



**REPORT ON FISHERIES
MANAGEMENT IN INTERNATIONAL
DEEP SEA WATERS AND ITS
BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION**

by Álvaro Fernández, Alberto González-Garcés y Enrique de Cárdenas

ANTECEDENTES

On the 1st July 2016 Mr. Jose Antonio Suarez Llanos, General Manager of the Shipowners' Cooperative of Vigo (ARVI), and Chairman of its Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) addressed a request to the experts of this Advisory Committee to draft a report in relation to the future fisheries management in international deep seas, including for this purpose the FAO draft on "*Analysis and guide for the implementation of international and policy instruments related to deep sea fisheries and biodiversity conservation in ABJN (Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction)*" of 27th June 2016.

Given the biological and technical repercussions for the Spanish high-seas fleets relating to fisheries management of this international regulation proposal, the STAC members who are more experienced in this subject from a scientific-technical perspective, were contacted in order to prepare an ad-hoc report for ARVI.

Oceanographers-Biologists of ARVI' Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee, they developed their professional career as researchers for the Spanish Oceanographic Institute and scientific advisors for the State and the EU fisheries administrations as well as for fisheries catching sector organizations from the 70's last century to recent years. They prepare the following report.

CONTENT

ANTECEDENTES	1
A. GENERAL AND POLITIC ASPECTS	3
B. THE REPORT ON THE "GUIDE FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF AREAS BEYOND THE LIMITS OF NATIONAL JURISDICTION"	7
C. PROTECTION OF VULNERABLE MARINE ECOSYSTEMS REGARDLESS OF THE DEPTH DEFINITION. .	9
D. OBJECTIVES OF FUTURE DEEP-SEA FISHING REGULATIONS:	10
E. SCOPE AND PRINCIPLES OF THE "INTERNATIONAL GUIDES FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF DEEP-SEA FISHERIES IN THE HIGH SEAS"	11
F. METHODS TO ACHIEVE THE STATED OBJECTIVES, STATES AND RFMOs SHOULD ADOPT AND IMPLEMENT APPROPRIATE MEASURES:	12
G. "DIRECTRICES INTERNACIONALES PARA LA ORDENACIÓN DE LAS PESQUERÍAS EN AGUAS PROFUNDAS EN ALTA MAR"	12
H. AUTHORS' OPINION IN RELATION TO THE CONCEPT CON VULNERABLE MARINE ECOSYSTEMS. ...	13
I. GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE "INTERNATIONAL GUIDE FOR MANAGEMENT OF THESE FISHERIES".	14
J. COLOPHON: POINTS HIGHLIGHTED BY THE AUTHORS OF THIS REPORT TOWARDS THE NEAR FUTURE:.....	19
K. ANEXO	22

A. GENERAL AND POLITIC ASPECTS.

i.- The political importance of the FAO draft report mentioned in the "Background" section is that these initiatives force the EU and the International Waters Fisheries Administrations (International Fisheries Organization, the RFMO) towards its implementation given the increasing growth of environmental concern in developed societies which today are very informed and influenced by the media and international NGOs in terms of environmental and biodiversity protection in general and in particular that of the marine environment.

ii.- The indications in the previous point increasingly constrain international fisheries management decision-makers as well as the people representative bodies (National and EU Parliaments), greatly influencing the international legal rules that are finally approved. The vector "NGO> Media> Public> Parliaments> EU and national governments" increasingly works with more demanding and efficient mechanisms, thus conditioning the binding rules for States and consequently their fishing fleet.

iii.- On the issue we are dealing with in this report related to fishing in deep-sea waters outside (and inside) the exclusive economic zones of the European Union and coastal States in all seas and oceans, the above two points are further strengthened by what we might call a "defenseless of biodiversity" inhabiting in those waters in face of the fishing industry and the governments of the coastal states, the European Union and International Fisheries Organizations, on the one hand and on the other hand, because they spread over the deep-sea waters where especially sensitive or vulnerable species live on the seabed due to their biology (reproduction, growth, ecology). Also, sedentary species such as cold water corals and other organisms, which are especially sensitive to human action due to their very slow growth. Therefore, species living in deep-sea waters require management measures adapted to their special biology.

iv.- The reception of the draft report that has now been circulated by FAO has a long track record in scientific and international management organizations, which have issued important documents on this subject previously: The National Assembly of the United Nations, the World Sustainable Development Summit, the FAO itself, the Regional Fisheries Organizations such as NAFO, NEAFC, GFCM, ICCAT, SEAFO, CCMLR, GFCM international organizations such as IUU-Fishing, CITES, IMO, IPOAs, OSPAR, ICES and others. All of them have showed concern about the fishing control of free waters in general and in particular in deep-sea waters, promoting and urging compulsory international management.

v.- The European Union, starting from the Parliament and following the Commission as its management body, has been maintaining this issue in its agenda for many time, showing its usual desire to take the lead worldwide in the environmental defense linked to fisheries management (with continuous pressure, as we mentioned above, by the Parliament and the NGOs, about which they were so sympathetic particularly the former DG-MARE Commissioner and many European Members of Parliament, especially those from States less interested in those fisheries). Governments of countries without fishing interests in the areas under this debate, i.e. NAFO, NEAFC or the SW Atlantic of much interest to the Spanish distant water fleets, easily fly the environmental flag or "get profile" in cases like the one being dealt with in this report.

vi.- For decades, the Spanish fishing industry has have important interests in various deep commercial fisheries where species of high commercial value are caught, such as Greenland halibut and others in the NAFO area, adult hake, monkfish, Norway lobster and others in the NEAFC, toothfish and cephalopods in the ICSEAF (Southwest Atlantic), and others including crustaceans in archipelagos and cliffs in platforms within our EEZ and territorial seas.

