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1 This report was prepared by Claire Christian, Lyn Goldsworthy, Rob Nicoll, Ricardo Roura, Barry Weeber, Rodolfo Werner, and Bob Zuur.
I. Overview

The Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR) held its XXXV Meeting at the Secretariat Headquarters in Hobart (Australia), from October 17 to 28 October 2016. The Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition (ASOC) has observer status and attends CCAMLR meetings every year. ASOC participated in the discussions of the Scientific Committee; the Standing Committee on Implementation and Compliance (SCIC) and the Commission meeting.

1. Summary of Outcomes

Positive

- CCAMLR agreed CM 91-05: Ross Sea region marine protected area.
- CCAMLR agreed CM 51-06: General measure for scientific observation in fisheries for *Euphausia superba*.
- CCAMLR agreed CM 24-04: Establishing time-limited Special Areas for Scientific Study in newly exposed marine areas following ice-shelf retreat or collapse in Statistical Subarea 48.1, Subarea 48.5 and Subarea 88.3.
- CCAMLR made progress on several issues that have stalled for the past several years.

Negative

- CCAMLR could not agree CMs regulating transhipment or banning shark finning.
- A general drift into "balancing" conservation and rational use as the default mode for decision making, with conservation instruments largely a means to facilitate science and fisheries research.

Presently Indeterminate

- Resolution of *Yantar 35* anomalous catches.

2. ASOC Activities at CCAMLR XXXV

ASOC submitted nine Information Papers:

- CCAMLR-XXXV/BG/08 The *Hongjin* 707: Case study and recommended next steps for CCAMLR
- CCAMLR-XXXV/BG/23 How fishing and marine protection can coexist in the Southern Ocean: An economic analysis of the Ross Sea and East Antarctic MPA proposals
- CCAMLR-XXXV/BG/24 Follow up to the Joint CEP/SC-CAMLR Workshop on Climate Change and Monitoring
- CCAMLR-XXXV/BG/25 Progress on Southern Ocean protection and vessel activity
- CCAMLR-XXXV/BG/26 A representative system of CCAMLR MPAs: Current proposals and beyond

---

2 The Scientific Committee meeting took place from 17-21 October, and the Commission meeting took place from 17-28 October.
3 The Scientific Committee and SCIC are both subsidiary bodies of the Commission and put forward recommendations for the Commission to take the relevant decisions concerning the marine living resources of the Southern Ocean.
- CCAMLR-XXXV/BG/27 Collaborating to eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) fishing in the Southern Ocean
- SC-CAMLR-XXXV/BG/17 Antarctic krill fisheries management and the need to retain CM 51-07
- SC-CAMLR-XXXV/BG/18 Antarctic krill fisheries management: "What's next?"
- SC-CAMLR-XXXV/BG/30 Tracking Antarctica, A New WWF report on the state of Antarctica and the Southern Ocean

ASOC published two issues of the international newspaper ECO. The Antarctic Ocean Alliance (AOA) held a successful reception for delegates. Additionally, Pew sponsored a luncheon to introduce the MAPPPD database (an online tool for analysing pygoscelid penguin colonies) and the Antarctic Wildlife Research Fund (AWR), of which ASOC is a part, held a luncheon to introduce the projects that received funding in 2017. ASOC had numerous formal and semi-formal exchanges with delegates in ad-hoc meetings, coffee breaks, receptions, etc.

II. List of ASOC Participants

Environmental NGOs were represented on the following national delegations:
Australia: Alistair Graham (WWF-Australia) Lyn Goldsworthy (The Frank Fenner Foundation) - New Zealand: Barry Weeber (ECO)
South Korea: Eunhee Kim (KFEM)
United Kingdom: Rod Downie (WWF UK)
United States: Ryan Dolan (The Pew Charitable Trusts)

The ASOC Delegation was represented by:
Cassandra Brooks (Stanford University), Julian Chen (AOA), Claire Christian (ASOC – head of delegation), Barbara Cvrkel (Pew Charitable Trusts), Samara Constable (Frank Fenner Foundation), Ryan Dolan (Pew Charitable Trusts), Elsa Evers (AOA), Jim Gray (Pew Charitable Trusts), Chris Johnson (WWF-Australia), Andrea Kavanagh (Pew Charitable Trusts), Reinier Hille Ris Lambers (WWF-Netherlands), Rob Nicoll (AOA), Dr. Ricardo Roura (AOA), Paul Sheridan (Pew Charitable Trusts), Amanda Sully (AOA), Seth Sykora-Bodie (Duke University) Mike Walker (AOA), Dr. Rodolfo Werner (Pew Charitable Trusts/ASOC), and Bob Zuur (WWF-Germany).

