of the Commission to be advised of shortlisted candidates. Shortlisted candidates will be invited to the next meeting of the Commission where the Chair of the Commission will make arrangements for the final selection process.

15. Interviews and selection will take place in the first week of the CCAMLR-44 Commission meeting. The final selection will be as agreed after consultation with Heads of all Delegations in accordance with Article XII, paragraph 1, of the Convention.

16. Economy class travel and per diem expenses of candidates invited for final selection will be reimbursed by the Commission except where a Member of the Commission pays for these costs directly. Members are strongly urged to assume these costs.

17. The shortlisted candidates will be notified of the final selection decision of the Commission.

Start date

18. The chosen candidate will report to the Secretariat Headquarters in late February 2026 for a handover lasting at least 7 working days before the departure of the incumbent Executive Secretary.

## **Advertisement**

### **Executive Secretary of the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR)**

The Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR) invites applications for the position of Executive Secretary.

CCAMLR is an international organisation, with Headquarters in Hobart, Australia, responsible for giving effect to the objectives and principles of the Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources which provides for the conservation and rational use of marine living resources in waters adjacent to Antarctica.

The Executive Secretary manages an administrative, technical and scientific staff; presents and manages the Commission budget and associated programme of work; and organises the meetings of the Commission, the Scientific Committee and their subsidiary bodies.

#### Selection criteria

- Be a citizen/national of a State Member of the Commission.
- Have experience of the operations of international, regional and/or intergovernmental organisations.
- Demonstrate a high level of managerial and leadership experience and proven competence, in such areas as:
  - the selection and management of administrative, technical and scientific staff.
  - the preparation of financial budgets and the management of expenditures.
  - the organisation of meetings and provision of Secretariat support for high-level committees.
- Demonstrate an ability to direct processes of change at the substantive and management levels within large institutions of national or international scope.
- Be familiar with Antarctic affairs.
- Be familiar with fisheries and/or ecosystem management.
- Demonstrate competency in the ability to lead and motivate a team of senior and mid-level managers in a multicultural setting, to set strategic direction and program priorities and effectively plan, mobilise and manage resources to deliver expected results.
- Possess a university degree, academic degree, or equivalent qualification.
- Professional competency in English is essential, with proficiency in at least one of the other three languages of the Commission desirable.

## Salary and allowances

The appointment will be for a term of four years with the possibility of one additional four-year appointment. Appointment will be at Level D1 step I on the International Civil Service Commission salary scale for the professional and higher categories. Details of remuneration and allowances are available on request from the Finance and Administration Manager, CCAMLR Secretariat ([recruitment@ccamlr.org](mailto:recruitment@ccamlr.org)).

## Availability

Unless otherwise agreed with the Chair of the Commission, the individual selected for the post of Executive Secretary must be available to commence work at least 7 working days prior to the departure of the incumbent Executive Secretary on Friday 6 March 2026 and will assume the post on that day.

## Additional information

CCAMLR is an equal opportunity employer.

Please consult the CCAMLR website at [link] for complete information on duties, selection criteria, staff regulations and the application process.

## Closing date

Applications must be received no later than 1200 h **UTC** Saturday 19 April 2025. Applicants are requested to submit their applications as soon as practically possible.

## Applications

Applications should be made through the dedicated portal on the CCAMLR website accessed via the career's page [link]

## Applications must include

- A cover letter of maximum 500 words. This will be translated by the Secretariat.
- The Standard Application Form detailing experience against the selection criteria name and containing full contact details for three (3) referees with professional knowledge of the applicant's competencies. Only the referees for shortlisted candidates will be contacted. Word limits must be adhered to. This will be translated by the Secretariat.
- A CV or resumé consisting of a maximum 1000 words of narrative containing information not otherwise presented in the application form (eg previous posts held).

Other information including but not limited to lists of publications, projects, and awards may be attached as Annexes. Only the narrative part of a CV will be translated.

## Standard Application Form



# CCAMLR

---

## Standard Application Form

### Personal details

Name:

Address:

Phone number(s):

Email address:

Citizenship:

### University and Advanced Degrees

List degrees and years awarded. Note that Shortlisted applicants will be required to bring copies of academic certificates or other qualifications, as applicable, to interview.

### Language proficiency in English, French, Russian, Spanish

Note level of proficiency by using the appropriate number: 0 = none; 1 = fair; 2 = intermediate; 3 = advanced; 4 = superior; 5 = native

	Reading	Writing	Speaking
English			
French			
Russian			
Spanish			



**Professional and management experience (250-word limit for each of the following 8 questions)**

1. Experience or detailed knowledge of the operations of international, regional and/or intergovernmental organisations (max 250 words).