Authors' Note: The above first six points affect and will continue to affect this debate and are a handicap for sincere, rational, scientific and dispassionate discussions, often giving rise to decisions taken "for show". They should be taken into account by representatives of our country (both from the fishing industry and administration) at informal and formal debates held in various forums. If necessary, this should be placed both on the table and in the normal and very important outdoor discussions that are previously held.

vii.- As a consequence of what is stated in the above points, the EU triaologue (Commission, Council and Parliament) recently reached an agreement to ban trawling below 800 meters depth in all EU waters, which is only subject to formal ratification and entry into force.

viii.- In our opinion, this EU agreement lacking a sound scientific base that includes a case-by-case scientific and technical analysis to indicate potential adverse impacts and the right quantification of the different fishing gears in the different areasinvolved in these sea bottoms is a bad precedent and means a first step taken by the EU to support future extensions to other areas of the global seas and oceans such as NAFO, NEAFC, and further distant waters with important historical economic interests for the Spanish fleet, which should also be put on the table.

ix.- It follows that it will definitely be, once again, a difficult struggle for Spain (Administration and fisheries sector), since it cannot count on the support of the various EU or other EU countries institutions and stands in front of the forehead of NGOs and States with lesser fishing interests, or higher interest in getting along with citizens (voters) of their countries. But all this should not be an obstacle to attend subsequent discussions with as much robust analysis and reports as possible to prove the knowledge on Spanish marine and fishing research, including bibliographic references, that our country through Spanish marine and fisheries researches has about these outmost remote areas from the coast, its active participation for decades in the Scientific Committees of the RFMO affected, the ongoing provision of information, publishing of scientific papers, development of annual observing schemes on board the fishing vessels, research and mapping campaigns of vulnerable and particularly sensitive sea bottoms from an ecological point of view, aiming at contributing to the analysis of their protection internationally. The State agency responsible for the Spanish fisheries research, according to the State Maritime Fisheries Law in force and the Institution's Statute itself, is the Spanish Institute of Oceanography (IEO). In the recent decades it has made a commendable and important effort in researching potentially vulnerable marine ecosystems in various parts of our planet, with an important contribution of highly qualified and experienced staff in this type of sampling, oceanographic ships and state-of-the-art technologies as well as a high economic investment sustained over the years despite the recognized economic and staff constraints during the last five years.

x.- As indicated at the end of the previous point, it is fair to point out the activities in NAFO 3NO Zone since 1995, 3M Zone since 1998, Flemish Cap areas since 2003, off the Patagonia coast, NEAFC Hatton Bank since 2005, Cantabrian submarine canyons and Galicia grounds. Special mention should be made of the work done by the IEO on the Antarctica platform facing the Atlantic, which despite management difficulties apparently insurmountable, were commendably coordinated by the researcher Ms. Ana Ramos who is today working at the Oceanographic Center in Vigo and simultaneously teaching in marine benthos at the University of that city in Galicia. Since the 90s of last century successive multiannual, multidisciplinary and multi-institutional programs under the Spanish National Research and Development Plan were made. Dozens of scientific projects were covered. These projects involved a recognized team of researchers and technicians from the IEO and other national and foreign research centers, who knew the techniques for studying benthic ecology, cold water corals, protection of vulnerable marine ecosystems and the biology and ecology of deep sea living resources and used the

most modern sampling and underwater observation techniques with robots equipped with sensors using articulated sampling arms and high resolution underwater cameras, reaching depths below 1,500 meters. This has enabled, with the scientific advice of the IEO, to propose protection of specific vulnerable marine ecosystems areas to the Spanish government and international organizations.

xi.- In our opinion all these papers that were presented at international forums and the high investment Spain had to support and still continues to support, as well as the resulting important outcome that were published should be communicated and put into value at international meetings on the subject by the representatives of the Administration and the fisheries sector (Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Environment, Xunta de Galicia and other Governments of the Autonomous Regions, Advisory Councils of the EU Commission, CEPESCA, ship-owners associations, etc.). Therefore, the aim should be that management measures that are finally adopted are based on data and scientific papers where the analysis is made area-by-area and case-by-case, thus avoiding generalities and feelings, and restricting the invocation of the precautionary principle only to specific cases with proved ecological risk. The Annex to this report includes, as an example, an international scientific publication on this research by Mr. Pablo Duran, scientist of the IEO Vigo Oceanographic Centre.