Media support was provided externally by Dave Walsh (AOA).

The ASOC Team at CCAMLR XXXV. Front row (left to right, kneeling): [I've attached a couple of photos]

III. Issues and Outcomes

1. Marine Protected Areas

As in previous years, the issue of MPAs was high on the agenda. While the proposals for East Antarctica and the Ross Sea MPAs were once again on the table, the EU also presented a proposal for a Weddell Sea MPA, which was developed by Germany. There was an update on progress made in Domain 1/Antarctic Peninsula as well. While there were some expectations that there might be some progress in the Ross Sea proposal, this was by no means granted, and at the SC-CAMLR meeting ASOC made a strong intervention summarising discussions and the status of the MPA discussion, and reminded Members that in line with their 2009 commitments and CM 91-04, CCAMLR members must adopt meaningful MPAs across the nine planning domains, starting at this meeting.

East Antarctica

The revised proposal for East Antarctic Representative System of Marine Protected Areas (EARSMPA) was introduced during the first day of the Commission. The EARSMPA proponents
(Australia, EU and its Member States Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Poland, Spain, Sweden and UK) noted that the proposal was first presented to the SC in 2010 and that the draft CM has been under consideration since 2012. The proposal aims to provide added protection to important areas representative of Antarctic marine ecology and establish science reference areas, while permitting multiple uses consistent with the objectives of the MPA and utilising adaptive management approaches. While the fundamental principles remain the same, significant compromises had been made to take account of the views of Members since then, including changing the MPA from a closed system with multi-use activities requiring approval to an open system where all activities may be proposed for consideration.

The Commission continued its discussion of the proposal later in its meeting. The EARSMPA proponents stressed that establishment of the MPA did not compromise any existing rights of Members and that the proposal is consistent with CM 91-04 obligations. In supporting the proposal moving forward to drafting group, Norway and USA noted that while this is a different approach to the Ross Sea MPA, the flexible system which permits resource use within an MPA was very appropriate for this data-poor region within this domain and fits well with CCAMLR's mandate. Korea and Chile also expressed their support. Japan noted that all its concerns had been considered other than the issue of duration.

Russia acknowledged that progress had been made but noted it still had issues of principle. In their view, each MPA element of the proposal should be presented as separate MPAs and that there was no standard for what level of data is required to support the development of a proposal. China expressed concern about the proposed duration and sought clarification on what specific activities would be inconsistent with the objectives and what activities would be managed, restricted or prohibited as well as additional detail on the proposed research plan. As the AOA paper on MPAs and fishing points out some of the areas currently are closed to toothfish fishing.

The proposal was not progressed.

Ross Sea
The Ross Sea proposal was introduced immediately after the opening of the meeting along with the other proposals. Significant discussions took place on the margins and ultimately the US and New Zealand uploaded a revised CM on Tuesday night of the second week. It included several provisions that had been negotiated with the Russian delegation:

- 50 year designation for the GPZ and KRZ with a hard stop
- 30 year designation for the SRZ
- Increase in SRZ catch limit from 13 to 15% of the overall catch limit

Japan and China made it clear during the discussions that they wanted more discussion on the period of designation.

Following further discussions on the margins and during CM drafting group, consensus was finally reached and the MPA was agreed. The last remaining issue was the extent of duration, with discussions on the margin dropping the positions of "permanence" and "very short duration" (undefined but ranging on 10-25 years in several statements) before a final figure was agreed by HODs behind closed doors. The ultimate result was that the overall designation for the MPA was 35 years, with a designation of 30 years for the SRZ. The announcement that the CM had been agreed was greeted with much celebration, and the next day in plenary. Most Members made positive statements, with many though indicating that the 35 year duration was less than ideal and that permanence is preferred. The general mood was much more positive than it had been in previous years at the end of CCAMLR.
The MPA will come into force on 1 December 2017. There are a number of associated issues that will need to be sorted including opening up currently zero catch limit toothfish areas outside the MPA in 88.1 and the catch limits and measures that will apply. Further work on the development of the research and monitoring plan to be submitted to the next CCAMLR meeting. This will include an international workshop.

