6. Recovery
Where VMEs have been degraded over time, portions of areas where they have previously occurred should be set aside to allow for regeneration or recovery.

7. Stock assessments
The UNGA should reaffirm paragraph 119(d) of resolution 64/72 to require conservation and management measures on the basis of stock assessments and the best available scientific information, including precautionary reference points, and management strategies or plans for fisheries based on such reference points, as well as analyses of conservation and management alternatives, such as the establishment of total allowable catch or total allowable fishing effort at different levels, to ensure the long-term sustainability of deep-sea fish stocks and non-target species, and the rebuilding of depleted stocks, and call on States not to authorize bottom fishing activities until such measures have been adopted and implemented.

8. Multispecies deep-sea fisheries
Multispecies deep-sea fisheries should be prohibited unless or until a scientific understanding of the impact or risk of impact on all affected species can be determined. Only selective deep-sea fisheries should be permitted on the basis of comprehensive stock assessments of the target species, with sustainable limits on the catch established accordingly, and depleted stocks rebuilt consistent with paragraph 119(d) of resolution 64/72.

9. Full implementation
The UNGA should reaffirm, in no uncertain terms, the call in paragraph 120 of resolution 64/72 on flag States and members of RFMOs or arrangements with the competence to regulate bottom fisheries to adopt and implement measures in accordance with resolutions and international law, and not to authorize bottom fishing activities until such measures have been adopted and implemented.

10. RFMO biodiversity protection mandates
States should be called on to amend, as necessary, the mandates of RFMOs with competence over bottom fishing, to ensure that RFMOs take all necessary action to protect biodiversity in the marine environment as required under Article 5(g) and other relevant provisions of the UN Fish Stocks Agreement. It is important that all States respect the rights and interests of the international community as a whole. The UNGA has a key role to play in ensuring that this occurs in ocean areas beyond national jurisdiction – our global ocean commons. It should no longer be acceptable for States, whether individually or through RFMOs, to exercise a right to fish on the high seas without ensuring the conservation of marine biological diversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction, sustainable exploitation of fish stocks, minimal impact on bycatch species and the preservation and protection of the marine environment as called for in the UNGA resolutions and required under international law.

The Deep Sea Conservation Coalition is a coalition of over 70 organizations worldwide promoting the conservation and protection of biodiversity on the high seas. Since its creation in 2004, the DSCC has been actively involved in the international debate and negotiations to address the adverse impacts of high seas bottom fishing on deep-sea biodiversity and fish stocks in areas beyond national jurisdiction, and more recently has also been engaged in the work of the International Seabed Authority regarding the regulation of seabed mining.
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matthewgianni@gmail.com
www.savethehighseas.org
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It is important that all States respect the rights and interests of the international community as a whole.

How much longer will it take?
A ten-year review of the implementation of United Nations General Assembly resolutions 61/105, 64/72 and 66/68 on the management of bottom fisheries in areas beyond national jurisdiction.
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Executive summary

The United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) in 2002 adopted the first in a series of resolutions regarding the conservation of biodiversity in the deep sea.

Prompted by serious concerns raised by scientists, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and numerous States, these resolutions progressively committed States to act both individually and through regional fishery management organizations (RFMOs) to either manage bottom fisheries in areas beyond national jurisdiction to prevent significant adverse impacts on deep-sea species, ecosystems and biodiversity or else prohibit bottom fishing from taking place.

It has now been almost 15 years since the debate over deep-sea bottom fisheries first began in the UNGA. Ten years have passed since resolution 61/105 in 2006, calling on States to take a set of specific actions to manage bottom fisheries in areas beyond national jurisdiction to protect vulnerable marine ecosystems (VMEs) from the adverse impacts of bottom fishing and ensure the sustainability of deep-sea habitats.

Despite the considerable progress by some RFMOs, there remain significant gaps in the implementation of key elements and commitments in the resolutions. In the past year, the UNGA will review progress toward the implementation of its resolutions and identify areas for improvement.

Key findings

The report of the UNGA’s First Global Marine Assessment, published in 2015, states that the deep sea constitutes the largest source of species and ecosystem diversity on Earth. These ecosystems are crucial for global functioning and there is strong evidence that the richness and diversity of organisms in the deep sea exceed that in all other known biomes, from the metazoon to the microbial realms.1 At the same time, the documented extent of deep-water trawl fisheries has led to pervasive concern about the impact of deep-sea ecosystems in these areas associated with seamounts and other deep-sea environments. The report further states that the vast majority of deep-water fisheries have been carried out unsustainably, or at least without satisfactory assessments of impacts and sustainability. This has led to the serial depletion of dozens of targeted stocks and to severe impacts reported for bycatch species, including other fishes and benthic invertebrates from diverse coral and sponge communities. The report concludes that although the impacts have not been assessed globally, extrapolations from local and regional studies indicate that deep-sea fishing — and in particular deep-water trawling — has likely caused severe, widespread, long-term destruction of deep-sea environments globally.2