xii.- The first part of the FAO draft report mentioned in the beginning makes a review of the existing legislation (either mandatory by the UN, RFMO, etc., or recommendations from the FAO or similar organizations). The review seems to be very complete; however it simply summarizes what already exists. The second part is a "step by step guide" to transpose international law into national legislation. It is a useful guide, but in Spain that transposition is already done systematically, as it is done in relation to the European regulations. Actually, the EU legislation, since it is adopted and published in the Official Journal of the European Union, is binding on Member States even in the absence of that transposition.

xiii.- Based on what has been expressed so far it is time now (although it should have occurred better some months ago, actually), to provide input to the draft to be defended at the debates prior to its potential approval by the EU, both in professional bilateral forums and in the meetings of the Spanish fisheries and environment Administration with the participation of CEPESCA, for example, as well as in bilateral meetings with the representation of Spain in Brussels, with the Commission DG MARE, Spanish MEPs, Ministries of Fisheries of the coastal Autonomous Communities, etc.

Authors' note: Perhaps an analysis should be carried out of the available information to estimate of economic, social and international relations implications of these new legislations for the Spanish fleet.

B. THE REPORT ON THE "GUIDE FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF AREAS BEYOND THE LIMITS OF NATIONAL JURISDICTION".

To the aforementioned "*Draft Analysis and Guide for the implementation of international and policy instruments related to the deep fisheries and biodiversity in ABNJ*", which is the subject of this report, we provide the following additional considerations:

i.- After reading carefully the aforementioned draft, firstly we note that the "purpose of the Guide," turns out to be: "Identify the range of instruments that may be relevant for deep sea fishing and its impacts on marine biodiversity beyond national jurisdiction with a view to providing advice to States on the steps that may be necessary to implement these instruments at the national level".

ii.- It goes on saying that "there is no single definition of fishing or deep-sea fisheries used internationally", but it reminds that the FAO "International Guidelines for the management of deep-sea fisheries on the high seas" apply to "fisheries in which the total catch (by-catch) includes species that can withstand only low exploitation rates and in which fishing gears often have contact with the seafloor during the normal course of fishing operations" and that this definition will be used in this "Guide". The consequences of this definition should be analyzed in depth for its very likely impacts on the Spanish fleets.

iii.- The "Guide", as aforementioned, has two parts: The first part provides a detailed review of international instruments (whether mandatory or just recommendations) that are important for the conservation and management of deep-sea fisheries and associated ecosystems . The review seems magnificent, but it simply summarizes what there already exists. The second part provides a step by step guide to move international law into national legislation. It is very useful, but in Spain a systematically transposition is already done. It seems to us that the sentence should be primarily addressed to countries having transposition problems into national legislation. In any case this question would deserve a legal expertise contribution in this area.

iv.- Regardless of the explicit contents of the "Guide" there are two remarkable points that may be in the future regulation process of Deep-Sea Fisheries: The definition of deep-sea and the basis for the protection of Vulnerable Marine

Ecosystems with mechanisms scientifically validated and internationally accepted by decision-making bodies on management measures.

v.- Deep-sea definition: As indicated in the draft "Guide", there is no single definition of "deep-sea waters" accepted internationally. In each field a different limit depth is usually applied taking into account scientific criteria or other information available on the environment in question. For example, NEAFC, as indicated in the draft, usually uses 400 meters depth to define deep seas based on ICES advice. However, the Trilogue of the European Union has just reached an agreement to ban trawling below the 800 meters depth in EU waters. By recently deciding on considering 800 meters as a boundary to define deep-sea in their own waters the EU Trilogue will most likely try to keep the same limit in waters beyond national jurisdictions or European Union, or other RFMO, which will certainly have negative impact on Deep-Sea Fishing, the general trend being aimed at the protection of Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems. Such trend can be read in the section on Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems of the FAO "International Guidelines for the management of deep-sea fisheries in high seas". Several research institutions in countries around the world are carrying out researches on this subject in a number of important fisheries for Spain like NAFO and NEAFC to put as an example in the North Atlantic fisheries.

vi.- Deep-sea limits as a base for the protection of the VME: The choice of 800 meters depth by the Commission is probably based on an interpretation of the work "*A scientific basis for regulating deep-sea fishing by depth*" by Jo Clarke et al., researchers from Glasgow and Aberdeen, UK. A novel technique using data from deep trawling scientific campaigns in the NE Atlantic is used to show the depths from which the ecological rates and catch value change significantly. The results of these British scientists suggest that between 600 and 800 meters commercial fishing benefits begin to be outweighed by the potentially negative ecological consequences.

vii.- In the opinion of the authors of this report of the ARVI's Scientific and Technical Committee, it seems to us to be very difficult to make a comparison between the ecological importance of such broad areas and different geographical locations in different seas and oceans of the world, and the economic value and social development of fishing in the same areas. The message we draw from what has been said is that it will be necessary to have scientific and analytical information and publications that become the basis for the decision-making bodies since they should make the decisions, in our opinion, using the best scientific information available as we have indicated in the above points of this report.