In general, ASOC supports the new CM 91-05:

- The boundaries did not change, especially in relation to the Balleny Islands, Scott Island or the Shelf. Many critical habitats remain protected.
- Although not permanent, the duration of 35 years is longer than the 20 years (or even 10 years) some Members suggested. Several Members made it clear that this was not precedent setting.
- Fishing shifted to the north and east away from key predators and in areas with less ice – AOA produced an excellent report on the fisheries impacts of the RSRMPA.

The news of the designation resulted into excellent media coverage around the globe, often including ASOC and its members.

**Weddell Sea**

Germany introduced the EU’s proposal for an MPA in the Weddell Sea, which included a promotional video. The proposal covers most of the key areas needing protection and is quite restrictive on krill fishing. However, some Members expressed issues with the Weddell Sea proposal, and thought that the proponent needed to discuss the proposal further at WG-EMM in 2017 (especially the interface with research fishing). In particular, Norway noted that some of its scientific data had not been included in the proposal. Germany agreed that work on the proposal would continue intersessionally including consideration by the Working Group on Ecosystem Monitoring and Management.

**Checklist**

Discussions on Japan’s proposed checklist continued intersessionally. Japan has agreed that the checklist could be used on a voluntary basis.

### 2. Antarctic Krill Fishery

**Krill fishery report**

During the current fishing season (2015/16), 11 vessels fished in Area 48 and the total catch reported until the time of the meeting was 258,365 tonnes, which is an increase over the 2014/15 catch of 225,646 tonnes. The catch from Subarea 48.1 in 2015/16 has been 154,461 tonnes and that subarea was closed on 28 May 2016 when its maximum catch limit was reached. ASOC remains concerned about the trend of increased catches, especially the focus of fishing in limited areas within and close to the Bransfield Strait near penguin colonies.

For the 2016/2017 season, 6 Members notified for 18 vessels (Chile: 2; China: 7; Korea: 3; Norway: 3; Poland: 2; Ukraine: 1. Notifications were for Subareas 48.1 (17 vessels), 48.2 (16 vessels), 48.3 (15 vessels) and 48.4 (10 vessels) and Divisions 58.4.1 (3 vessels) and 58.4.2 (3 vessels).

**Observer coverage**

Ukraine tabled a proposal to require 100% observer coverage for the krill fishery, in line with the requirements for CCAMLR toothfish fisheries, noting that for the past five years the overall observer
coverage for the krill fishery had averaged 90%. For many years, the Scientific Committee has been advising that 100% observer coverage on krill vessels was scientifically desirable.

Chile submitted a paper proposing a gradual increase in scientific observer coverage, noting the need for more data to assist the development of an effective regulation of the krill fishery.

All Members supported a move toward full observer coverage in recognition that this would assist CCAMLR’s efforts to develop the feedback management system for the krill fisheries. After extensive discussions, the Commission agreed to implement a staged approach and thus CM 51-06 was amended accordingly to read as follows:

[(i) a target coverage rate of no less than 50% of vessels during the 2016/17 and 2017/2018 fishing seasons; a target coverage of 75% of vessels during the 2018/19 and 2019/2020 fishing seasons; and 100% coverage in subsequent fishing seasons.

Chile’s paper also highlighted other differences in the monitoring and control of the krill fishery which are required in other fisheries in the CCAMLR Area. For example, the krill fishery is currently not subject to port inspection obligations, catch certification requirements or VMS requirements, which are key elements to combat illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing and to preserve Antarctic marine ecosystems. While many Members agreed that there should be regulatory consistency between fisheries, one Member felt that different management measures were more appropriate. ASOC supports the approach proposed by Chile.

CM-51-07 and Feedback Management (FBM)

CM 51-07, which establishes an interim catch distribution of the trigger level (620,000 tonnes) in the krill fishery among subareas in Area 48, was up for renewal this year and was the subject of extensive discussion (intersessionally and at the meeting). CM 51-07 was adopted to prevent overconcentration of krill fishing in areas that are crucial foraging areas of key predators such as penguins, seals and whales. This measure is of critical importance and without it the entire catch limit could be taken from a small area. In the last WG-EMM meeting the it was recommended that 51-07 should be renewed until feedback management (FBM) is in place.