2. Demonstration of a high level of managerial and leadership experience and proven competence, (max 250 words) in such areas as:
- a. the selection and management of administrative, technical and scientific staff
  - b. the preparation of financial budgets and the management of expenditures
  - c. the organisation of meetings and provision of Secretariat support for high-level committees.

3. Demonstrated ability to direct processes of change at the substantive and management levels within large institutions of national or international scope (max 250 words).

4. Familiarity with Antarctic affairs (max 250 words).

5. Familiarity with fisheries and/or ecosystem management (max 250 words).

## Competencies

6. Ability to lead and motivate a team of senior and mid-level managers in a multicultural setting (max 250 words).

7. Ability to determine and communicate a clear strategic direction, including interdisciplinary dimensions, and set clear program priorities (max 250 words).

8. Ability to translate strategy into sustainable action and effectively plan, mobilise and manage resources to deliver expected results (max 250 words).

## Referees and testimonials

Provide the name and full contact details for three (3) referees with professional knowledge of the applicant's competencies. Only the referees for shortlisted candidates will be contacted.

Referee 1:

Referee 2:

Referee 3:

**Checklist:**

To submit your application online, you must include the following:

- **This Standard Application Form**
- **A Cover letter** (a maximum 500 words, which will be translated)
- **Your Curriculum vitae** (a maximum 1000 words of narrative, which will be translated.  
All other material should be in annexes and will not be translated)

**Budget for Recruiting the Executive Secretary**

<b>A. 2025 BUDGET</b>	
<b>1. International advertising</b> in periodicals (the Economist) and using Secretariat’s contract search partners	A\$7 000 <sup>1</sup>
<b>2. Travel and per diem expenses for shortlisted applicants</b> Based on five applicants invited for interview, all travelling internationally, including travel and subsistence costs.	A\$33 000
<b>TOTAL 2025 General Fund Budget</b>	A\$33 000
<b>TOTAL 2025 Staff Replacement Fund</b>	A\$7 000
<b>B. 2026 FORECAST BUDGET</b>	
<b>1. Airfares for relocation of Executive Secretary</b> Approximate economy costs for a family of four.	A\$15 000 <sup>1</sup>
<b>2. Installation grant</b> One month’s salary for installation.	A\$20 000
30 days Hobart per diem rate for one person, a maximum of 15 days per diem for any dependents	A\$20 000 <sup>1</sup>
<b>3. Removal costs</b> Approximate cost based upon up to one international shipping container.	A\$30 000 <sup>1</sup>
<b>4. Sundry</b> Insurance and storage of goods, vehicle expenses.	A\$7 000 <sup>1</sup>
<b>5. Changeover</b> 7-day handover period.	A\$7 000
<b>TOTAL 2026 in General Fund Budget</b>	A\$27 000
<b>TOTAL 2026 in Staff Replacement Fund</b>	A\$72 000

---

<sup>1</sup> These amounts may be funded from the Staff Replacement Fund.

## 2024 Revised Budget, Draft Budget for 2025 and Forecast Budget for 2026

	2024	2025	2026	Notes
	Revised budget	Draft budget	Forecast budget	
<b>General Fund</b>				
<b>Income</b>				
Core Members' Contribution	4 368 968	4 489 583	4 596 109	Assuming no new members joining in 2025 or 2026
Additional income		-	-	Additional income to generate a balanced budget.
Interest	210 251	176 919	159 876	Investment interest rates are assumed to gradually decline in 2025 and 2026
Staff Assessment Levy (SAL)	710 000	692 034	746 733	The SAL represents income deducted from staff salaries in respect of tax.
Sales (Tagging)	63 300	65 009	66 634	Tagging equipment costs are passed on to the fishing companies in the form of cost-recovery.
Miscellaneous income – Fishery Notifications	711 158	725 311	758 447	Provision is made for refunds of notification fees if fishing in some areas does not proceed.
Miscellaneous income – Rent Contributions	502 794	516 369	529 278	Rent expenditure expected to increase at CPI
Miscellaneous income – Grants	185 740	220 000	-	Final payment from the 2024 EU grant (Ref. 101092707).
Miscellaneous income – Other	70 000	80 000	82 000	Income from hiring out Secretariat meeting facilities transferred to the Asset Replacement Fund
Fund Transfers	- 70 000	- 80 000	- 82 000	Transfers to the Asset Replacement Fund
<b>Total income</b>	<b>6 752 210</b>	<b>6 885 224</b>	<b>6 857 078</b>	
<b>Expenditure</b>				
Salaries	4 625 287	4 637 510	4 807 995	No recruitment of one vacant position approved within the Strategic Plan 2023-2026.
Equipment	450 508	461 770	388 315	Minor capital items, annual software and hardware purchases/leases web site and data systems.
Depreciation	205 000	184 750	194 750	Equipment purchased over A\$1 000 is depreciated over its estimated useful life.
Insurance and Maintenance	203 343	213 427	223 762	Insurance and building service costs (rates etc) continue to increase strongly.
Training	15 400	15 785	16 180	Training remains an important priority for the Secretariat and is delivered efficiently to save costs.
Meeting Facilities	566 600	580 765	595 284	Covers CCAMLR meetings hosted at Headquarters.
Travel	150 000	203 000	175 075	Travel to support CCAMLR working groups, other meetings and international representation.
Printing	10 686	10 974	11 249	
Communications	20 503	21 056	21 583	
Sundry (incl. audit)	143 915	147 513	151 200	Includes audit, recruitment and legal costs.
Rent/cost of goods (tagging)	566 094	581 378	595 913	Contributions from the Australian and Tasmanian governments and COGS expenditure.
<b>Total expenditure</b>	<b>6 957 335</b>	<b>7 057 929</b>	<b>7 181 305</b>	
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.