C. PROTECTION OF VULNERABLE MARINE ECOSYSTEMS REGARDLESS OF THE DEPTH DEFINITION.

i.- In Spain, as it has been detailed previously, the Spanish Institute of Oceanography has made a significant research effort on this type of sea bottoms with ecological interest. Surely they are of special interest to ARVI research carried out in areas of Hatton Bank, on the continental shelf and Patagonian slope off the 200 miles of Argentina, on the banks of Valdivia and Ewing Seamount and in the NAFO area.

ii.- Deep waters are the largest ecosystem in the world with a high level of biodiversity and many species that have certain characteristics of their life cycle that make them vulnerable to high levels of exploitation. Many deep-sea fisheries have a history of being unsustainable. In the Northeast Atlantic there has been a decrease in the abundance of commercial fish species since the deep sea fishing began in the early 70's. Current management is carried out through effort restrictions and the total allowable catch (TAC), but there are still problems with compliance and high levels of bycatch of vulnerable species, such as sharks. The European Union is currently considering new legislation to manage deep-sea fisheries, including the introduction of a limit depth for trawling. However, there is little evidence to suggest an appropriate depth limit.

iii.- Data from scientific campaigns were used to know and demonstrate that the biodiversity in demersal fish community, both the proportion of biomass discarded with respect to commercial biomass and the proportion of elasmobranchs (sharks and rays) with respect to commercial biomass increased significantly between 600 and 800 meters deep, while the market value decreases.

iv.- This set of results suggests that limiting trawling at a maximum depth of 600 meters could be an effective management strategy that may adapt to the needs of European legislation, such as the Common Fisheries Policy (EC no. 1380/2013) and the framework Directive on marine strategy (2008/56 / EC).

v.- Summary available on Spain research on this topic and its achievements: The current Director of the IEO, Mr. Eduardo Balguerías made a magnificent presentation with a summary of the historical results of these investigations at the "Third International Conference on the Future of Fishing organized by ARVI "(Vigo, 16th June 2016). We think it would be helpful that either CEPESCA or ARVI ask the Director of the IEO, either directly or through the General Secretariat of Fisheries, a summary of these investigations, an assessment of the results and a proposal to

continue these investigations and that same are funded by the relevant Ministries of the Spanish Governments, both that that is about to be constituted and the following one.

vi.- The purpose of the future deep-sea regulations: The document we are analyzing throughout these points says it is a question of achieving an efficient and sustainable use of living resources in the high seas and the conservation of biodiversity through the systematic implementation of ecosystem approach with the objectives listed below.

D. OBJECTIVES OF FUTURE DEEP-SEA FISHING REGULATIONS:

i.- Improve practices for sustainable management of deep-sea fisheries, taking into account the related impacts on ecosystems;

ii.- Protect Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems and Significant Ecologically and Biologically Areas;

iii.- Conduct an improved area-based planning practice for deep-sea ecosystems.

iv.- Verify and provide planning tools based on efficient methodologies and areas included in the "Regional Seas Programmes" and RFMO,s programs to develop regional policies and management plans.

Author's note: The Organizations affected by future international management of EMV are the RFMO, the European Union and therefore its Member States. Other organizations directly concerned and involved in this issue are the Regional Organization for the Management of Deepwater Fisheries, the South Pacific Permanent Commission, Regional Coordination Unit for Eastern Africa, the IUCN, the Convention on Biological Diversity, and the relevant organizations of the fishing industry.

E. SCOPE AND PRINCIPLES OF THE "INTERNATIONAL GUIDES FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF DEEP-SEA FISHERIES IN THE HIGH SEAS".

The "Guides" as they are called, have been developed for fishing carried out in areas that are outside national jurisdiction with the following characteristics:

i.- The control must be comprehensive to all fishing vessels whose fishing gears are likely to contact the seabed during normal performance of fishing operations.

ii.- Total catches must be it literally (absolutely everything caught with the fishing gears) especially including species which can only support a low rate of exploitation according to the biological information.

iii.- In these cases the affected States and RFMOs should consider, as appropriate, the application of the elements included in these guidelines to similar fisheries in areas beyond national jurisdiction, including species accounting for medium productivity.

iv.- For the purposes of these Guidelines, the described fisheries will be called "deep-sea fisheries".

v.- Coastal States may apply these Guidelines within their national jurisdiction, as appropriate.

vi.- The main management objectives of DFP are to promote responsible fisheries that provide economic opportunities while ensuring the conservation of living marine resources and the protection of biodiversity in the marine environment.

vii.- To that end they should ensure long-term conservation and sustainable use of marine living resources in deep waters.

viii.- Significant adverse effects on marine ecosystems shall be always prevented.

F. METHODS TO ACHIEVE THE STATED OBJECTIVES, STATES AND RFMOs SHOULD ADOPT AND IMPLEMENT APPROPRIATE MEASURES:

i.- In accordance with the precautionary approach, as is reflected in Article 6 of the 1995 United Nations Agreement on Fish Stocks and described in Articles 6.5 and 7.5 of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (the Code).

ii.- Under an ecosystem approach to fisheries (EAF).

iii.- In accordance with the relevant rules of international law, particularly as reflected in the United Nations Convention of 1982.

iv.- Consistent with other relevant international instruments, identifying areas where VME are known to exist or likely to exist and adopting measures using the best information available.