Ukraine contributed a paper arguing for significant changes in the distribution of the catch limits under CM 51-07, proposing an increase in the catch limit for Subarea 48.1 (which is the subarea most impacted by the fishery in recent years). The proposed changes did not have any scientific basis, but rather seem to be due to Ukraine’s belief that krill is “underutilized”. During both the SC and the Commission meetings, Ukraine repeated this line of argument and brought in “socio-economic factors” to these discussions, as well as their belief that CCAMLR was required to follow Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) declarations on non-discriminatory access to resources. Ukraine also has indicated that because it uses krill for direct human consumption, it should be able to increase fishing. Ukraine’s proposal was not accepted.

Russia reiterated arguments that the trigger level had no scientific basis and that there was no evidence that krill fishing had a negative ecosystem impact.

The UK presented two papers indicating how environmental variability has led to reduced penguin breeding performance and increased penguin mortality following starvation at some locations in the NW Antarctic Peninsula (i.e. Cuverville Island gentoo die-off this summer). Highlighting the need for applying a precautionary approach the UK suggested implementing tools such as seasonal coastal buffers closed to fishing, closed areas during critical ecological time periods, and fishing limits and move-on rules.
Norway submitted a paper, proposing to replace CM 51-07 by an operational FBM system. The paper outlines a combination of time and space restriction to the fishery in 48.1, and is reliant on data from the fishing industry. The proposal attempts also to stimulate the fishery to cooperate and coordinate as needed for a FBM to be successful.

Australia contributed a useful paper on a risk assessment approach that could be used to move the management of the krill fishery to stage 2 of FBM. The risk assessment is basically a method for spreading the risk of localised effects of catches of Antarctic krill up to the trigger level, during the development of stage 2 of FBM. The proposal recommends using the risk assessment approach to provide advice on reviewing CM 51-07 this year and on future proposals that envision spatial subdivisions of catch limits. This approach basically calculates relative risks associated with options to subdivide a catch limit among areas. In addition, both the UK and the US had also presented possible FBM approaches at WG-EMM in July 2016 to be considered by the SC.

The SC agreed that the Australian risk-assessment approach could assist the transition to Stage 2. Australia’s work on the risk assessment approach was considered to be helpful and it was proposed to guide the work in the coming years. In any case, the development of an operable FBM would definitely benefit from an active interaction between the Australian risk assessment proposal, and the US, UK and Norwegian FBM proposals for area 48.1.

After extensive discussions, CM 51-07 was renewed maintaining the previous distribution of the catch limits into the Subareas. The Conservation Measure will be in effect until the 2020/2021 fishing season. The measure also requires that the SC updates its advice on the distribution of the trigger level as information becomes available, and it reports back to the Commission about the status of work on the risk assessment framework, feedback management and the spatial allocation of catch, no later than the 2019 annual meeting. It is therefore critical that the SC spends the next five years focusing its work to move from a trigger-level-based management system to an effective FBM system which incorporates an updated risk assessment framework.

Some Members, such as the UK proposed that CCAMLR implements a buffer around penguin colonies where mortality events were recorded in 2015/2016 (i.e. Cuverville Island, Neko Harbor and Biscoe Point). A 15 km distance was proposed by the UK, which was considered to be the mean of the maximum foraging distance for breeding gentoo penguins during the summer and would ensure that these colonies are able to recover. Temporal closures such as this would be consistent with CCAMLR’s commitment to the ecosystem approach by ensuring that fishing does not exacerbate the impacts of any natural events on penguin colonies. During the meeting, the Association of Responsible Krill Harvesting Companies (ARK) announced its decision not to fish during the next fishing season (2016-2017) close to the penguin colonies where mortality events happened last Antarctic summer. This decision reduced the pressure on the Commission to take an official decision to ban fishing in those areas and showed that ARK is sensitive to this type of situation.

**Antarctic Wildlife Research Fund (AWR)**

The AWR hosted a lunch presentation to give CCAMLR delegates an overview of the projects funded by the AWR’s second round of grants. The two projects funded are complementary and aim to address the uncertainty related to krill flux, which refers to variations in the temporal and spatial movements of krill. Further information about these projects is available from www.antarcticfund.org.