The conclusions of the Global Marine Assessment report that a study published in 2014 which looked at the impact of bottom trawling on deep-sea sediment areas in the Mediterranean and concluded that “intensive and chronic bottom trawling is deemed to transform large portions of the deep continental slope into fauna deserts and highly degraded seascapes" and that bottom trawling “represents a major threat to the deep seafloor ecosystem at the global scale.”3 The adverse impacts of deep-sea bottom fishing are not confined to the degradation or destruction of VMEs. Another study published in 2014 looked at the feeding habits of bottom dwelling fish inhabiting depths between 500–1800 meters along the Irish and UK continental slopes and estimated that this community of fish alone captures and stores a volume of carbon equivalent to over 1 million tonnes of CO2 every year.4

The UNGA first expressed concern over the threats to the biodiversity of seamounts and other deep-sea areas beyond national jurisdiction in resolution 57/141, adopted in 2002. At that time, virtually no management measures were in place to protect deep-sea ecosystems in these areas from the harmful impacts of bottom fishing, in particular bottom trawling. Moreover, there were fewer RFMOs with the legal competence to manage bottom fisheries in the high seas. In the North Pacific, South Pacific, Southwest Atlantic and Indian Oceans, there were no RFMOs or arrangements to the UNGA resolutions. In regard to the management of deep-sea bottom fisheries, important achievements since the adoption of the UNGA resolutions include:

1. Three new agreements establishing that RFMOs are to manage high seas bottom fisheries in the North Pacific, South Pacific and Southern Indian Ocean have been negotiated and entered into force.

2. The North East Atlantic Fisheries Commission (NEAFC), the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO) and the South East Atlantic Fisheries Organisation (SEAFoO) have closed substantial areas of the high seas to bottom fishing, including a number of areas where VMEs are known to occur. NEAFC and SEAFoO have further closed areas to bottom trawling below 1000m. VMEs are likely to occur (see the maps on pages 5–8).

3. Measures adopted by the States involved in negotiating the new North Pacific Fisheries Commission (NPFC) and the regulations adopted by the South Pacific (SPFMO) restrict bottom fishing on the high seas in these regions to a 20-nautical miles footprint unless a prior impact assessment is conducted to allow vessels to bottom fish outside of the footprint.

4. Bottom trawling has been prohibited by the Convention for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR) on the high seas in the Southern Ocean. The General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM) has prohibited bottom trawling below 1000m.

5. Several RFMOs – CCAMLR, SPFMO and NEAFC (the latter for areas below 200m) – have established bans on the use of bottom gillnets in their regulatory areas. SEAFoO has a standing “recommendation” (since 2009) that gillnets be banned in the SEAFoO Convention Area until more information becomes available.

6. Most RFMOs and States involved in regional negotiating processes to establish new RFMOs to manage bottom fisheries in the high seas have adopted (although not fully implemented) binding regulations or multilateral “interim measures” to manage bottom fisheries largely consistent with the UNGA resolutions. In most cases the regulations have incorporated key provisions of the international
Guidelines for the Management of Deep-Sea Fisheries in the High Seas (UN FAO Guidelines). These establish internationally agreed criteria for identifying VMEs, conducting impact assessments and determining significant adverse impacts of bottom fisheries (see Table 1).

7. In areas of the high seas where no RFMO exists or is under negotiation, the European Union (EU) has adopted and implemented measures pursuant to paragraph 86 of resolution 61/105 with respect to vessels flying the flag of EU member states. As a result, Spain conducted a comprehensive impact assessment of the potential impact of bottom fishing on VMEs on the high seas in the Southwest Atlantic and closed most of the area below 400m to Spanish trawlers to protect VMEs.

8. Transparency in the work of the RFMOs managing bottom fisheries in the high seas has improved considerably over the past decade, both for the already established RFMOs such as NEAFC and NAFO as well as the new RFMOs in the North and South Pacific and Indian Oceans.

However, many of the commitments in the UNGA resolutions – in particular the specific actions called for in the resolutions beginning with resolution 61/105 – remain either partially or entirely unfulfilled, leaving vast areas of ocean unprotected.

Regional shortcomings

The regional sections of the full DSCC report highlight specific shortcomings in each region, which are summarized as follows:

Inadequate assessments

Many of the impact assessments that have been carried out for bottom fisheries in the high seas are not consistent with the criteria established in the UN FAO Guidelines and endorsed by the UNGA beginning with resolution 64/12. The impact assessments are often partial or incomplete, or both, as a result of a lack of good baseline information, substantial scientific uncertainties and/or other reasons.

No cumulative assessments

Cumulative impact assessments as called for in resolution 66/18 have not been conducted in any region. This includes in relation to the current status of VMEs that were impacted or degraded by bottom fishing in the years prior to the adoption of the UNGA resolutions.