G. “DIRECTRICES INTERNACIONALES PARA LA ORDENACIÓN DE LAS PESQUERÍAS EN AGUAS PROFUNDAS EN ALTA MAR”.

This guide provides a complete description of the fundamental concepts, starting with an explanation of the characteristics of species exploited in these ocean bottoms:

i.- Many marine living resources exploited by the DFP have biological characteristics that pose specific challenges for sustainable use and exploitation. The following examples can be mentioned:

- Maturation at relatively advanced ages,
- Slow growth,
- Long life expectations
- Low natural mortality rates;
- Intermittent recruitment of good quality year-classes.
- Possibility that spawning does not occur every year.

As a result of this, the deep sea living marine resources have low productivity generally, so they cannot sustain but a low operating rate. Furthermore, when a depletion of these resources occurs, the recovery is expected to be long and it is not assured. The great depths where these living marine resources are caught by the DFP pose other scientists and technicians challenges to provide scientific support to management. All these factors make that both assessment and management are more expensive and exposed to greater uncertainty.

H. AUTHORS' OPINION IN RELATION TO THE CONCEPT ON VULNERABLE MARINE ECOSYSTEMS.

i.- The vulnerability of stocks, communities and habitats is related to the probability that a stock, community or habitat experience a substantial alteration due to a short duration or chronic disturbance, the likelihood that it recovers and how long it takes to recover.

ii.- In turn, these elements are related to the characteristics of ecosystems themselves, especially those relating to biological and structural aspects. The features of these complex ecosystems may be that they show physically or functionally fragile. The most vulnerable ecosystems are those that can be easily disturbed and have a very slow or no recovery.

iii.- The vulnerability of stocks, communities and habitats should be assessed in relation to their specific threats. Some geographic features, particularly those who are physically weak or naturally scarce, may be vulnerable to most forms of disturbance, but the vulnerability of some stocks, communities and habitats may vary greatly depending on the type of fishing gear used or the type of disturbance experienced.

iv.- The risks under which a marine ecosystem is, are determined by their vulnerability, the probability of suffering a threat and the means to counterbalance it.

I. GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE “INTERNATIONAL GUIDE FOR MANAGEMENT OF THESE FISHERIES”.

i.- The first part of the document summarizes the recommendations, resolutions and regulations of various international agencies on deep-sea fisheries in international waters aiming at ensuring as far as possible the long-term conservation of bottom ecosystems, which can be seriously impaired by the action of man.

ii.- These regulations come from both the General Assembly of the United Nations and the various Regional Fisheries Organizations, as well as agreements on the protection of biodiversity.

iii.- The second part is intended as a guide to how to transpose these regulations to the legislation of each country and illustrates it with examples of how certain countries have transposed these recommendations into their legislation.

iv.- In the case of Spain, it does not mean anything new as we have previously stated, for all regulations, as they enter into force, are first taken by the EU and are immediately transposed into the Member States national law.

v.- As for the definition of deep-sea fisheries, the statement " *Most deep-sea fishing occurs at a depth of at least 200 meters, but up to depths of as much as 2000 metres* " is ambiguous and should be specified, because although it is true that the deep-sea species are caught in that range of depths, it is also true that between 200 and 600 meters deep other fisheries take place in very important slope, as in the case of hake, monkfish, Norway lobster and other high value fisheries, which have a minimal impact on the ecologically sensitive species.

vi.- All measures to fight the IUU fishing have largely favored the compliant fleets such as ours especially over the recent lustrums, as they seek to discourage unfair competition. These measures include: "*Establishment and maintenance of a record of fishing vessels authorized to fish on the high seas*" , "*Prohibition of flagging identified IUU vessels*"," *mandatory authorizations for fishing vessels operating on the high seas*" , "*market and trade regulations*" etc. They are widely recommended by the various competent bodies.

vii.- A definition from 600 meters would avoid these problems, but not another very important one that is the intention of the EU to implement this own regulation in international waters. For example, if it was applied in Newfoundland, that would be

a serious problem indeed because most of the Greenland halibut fishery is carried out below 800 m depth.

viii.- On the other hand, when the problem of managing a deep sea fishery is approached the following statement is systematically introduced: *many deep-sea species are subject to slow growth, low reproductive rates and low natural mortality rate*", which is immediately linked to the fact these species can only sustain very low exploitation rates, or not even that. Although deep sea species generally have slower growth, greater longevity and delayed sexual maturation (they tend to be more strategists than K) compared to short life pelagic species or shallower water demersal species, however, there is a great variability between them, ranging from cases of extreme longevity like orange roughy (*Hoplosthetus*) to other species such as the deep sea crustaceans like pink shrimp (*Aristeus*), or carabiner (*Plesiopenaeus*), in which cases the variables would resemble more to the species of shallow waters than to the *Hoplosthetus*. This makes it possible to perfectly develop directed fisheries for some of them.

