

COMM CIRC 09/128 SC CIRC 09/65 **Tuesday, 24 November 2009**

Consolidated Revision of Report on Preliminary Impact Assessment for New and Exploratory Fisheries in 2009/10

Telephone: +61 3 6210 1111 **Fax**: +61 3 6224 8744

Email: ccamlr@ccamlr.org

Web: ccamlr.org

PO Box 213, North Hobart, Tasmania 7002 Australia 181 Macquarie Street, Hobart, Tasmania 7000 Australia



CCANLLR PO BOX 213, NORTH HOBART, TASMANIA 7002 AUSTRALIA 181 MACQUARIE STREET, HOBART, TASMANIA 7000 AUSTRALIA Website: www.ccamlr.org

TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION AND THE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE

COMM CIRC 09/128 SC CIRC 09/65 24 November 2009

Consolidated Revision of Report on Preliminary Impact Assessment for New and Exploratory Fisheries in 2009/10

Following the procedure agreed by the Commission (CCAMLR-XXVIII, paragraph 12.18(i–v); COMM CIRC 09/123–SC CIRC 09/62 refers), the Chair of the Scientific Committee and the Convener of WG-FSA received only one comment, from the USA (attached), and have provided a consolidated revision of the report card (SC-CAMLR-XXVIII, Annex 5, Table 17 Rev. 2, also attached) with the following commentary:

COMM CIRC 09/127, reported that 'the Republic of Korea has withdrawn two vessels from Division 58.4.3b (*Insung No. 1* and *Insung No. 66*), two vessels from Subarea 88.1 (*Insung No. 2* and *Insung No. 66*) and one vessel from Subarea 88.2 (*Insung No. 66*)'. It should be noted that VME assessments by Korea in respect of the two Korean vessels notified for Division 58.4.3a, and the one remaining Korean vessel notified for Division 58.4.3b, were unavailable for review by the Chair and the Convener and are not included in the assessment in the revision of Table 17. Clarification of this has been added to Footnote 6 of the revised report card.

Members are kindly requested to consider the next stage of the procedure as set out in CCAMLR-XXVIII, paragraph 12.18(vi-vii), and the dates therein.

Dr D.G.M. Miller Executive Secretary

Attch.

17 November 2009

Dr. David Agnew, Chair Scientific Committee Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources

Dear David,

As per the agreement described in Paragraph 12.18 of CCAMLR-XXVIII, I am sending this letter to comment on the contents of SC CIRC 09/62 (also COMM CIRC 09/123), the bottom fishing impact assessment report card that was updated by yourself and Dr. Christopher Jones (Convener of WG-FSA) to include information provided by Russia and the Republic of Korea.

I would like to thank you and Christopher, and I found that your efforts usefully placed the information provided by Russia and Korea in context with information provided by other Members. The Russian and Korean information fell within the range of that provided by others. I note that, given the lack of detail in notifications made in accordance with CM 22-06, WG-FSA previously concluded it is difficult to review whether the proposed fishing activities will contribute to significant adverse impacts of VMEs (SC-CAMLR-XXVIII, Annex 5, paragraph 10.19). In my opinion, this difficulty remains despite the addition of information provided by Russia and Korea. However, since the impacts of fishing gear on seabed communities are cumulative (SC-CAMLR-XXVIII, Annex 10, paragraph 3.8) and the updated report card indicates an increased level of fishing effort relative to the original report card, I also think that the information presented in the updated report card may indicate increased risks that fishing activities will contribute to significant adverse impacts on VMEs. Finally, I note that SC CIRC 09/62 states "the preliminary impact assessment provided by the Republic of Korea is incomplete as there were no preliminary impact assessments for two of the divisions in which Korea has notified its intention to undertake new and exploratory fisheries." Obviously, for these divisions, it is not possible to determine whether Korea's proposed fishing activities will contribute to significant adverse impacts on VMEs nor to evaluate their proposed mitigation measures.

Thank you for circulating the report card,

George M. Watters, Representative to the Scientific Committee

United States of America



Table 17 Rev. 2: Evaluation report card of assessments of bottom fishing activities submitted under the pro forma in Conservation Measure 22-06, Annex A. NA – unknown; NR – information not provided; L – minimal detail or summary information; M – some detailed information provided, some discussion; H – detailed data provided, detailed discussion of potential impacts.

| Member/Gear | Argentina | Japan | Korea, Republic of | New Zealand | Russia | South Africa | Spain | UK | Uruguay | Total |
|---|------------------------|-------|-----------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|-------|---------|---------|-------|
| Number of vessels ¹ | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 23 |
| Number of subareas/divisions | 2 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 5 | |
| Notifications (vessel*fishery) | 2 | 5 | 28 | 13 | 5 ² | 2 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 70 |
| Assessment submitted by deadline | + | + | - | + | - | + | + | + | + | 7/9 |
| 1.1 Scope | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.2 Proposed fishing activity | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.2.1 Detailed description of gear | M | M | M | Н | M | M | M | L | M | |
| 1.2.2 Scale of proposed activity (number of sets in the season) | 170 | 400 | 1005 ³ | 500 | 244 ⁴ + 120 ⁵ | NA | 110 | 471 | NA | |
| 1.2.3 Spatial distribution of activity | L | L | L | L | L | L | L | L | L | |
| 1.3 Mitigation measures to be used | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | |
| Effectiveness | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | |
| 2.1 Assessment of known/anticipated impacts on VMEs | L | M | L^6 | Н | NA | NR | NA | M | L | |
| 2.1.1 Estimated spatial effort footprint Please provide details of % area covered by fishing effort. | 1.2 km ² | NR | 1.102% | NA | 0.002% + <0.001% | <20% | 0.37% | 0.0035% | NA | |
| 2.1.2 Summary of potential VMEs present within areas of activity | L | L | L | Н | L | NR | M | Н | NR | |
| 2.1.3 Probability of impacts | L | L | L | Н | L | L | M | Н | NR | |
| 2.1.4 Magnitude/severity of the interaction of the proposed fishing gear with VMEs | L | L | L | Н | L | L | Н | M | NR | |
| 2.1.5 Physical and biological/ecological consequences of impact | L | L | L | Н | L | L | Н | L | NR | |
| 2.2 Estimated cumulative footprint | NR | L | NR | 0.00 88% | NR | NR | NR | 0.12% | NR | |
| 2.3 Research activities related to provision of new information on VMEs | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.3.1 Previous research | L | L | L | Н | L | L | M | M | NR | |
| 2.3.2 In-season research | L | L | L | L | L | L | M | M | L | |
| 2.3.3 Follow-on research | L | L | L | Н | L | L | M | L | NR | |
| Cumulative assessment quality | L | L | L | Н | L | L | M | M | L | |

This assessment is based on the original number of vessels notified – noting that Korea, New Zealand and the UK have subsequently indicated that are withdrawing some vessels (CCAMLR-XXVIII, paragraph 11.4).

² Includes Subarea 48.2 but not Subarea 48.4.

³ Estimate includes reported effort last year where no details were given for next year, no information was available to two divisions.

⁴ Estimated from 4 800 hooks/set, 27 500 hooks/day, 30 days for each of 2 longline vessels + 3 lines of traps for 40 days for the pot vessel.

⁵ Longlines and pots respectively.

Complete information for an assessment of section 2 was only available for two vessels, *Jung Woo No. 2* and *Jung Woo No. 3*. For two Divisions (58.4.3a and 58.4.3b) no VME assessments were available for review.