	2024	2025	2026	Notes
	Revised budget	Draft budget	Forecast budget	
Transfer to Asset Replacement Fund				Transfers to the ARF are not anticipated.
<b>Surplus/–Deficit</b>	<b>- 205 124</b>	<b>- 172 704</b>	<b>- 324 227</b>	
General Fund balance at 01 January	730 577	525 453	352 748	
<b>General Fund balance at 31 December</b>	<b>525 453</b>	<b>352 748</b>	<b>28 251</b>	Note reducing General Fund balance

## Equity Funds

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

## Special Funds

	2024	2025	2026	Notes
	Revised Budget	Budget	Forecast	
<b>Special Funds</b>				All special funds have some income from investment interest.
<b>General Capacity Building Fund</b>				
Income	4 988	3 276	1 902	
Transfer GSCF to GCBF	15 000			
Expenditure	- 70 000	- 69 475	- 21 235	The GCBF supported 5 travel applications (A\$40 000) and paid the final A\$30 000 of the Uruguay Grant in 2024
Balance at 31 December	172 375	106 176	86 843	

	2024	2025	2026	Notes
	Revised Budget	Budget	Forecast	All special funds have some income from investment interest.
<b>CDS fund</b>				
Income	29 794	24 482	20 160	
Expenditure	- 70 000	- 187 500	- 78 000	Expenditure as approved by SCIC
Balance at 31 December	1 288 177	1 125 158	1 067 318	
<b>General Science Capacity Fund</b>				
Income	6 821	3 439	616	
Expenditure				
Workshop Support	- 10 000	-15 000		
Scholarships	- 45 000	- 60 000	- 60 000	Provision for funding 2 scholarships and 3 conveners per year at the increased rates agreed by the Scientific Committee in 2022
Convenor Travel Support	- 60 000	- 75 000	- 60 000	
Transfer GSCF to GCBF	-15 000			
Balance at 31 December	180 960	34 400	-84 984	
<b>MPA Fund</b>				
Income	4 256	3 687	3 542	
Expenditure				
Balance at 31 December	193 994	197 681	201 223	
<b>CCAMLR Ecosystem Monitoring Program (CEMP) Fund</b>				
Income	11 890	9 229	7 306	
Expenditure	- 56 432	- 87 075	- 68 527	Expenditure on approved CEMP projects
Balance at 31 December	485 598	407 752	346 530	

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

Note: Contributions may be adjusted as a result of any sustainable financing review

	Contributions 2024	Balance Outstanding (18 October 2024)	Draft Contributions 2025	Forecast Contributions 2026
Argentina	149 986		154 036	157 887
Australia	169 531		172 828	176 450
Belgium	149 986	149 986	154 036	157 887
Brazil	149 986		154 036	157 887
Chile	163 657	34 316	167 000	169 878
China	190 953		197 837	193 615
Ecuador	149 986	149 064	154 036	157 887
European Union	149 986		154 036	157 887
France	184 597		189 302	194 259
Germany	149 986		154 036	157 887
India	149 986		154 036	157 887
Italy	149 986		154 036	157 887
Japan	150 987		155 186	159 324
Republic of Korea	180 061		184 050	188 169
Namibia	149 986	10 386	154 036	157 887
Netherlands	149 986	149 986	154 036	157 887
New Zealand	155 548		158 462	162 227
Norway	290 104		306 643	322 037
Poland	149 986		154 036	157 887
Russia	151 432	6 573	155 036	157 887
South Africa	151 875	151 875	155 529	159 107
Spain	152 227		156 536	160 857
Sweden	149 986		154 036	157 887
Ukraine	165 562		167 874	171 299
UK	160 865		165 747	169 276
USA	149 986		154 036	157 887
Uruguay	151 750		155 088	159 197
	4 368 968	652 186	4 489 583	4 596 109