ix.- In the case of the Newfoundland Greenland halibut, its peculiar exploitation pattern can help the sustainability of the fishery. Indeed, even though they are long-life species their exploitation pattern in very marked "dome" make that fishery only impacts heavily on very few ages where the fishing gear is really effective. After overcoming these, the remaining stocks will suffer a very low exploitation rate.

x.- The long-term sustainability of deep sea stocks, as every stock exploited, will depend on the balance between the rate of change of the factors that increase biomass as is the case of the individuals weight growth, their renewal ability (maturation, individual fecundity, survival and recruitment) and possible final immigrations from neighboring stocks, and those causing biomass decrease such as the natural mortality, migration and mortality due to fishing, which will be characterized by the intensity each stock age is fished. Therefore, management of these stocks should follow the recommendation of regulating *"on a case-by-case basis and on a scientific basis, including the application of the precautionary approach"*.

xi.- Here it is important that the precautionary approach is applied, that is, if it is shown that the stock is able to sustain a fishery, there should be no objection to develop same.

As it has been said, among the deep sea stocks some are more vulnerable and some are less vulnerable. In our opinion, the fleets exploiting the deep sea resources should be characterized by the specific composition of their catches and

the impact on the various "deep sea" species rather than by depth ranges. Otherwise, we will risk ending up applying burdensome measures to fleets that really have very little impact on the conservation of the species that are more vulnerable.

xii.- One way the problem could be addressed would be to see the proportion of these species in the annual catch of different fleets that work in the area. This proportion will coincide with the share of these fleets in fishing mortality of species. This way those fleets or fishing vessels whose cumulative mortality on vulnerable species does not reach for example 10%, may be exempted from the measures, which will release a large number of vessels whose catches are almost anecdotal, with the assurance that regulating and controlling the remaining fishing fleets with greater fishing activity, 90% of mortality will be controlled and regulated.

xiii.- If this system is implemented, regulators would be surprised to check that the longlines working below 600 meters have greater impact on deep-sea sharks than trawls. This is because trawls only "sweeps" the surface that lies between the fishing doors, which means that the species are caught in proportion to the species distribution in the ecosystem, while catchability of longline will depend on the species in question and those vulnerable to this fishing gear may be attracted from great distances and even within the same species it may impact some year classes (the most swimmers).

xiv.- As management measures for these stocks, the various organizations propose the classic "*catch and/or effort limitations*" and in some cases "*area-based management and conservation, including closing high seas areas for its vessels*" although these measures are more relate to the conservation of VME.

xv.- Regarding the last point, there is a general recommendation to carry out "*Environmental impact assessments*" as a requirement prior to the authorization of a new deep sea fishery. This requirement also applied to the already existing authorizations and the RFMOS like NAFO and NEAFC took this resolution into consideration by establishing a map of the fishing footprint on the understanding that VMEs are unlikely to appear in an area where fishing activity have been carried for years . To this end, VMS positions provided by the contracting parte were of great help.

xvi.- This fishing footprint has been complemented with proven scientific information from ad-hoc campaigns designed to locate possible areas with VME or presence of vulnerable species in the sets of the research campaigns dedicated to evaluating stocks. Once shown that the new fishery is unlikely to affect VME, the

fishery depth should meet the following requirements to contribute with detailed information on fishing operations (*"information on fishing operations, including vessel position, catch of target and non-target species, including through logbooks and VMS "*) and on control, inspection and enforcement (*"Establishment of a monitoring, control, surveillance, and enforcement system, including sanctions and a legal and administrative mechanism to identify serious violation", o "transshipment regulations/authorization"*).

xvii.- What is said in the previous paragraph means nothing new about what is required having in mind the EU Fishery Management requirements for medium and large size fishing vessels.

xviii.- There is a general recommendation to reduce levels of by-catch *"Establishment of regulations to reduce by-catch"*, which is already included in the new CFP and a UNGA resolution adopted by various organizations requesting the *"Regulation of design and use of fishing gear"*. So far this has only resulted in the banning of trawl and/or gillnets below certain depths for example 1000 meters in the Mediterranean.

xix.- The prohibition of gillnets in EU waters below 600 meters and the recent ban on trawling below 800 meters in EU waters are not properly substantiated on technically scientific information. We have already approached above the problem arisen from depth-based regulations.

xx.- The vast majority of organizations state that to undertake the management of these fisheries a protocol must be established where catches of certain individuals are above certain levels *"Deep-sea fishing protocols, VME thresholds, indicator species, move-on rules"*.

xxi.- The implementation of these protocols have several drawbacks. Firstly, limits are very difficult to establish, since different limits have to be fixed for different fishing gears working in the area since each of them has its own catchability of these organisms. Secondly, it may not be the same for different areas since the relative abundance of these species differ in each area.