3. **IUU Fishing and Vessel Issues**

**Hongjin 707**

ASOC submitted a paper on the situation of the *Hongjin 707*, a vessel that Korea had reluctantly notified to fish in the upcoming 2016/17 season. Korea had tried to prevent the vessel from fishing in the CCAMLR Area for three years after the vessel fished in jurisdictional waters in area 41 without
authorization, and subsequently was determined to have misreported catch amounts. The Hongjin Corporation took the Korean Ministry of Fisheries (MOF) to court over the suspension, because Korean law does not allow for a suspension of that length. The court agreed and required MOF to submit notifications to CCAMLR. At the time of the meeting, the MOF’s appeal of this decision was pending.

ASOC suggested ways that CCAMLR could prevent the vessel from fishing in its paper, and during the SCIC meeting recommended that the notification should be blocked by the Commission. Several Members asked Korea to verify the information in ASOC’s paper and Korea did so, providing additional details on the results of its investigations. Subsequently, Members expressed that they were not satisfied that the vessel could adhere to CCAMLR CMs, and therefore they could not support the notification. The Commission agreed not to include this vessel in notifications and Korea said it would respect this decision. This outcome was positive because it will prevent an unrepentant IUU fishing vessel from fishing in the Convention Area. However, it is clear that to avoid this situation in the future, Korea’s domestic legislation must be strengthened so that tougher penalties can be imposed.

Transhipment

The US and Australia presented a proposal for improving CCAMLR’s oversight of transhipments under CM 10-09. The proposal would have established a formal list of vessels used in transhipment that would be maintained by the CCAMLR Secretariat, and would prohibit transhipments between fishing vessels and vessels either not on the list or not licensed by CCAMLR. During discussions in SCIC, the initial proposal was changed significantly, and the US and Australia withdrew it from consideration. ASOC supported this because the revised proposal was significantly weaker than the original. The issue of transhipment outside the Convention area remains unaddressed.

4. Other fisheries, new and exploratory fisheries

Research Fishing

The Secretariat followed up on previous discussions about the regulatory framework for toothfish fishing under various CMs with a proposal to make the provisions for exploratory and research fishing more consistent. New areas are being opened up for toothfish fishing up the research fishing CM but are little different from exploratory fishing without the scrutiny, reporting and conservation measure requirements.

The Commission was unable to agree on the Secretariat’s proposal, and the issue will be discussed further intersessionally.

Russia submitted a paper reporting on the anomalous CPUEs from the fishing of the vessel Yantar 35 in area 48.5 in which it was asserted that the CPUEs were not a problem because other vessels had reported similarly high CPUEs at one point or another, focusing on NZ and UK vessels in the Ross Sea. Other Members noted that those CPUEs are not representative of the average CPUEs from those vessels. Though the Russian report overall concludes that there was no wrongdoing, Russia announced in the paper that it had decided to suspend the vessel's for other infractions from fishing in the Convention Area.

Exploratory toothfish fishing in data-poor information areas is again reaching a crisis point. Firstly, there is a disagreement on how to calculate precautionary catch limits and in the end the SC recommended that last years limits be rolled over. Secondly, some of the new estimates for catch limits were substantially lower than previous years and would have made it difficult to undertake exploratory toothfish fishing – so that the SC is raises the conflict between research needs and precautionary limits. Thirdly, in some of the research blocks there may not be adequate collection of
biological data and tagging to provide a future stock assessment. Some of these areas are in the proposed East Antarctic MPA.

5. Implementation and Compliance

Compliance Evaluation Procedure

The CCAMLR Compliance Evaluation Procedure (CCEP) was largely a constructive and productive exercise. The CCEP highlighted some issues of importance to ASOC, namely the implementation of seabird bycatch mitigation measures and protections for scientific observers on vessels. With regards to the latter, it emerged during the SCIC discussion of the preliminary compliance report that the CM related to observers was not officially part of CM 10-10 on the CCEP. The CM was subsequently revised to include it. This officially makes harassment or interference with observers a compliance violation that will be discussed by SCIC. Compliance categories in CM 10-10 were also revised following a proposal from Chile. The new categories are: compliant, minor non-compliant, seriously, frequently, or persistently non-compliant. This eliminates the former category of partially compliant. ASOC supports these changes.

The Uruguayan vessel the *Rambla* had significant seabird bycatch (20 mortalities) apparently due to problems with the deployment of streamer lines and a bird exclusion device. These issues were remedied after the first 28 line sets and the mortalities ceased. However, the issues highlights the importance for ASOC in monitoring the implementation of bycatch mitigation CMs.

