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SUMMARY: In June 2014, the ICED programme, the British Antarctic Survey and WWF co-hosted a two day workshop entitled “Understanding the objectives for krill fishing and conservation in the Scotia Sea and Antarctic Peninsula region” which involved participants from the science, conservation and fishing industry sectors. This report summarises the key initial conclusions and recommendations from the workshop. There is broad cross-sector commitment to maintaining a healthy ecosystem and support for management of the krill fishery that minimises the risk of the fishery negatively impacting ecosystem health. This accord could be strengthened by articulating a clear research and development strategy to support progress in the management of the krill fishery; broadening participation in WG-EMM to include other sectors and areas of expertise; and improving the availability of key information to all sectors.

INTRODUCTION

The ICED programme, the British Antarctic Survey and WWF co-hosted a two day workshop in June 2014 at WWF's Living Planet Centre entitled “Understanding the objectives for krill fishing and conservation in the Scotia Sea and Antarctic Peninsula region.”

This workshop involved participants from three sectors which the organisers identified as stakeholders in the management of the Antarctic krill fishery. These participants included four krill fishing industry representatives from two Association of Responsible Krill harvesting companies (ARK)-affiliated companies and one non-ARK-affiliated fishing company; representatives from seven conservation organisations; and eleven scientists from nine institutes in five countries, all but one of whom are regular current or past participants in WG-EMM.

The aims of the workshop were to:
- identify each sector’s objectives and information requirements for the krill-based ecosystem in the Scotia Sea and Antarctic Peninsula region (Subareas 48.1 to 48.4)
- explore and agree constructive ways for the three sectors to work together to ensure the responsible management Antarctic krill;
• develop recommendations to help guide CCAMLR in the development of its management approach for the krill fishery.

The first objective was addressed through dialogue and the collection of structured data which we are currently analysing with the intention of reporting to CCAMLR. The current report summarises the key initial conclusions and recommendations relevant to the second and third objectives.

The workshop demonstrated the benefits of cross-sector dialogue, with all sectors engaging constructively to discuss a range of relevant issues and identify ways forward. There was broad agreement on the conclusions and recommendations presented in the following section, with the caveat that the workshop did not aim to achieve consensus, so individual participants might not support all conclusions. Nonetheless, these recommendations are intended to be helpful to CCAMLR, particularly WG-EMM in its work to develop the management of the Antarctic krill fishery. We note that some of the workshop’s recommendations are similar to recent recommendations developed by WG-EMM. This is evidence of existing cross-sector engagement with the work of WG-EMM. We recommend that CCAMLR capitalises on this engagement by encouraging broader participation in WG-EMM.

**SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. **Current and future management of the krill fishery**

1.1 There is broad cross-sector commitment to maintaining a healthy ecosystem and support for management of the krill fishery that minimises the risk of the fishery negatively impacting ecosystem health.

1.2. Current catch levels are unlikely to be problematic, but the risks to ecosystem health, and uncertainties about the impacts of the fishery, increase with catch levels. One invitee, who was unable to attend the workshop, questioned whether there should be any krill fishing in the Southern Ocean.

1.3 Any long-term increase in catches beyond the current catch limit (the 620 kt “trigger level”) would require more information about the state of the ecosystem and its response to fishing than is currently available. CCAMLR should prioritise specification of the information that would be necessary before any long-term increase in catches beyond the “trigger level” can be considered. Such information is likely to include both data and analyses, and to concern the state of the ecosystem and its response to fishing.

1.4 The onus is on the fishing industry to facilitate the data collection and analysis (through provision of funding and access to vessels as a platform for science) necessary to support any request to expand the fishery beyond the “trigger level”. The process of collecting, analysing and interpreting these data should be coordinated through CCAMLR to ensure that it is transparent.
1.5 ARK should encourage krill fishing companies to apply for non-state market-based certification (from organisations such as the Marine Stewardship Council or Friend of the Sea), which is complementary to CCAMLR’s management of the krill fishery.

2. **Formulating a research and development strategy to support progress in the management of the Antarctic krill fishery so that the limited available resources can be targeted appropriately.**

   2.1 Stakeholders should conduct a further cross-sector exercise to identify priority objectives for research and development in support of CCAMLR’s management of the krill fishery. This exercise should involve CCAMLR, scientists, fishing companies and conservation organisations and it should aim to reach cross-sector agreement about these priorities.

   2.2 Understanding the potential for increases in fishery demand for krill and the likely rate of such increases is critical. Developing high quality information on future fishing scenarios should be a priority.

3. **Improving the availability of clear information to improve cross-sector understanding of the state of the ecosystem, the current management approach for the krill fishery and the CCAMLR decision making process**

   3.1 A clear, simple summary of key information about the state of the ecosystem, the current management approach for the krill fishery and the CCAMLR decision making process would aid cross-sector communication and understanding of these issues. A possible format is a set of answers to Frequently Asked Questions, hosted on the CCAMLR website. Workshop participants are willing to help identify these questions.

4. **Enhancing CCAMLR working practices to support progress in the management of the Antarctic krill fishery.**

   4.1 CCAMLR should encourage broader participation in its working groups, especially WG-EMM, to include a wider range of disciplines such as social scientists and economists where appropriate, as well as experts from the fishing industry and conservation organisations.

   4.2 CCAMLR could provide more support for first-time participants in its meetings, including pre-meeting briefings about the key topics and the meeting process, and mentoring during meetings.

   4.3 CCAMLR could encourage participation from the broader expert community by providing clear and timely information about which key topics will be discussed at working groups and about procedures for submitting work and obtaining feedback.

   4.4 CCAMLR should encourage a wider community, beyond those who attend working group meetings, to participate in inter-sessional work and discussions.

   4.5 CCAMLR should make more use of contracted experts to progress priority areas.

   4.6 CCAMLR should consider alternative working methods, such as facilitated small-group discussion, to optimise productive dialogue in its working groups.