xxii.- On the other hand though it is established, captains and masters are not trained to identify these organisms (sponges, cnidarians, polychaetes, bryozoans etc.), as they are species that can cause classification problems for experts. In addition, since they have no commercial interest, the easiest thing for the captain is to get rid of them and not to record anything in the log book, especially when we are aware that this may result in the closure of a given area. In fact we believe that in

the years during which this protocol has been in force in NAFO and NEAFC, there has not been communicated any single finding of this type by the fleet. Moreover, these problems are used as an excuse to demand a 100% coverage of control observers.

xxiii.- The implementation of these protocols was agreed at the UNGA and has been automatically moved into the RFMO, but it makes no sense in many cases. For example, in NAFO, the whole area with fishing footprint has been mapped and all areas with significant presence of VME have been identified and closed. What is the point then to keep these protocols? If a sample encountering occurred, it is most likely to come from another area dragged by the tide or the seabed currents.

xxiv.- Therefore, the Spanish General Secretariat of Fisheries have long been fighting in the EU so that NAFO implements the precautionary approach and that this obligation is eliminated. This would allow the issue of the 100% control observers on fishing vessels to be also raised.

xxv.- Returning to a point that seems important to us, and which we believe is being applied only when it produces adverse effects on fisheries, refers to the fact that regulation of these fisheries must be undertaken "*on a case-by-case basis and on a scientific basis, including the application of the precautionary approach*". This means that measures should not be general for all deep-sea fisheries, but should take into account the greater or lesser knowledge of ecosystems, their degree of vulnerability and the effectiveness of any mitigation measures of adverse effects that may be applied.

xxvi.- Actions taken by Spain in the management of deep sea fisheries: Spain starts from a quite privileged situation because since 2005 it has completed a program of systematic mapping of fishing grounds where our trawlers work in international waters (see Annex). The scientific quality of this program has been recognized in various international organizations such as the EU, NAFO or ICES. The results of this program have made it possible to locate areas with significant presence of VME in these fishing grounds, which have been presented in various forums in order that appropriate mitigation measures are in place.

J. COLOPHON: POINTS HIGHLIGHTED BY THE AUTHORS OF THIS REPORT TOWARDS THE NEAR FUTURE:

i.- Research on VME carried out by Spain, especially by the IEO and unilateral actions of our fisheries administration have been recognized in various international forums and have defused a maneuver of NGOs and some countries (eg Norway), who enjoyed the sympathy of Commissioner Damanaki, aimed at banning fishing in international waters which were not regulated by an RFMO (Atlantic SW) considering that unregulated fishing were carried out in these areas . With the information available or by using general criteria the bodies mentioned in this report have established fishing exclusion zones on the assumption they were an issue. This way, it was intended to guarantee that the continuation of the fleets' activity in these fisheries had no significant negative effects on the VME. In this sense, in the South West Atlantic fishing grounds, where there is no RFMO regulating fisheries, Spain unilaterally closed the problematic areas to the fishing activity of its fleet based on the information available from its fleet with scientific observers from IEO on board and the in-depth analysis of the data collected. Now Spain can talk in various forums from the moral authority of being the first country (if not the only one) that has performed so strongly.

ii.- As culmination of this chapter, in our opinion based on the experience gained in many years of research and management, like our British colleagues say, it is important to remember to legislators from the various forums that in order to respect the UN, RFMOS and others agreements, regulations concerning the management of deep-sea fisheries are more appropriately made "*On a case by case basis and on a scientific basis, including the application of the precautionary approach*".

iii.- Therefore, it is important to apply the precautionary approach, but deep-sea fishing should not be permitted in there are clear signs of risk to biodiversity. Even so, if it is shown that the stock is able to sustain a fishery and that there are procedures to mitigate possible undesirable effects on EMV, there should be no objection to this provided that the appropriate standards of protection is dictated in each case.

iv.- The regulation of fleets exploiting deep sea stocks should be made taking into account the vulnerability of same. In our opinion, the fleets exploiting the deep-sea resources should be featured by the specific catch composition and its impact on deep-sea species, rather than by depth ranges. Otherwise, we risk applying burdensome measures to fleets that really have very little impact on the

conservation of vulnerable species. So it could waive the application of certain harmful measures for fleets.

v.- One way to address the problem would be to see the proportion of these ecologically sensitive species in the annual catch of different fleets that fish in the area. This proportion will coincide with the share of the fleet in the fishing mortality of these species. This way those fleets or ships whose cumulative mortality on vulnerable species does not reach, for example, 10% could possibly be exempted from restrictive measures.

A large number of vessels whose catches of this species to be protected are practically anecdotal, would be free from unnecessary impairment with the assurance that by regulating and monitoring the rest of the fleets that fish more, the 90% of mortality will be controlled and regulated.

vi.- Banning trawling at depths greater than 800 meters in EU waters by claiming the incidence of this fishing gear on deep sea elasmobranchs makes no sense. If this system is implemented, regulators will surprisingly realize that, for example, longliners working at depths below 800 meters impacts on deep sea sharks more than trawlers.