Several vessels violated prohibitions on offal discharge. New Zealand provided a helpful background paper on the more technical aspects of this issue that encouraged Members to share information about their own vessels’ operations so that CCAMLR Members can continue to improve their practices.

6. Climate Change

There were two primary papers and one proposed CM discussed at CCAMLR and SC-CAMLR on climate change this year: the report of the joint SC-CAMLR/CEP workshop on climate change (May 2016), the report of the intersessional contact group on enhancing considerations of climate change in CCAMLR, and a proposed CM to designate time-limited special areas for scientific study in areas where ice shelves have recently collapsed. ASOC submitted a paper suggesting concrete actions that CCAMLR could take at the 2016 meeting to implement the recommendations of the joint workshop. The ICG was planned as a two-year ICG and therefore only provided an initial report that did not have any final conclusions or recommendations. There were few concrete actions beyond the SC’s endorsement of the workshop’s recommendations. It does appear that there is widespread support for the development of a climate change response workplan similar to the one developed by the CEP.

The ice shelves proposal was revised from previous years to include a two-stage approach in which areas would receive a temporary 2-year designation automatically following ice shelf collapse, and subsequently could be protected for a 10-year period following review by the Scientific Committee and WG-EMM. The final proposal changed some language to emphasize research fishing but the basic restriction that such fishing cannot exceed 1 tonne per Member remains the same. ASOC is happy with this outcome.

7. Other Vessels Issues

*Polar Code*
ASOC presented a paper urging CCAMLR Members to support the development of Phase 2 of the Polar Code, which would include fishing vessels, to SCIC. Specifically, ASOC wanted to encourage CCAMLR Members to contribute information on Southern Ocean fishing vessel incidents to the IMO’s Maritime Safety Committee and, while Phase 2 is in development, to take actions within CCAMLR to increase training for fishing vessel crews. Only New Zealand spoke up in favour of the paper. This is a disappointing outcome.

8. Performance Review
CCAMLR agreed to a second performance review after additional financial support was provided by the EU and Korea (the US had previously contributed funds). The terms of reference for the review include a focus on evaluating CCAMLR’s progress in implementing recommendations from the first review, with particular attention on recommendations that have not been addressed or implemented. New recommendations will also be considered.

Annex 1. Acronyms and Abbreviations

ALC Automatic Location Communicator
AMLR Antarctic Marine Living Resources
ATCM Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting
ATS Antarctic Treaty System
CAML Census of Antarctic Marine Life
COML Census of Marine Life
CCAMLR Convention / Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources
CCSBT Convention for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna
CDS Catch Documentation Scheme
CEP Committee for Environmental Protection (Antarctic Treaty)
CP/NCP Contracting Party/Non-Contracting Party
cVMS Centralised Vessel Monitoring System
DCD Dissostichus Catch Document
eDCD Electronic Dissostichus Catch Document
EEZ Exclusive Economic Zone
HFO Heavy fuel oil
IATTC Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission
ICCAT International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas
ICED Climate interactions and Ecosystem Dynamics in the Southern Ocean
ICG Intersessional Contact Group
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IOTC</td>
<td>Indian Ocean Tuna Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUU</td>
<td>Illegal, Unregulated and Unreported (fishing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCS</td>
<td>Monitoring, Control and Surveillance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPAs</td>
<td>Marine Protected Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRCC</td>
<td>Maritime Rescue Coordination Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFMO</td>
<td>Regional Fisheries Management Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAR</td>
<td>Search and Rescue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Scientific Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAR</td>
<td>Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIC</td>
<td>Standing Committee on Implementation and Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAFO</td>
<td>South East Atlantic Fisheries Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG-ASAM</td>
<td>Working Group on Acoustic Survey and Analysis Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSRUs</td>
<td>Small Scale Research Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSMUs</td>
<td>Small Scale Management Units (krill fishery)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>Total Allowable Catch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMS</td>
<td>Vessel Monitoring System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG-FSA</td>
<td>Working Group on Fish Stock Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG-IMAF</td>
<td>Ad hoc Working Group on Incidental Mortality Associated with Fishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG-SAM</td>
<td>Working Group on Statistics, Assessments and Modelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG-EMM</td>
<td>Working Group on Ecosystem Monitoring and Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>