This is so because the trawler only "sweeps" the surface that lies between fishing gear doors, which means that species are caught in proportion to the distribution of same in the ecosystem while catchability of longlines will depend on the species in question, and those who are vulnerable to this fishing gear can be attracted from great distances. Even within one species it can affect year classes that achieve greater swimming speeds.

vii.- As management measures for these stocks, the various organizations propose the classic "*catch and/or effort limitations*" and in some cases "*area-based management and conservation, treats including closing high seas areas for its vessels*" although these measures are more related to the conservation of VME.

viii.- In relation to the previous point, the various RFMO have carried out the international agreement to make a general recommendation to carry out the so-called "*Environmental impact assessments*" as prior requirement to the authorization of a new deep-sea fisheries. This requirement was also applied to the existing RFMO such as NAFO and NEAFC, which adopted this resolution by establishing the fishing footprint maps on the understanding that VME are unlikely to appear in areas where fishing has taken place for years. VMS positions data provided by the contracting parties were very helpful for this purpose.

ix.- The fishing footprint based on historical fishery background, has been supplemented with proven scientific information from ad-hoc campaigns designed to locating possible VME areas or the presence of vulnerable species in the research sets intended for stocks evaluation.

x.- Once shown that the new fishery is unlikely to affect VME, it must comply with the following requirements on detailed information supply: *“Information on fishing operations, including vessel position, catch of target and non-target species, including through logbooks and VMS”*. And for control, surveillance and enforcement, *“Establishment of a monitoring, control, surveillance, and enforcement system, including sanctions and a legal and administrative mechanism to identify serious violation”,* or *“transshipment regulations/authorization”*.

xi.- This is not anything new to what is already required by EU Fisheries Administration for medium and large size fishing vessels. There is a general recommendation to reduce by-catch levels *Establishment of regulations to reduce by-catch*", which is already included in the new CFP.

xii.- In addition to the above there is a UNGA resolution that has been adopted by various organizations whereby *“Regulation of design and use of fishing gear”* is requested though so far it has resulted only in the ban on trawling gear and/or gillnets below certain depths, for example, below 1000 meters depth in the Mediterranean.

xiii.- The reported ban on gillnets in EU waters at depth greater than 600 meters and the recent ban on trawling in EU waters below 800 meters as aforementioned, lacking a proven damage on ecologically sensitive species caused by its action in those depths will pose a serious problem to many fleets,. There might be more information and arguments than those used to defend the Spanish vessels affected by this issue in the Commission, the Council and the Parliament, even though the outcomes were similar.

xiv.- Finally, the vast majority of fisheries regulatory organizations provide that in order to manage these fisheries a protocol must be established if catches of certain species are above certain levels *"Deep-sea fishing protocols, VME thresholds, indicator species, move-on rules"*.

xv.- The implementation of these protocols have several operational problems (difficulty in establishing limits, complex identification of organisms, implementation difficulty). Firstly, the limits are very difficult to establish, because different limits

must be set for different fishing gears working in the area. This is so firstly because each fishing gear has its own catchability of these ecologically sensitive organisms, secondly because limitations should not be the same for different areas, since the relative abundance of these species differ in each area, and thirdly because, even though it is so established, the captains and masters are not trained to identify these sessile invertebrates to which no greater attention was paid but to return them to the sea (Sponges, Cnidarians, Polychaeta, Bryozoans etc.) . It is often alien species that may even cause classification problems to experts in marine benthos. In addition, simply using common sense and experience on fishing vessels, given that they have no commercial interest it is easier for the captain to discard them and not to record anything in the log book, particularly considering that they are aware that this may result in the closure of a given area of fishing interest with or without a real scientific basis.

xvi.- We actually believe that during the years these protocols have been in force in NAFO and NEAFC, no finding of sedentary invertebrates species have been reported yet by any of the fishing vessels of the fleet. we would add to this that these problems are sometimes used as an excuse to demand a 100% coverage of scientists observers on board for the comprehensive monitoring of catches.

xvii.- The application of these protocols was agreed at the UNGA and has been automatically transposed to the RFMOs, but in many cases this application, in our opinion, does not make any sense. For example in NAFO the fishing footprint has been mapped in the whole area and all areas with significant presence of VME have also been identified and closed, which makes it meaningless maintaining and extending these protocols unnecessarily harmful for Spanish vessels.

xviii.- In view of all the above we know that the Spanish fisheries administration has been fighting in the EU for long time in order that the precautionary approach is applied and this obligation is removed in NAFO. If these well-based foundations were acknowledged by the majority in decision-making bodies, it would also allow reconsidering the need for a 100% coverage of control observers on fishing vessels, which in many cases do not meet a minimum return and those costs could be applied in questions that are more necessary for the research and management of these fisheries.

K. ANEXO.

A good example of scientific publications by authors from the Spanish Institute of Oceanography on Spanish researches of vulnerable marine ecosystems in the

Atlantic Ocean can be seen in the Marine Policy journal under the title “*Actions taken by fishing Nations towards identification and protection of vulnerable marine ecosystems in the high seas: The Spanish case (Atlantic Ocean)*”, the authors of which are Pablo Durán Muñoz, M. Sagayo Gil, FJ Murillo, J.L. River, L. J. Lopez Abellan.