VME areas remain open to bottom fishing

Some high seas areas have been closed to bottom fishing, but many areas where VMEs are likely to occur remain open to bottom fishing without having been properly assessed. Moreover, there has been a general reluctance on the part of a number of States and RFMOs to close areas identified as VMEs where bottom fishing currently takes place, or has taken place in recent years. In some cases, bottom trawl fisheries occurring in VMEs identified by scientific bodies have been neither assessed nor prohibited. This is true, for example, for several VMEs in the NAFO and NEAFC areas. No areas have been formally closed to bottom fishing by the South Pacific or Indian Ocean RFMOs although some of individual flag States in these regions have closed some areas to their fleets (e.g. New Zealand in the South Pacific).

Overlarge footprints

Fishing “footprints” are the areas that have been delineated by a number of States and RFMOs to allow bottom fishing to continue based on “historical” bottom fishing in the region. In some cases these are very large and include half or more of the entire area of the seabed at various fishable depths (e.g. South Pacific, Northwest Atlantic).

Table 1: Extent to which key provisions of the UNGA resolutions and FAO Guidelines have been incorporated into interim measures and/or binding regulations adopted by RFMOs and regional negotiating processes

| Area/region | Require Impact Assessments | Incorporated the criteria in the FAO International Guidelines for Management of Deep-Sea Fisheries in the High Seas for Identifying VMEs, conducting impact assessments and determining SAIs into RFMO regulations | Requirement to assess impact on 'low productivity fish' as well as VMEs | Requirement to assess impact on 'low productivity fish' as well as VMEs |
|-------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| NAFO*       | By 2016                    | Y Y Y Y Y N                                                                      |                                                                                  |
| NEAFC*      | N Y Y Y Y N               |                                                                                  |                                                                                  |
| SPRFMO      | Y Y Y Y Y N               |                                                                                  |                                                                                  |
| CCGAMR      | N N N N N N               |                                                                                  |                                                                                  |
| NPFC        | Y Y Y Y Y Y              |                                                                                  |                                                                                  |
| SIOFA       | Y Y N Y N Y              |                                                                                  |                                                                                  |
| EU SW Atlantic/ Non RFMO Areas* | Y Y Y Y Y Y |                                                                                  |                                                                                  |

For a detailed description of the methods and analyses used to produce the maps see Section 1.1 “Methods and Analysis” of the full DSCC report.

Open, closed and other areas at fishable depths per region

KEY

- Y = Yes; N = NO
- VMEs = vulnerable marine ecosystems
- IAs = impact assessments
- SAIs = significant adverse impacts
- V = Vulnerable
- Y = Yes; N = NO

Table: Estimated fishable depth by RFMO/Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RFMO/Region</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Fishable Depth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAFO</td>
<td>Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization</td>
<td>2000m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEAFC</td>
<td>North East Atlantic Fisheries Commission</td>
<td>1500m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRFMO</td>
<td>South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organization</td>
<td>1500m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAFOR</td>
<td>South East Atlantic Fisheries Organisation</td>
<td>2000m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPFC</td>
<td>North Pacific Fisheries Commission</td>
<td>1500m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIOFA</td>
<td>South Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement</td>
<td>1500m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEAFC</td>
<td>Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources</td>
<td>2200m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For a detailed description of the methods and analyses used to produce the maps see Section 1.1 “Methods and Analysis” of the full DSCC report.
### SPRFMO\(^*\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% “Fishable”</th>
<th>Seamounts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area closed to all bottom fishing</td>
<td>0.0% 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas closed to bottom trawl by New Zealand</td>
<td>15.6% 3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas closed to bottom trawl by Australia</td>
<td>0.0% 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas where bottom fishing is permitted by New Zealand</td>
<td>7.5% 3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas where bottom fishing is permitted by Australia</td>
<td>14.9% 3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas where prior impact assessment required before bottom fishing can occur for New Zealand vessels</td>
<td>76.9% 93.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas where prior impact assessment required before bottom fishing can occur for Australian vessels</td>
<td>85.1% 96.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>371,117 880 km(^2) seamounts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The estimate in this table of the percentage of the area at fishable depths open to bottom fishing by New Zealand is considerably lower than that of Penny et al as indicated in Section 5.2.2 of the full DSCC report. They estimate that approximately 16% of the SPRFMO area at depths shallower than 2,000m is located within the open (green) areas of the New Zealand bottom fisheries footprint.

### SEAFO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% “Fishable”</th>
<th>Seamounts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area closed to bottom trawling</td>
<td>5.1% 1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas closed to all bottom fishing including bottom trawling</td>
<td>16.1% 21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas where bottom fishing is permitted</td>
<td>42.3% 25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas where prior impact assessment required before bottom fishing can occur</td>
<td>41.0% 53.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>175,943 502 km(^2) seamounts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GFCM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% “Fishable”</th>
<th>Seamounts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Areas closed to bottom trawling (incl 3 VME areas in red)</td>
<td>18.1% 39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas where bottom fishing is permitted</td>
<td>51.1% 1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas where prior impact assessment required before bottom fishing can occur</td>
<td>41.0% 53.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,496,929 136 km(^2) seamounts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NPFC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% “Fishable”</th>
<th>Seamounts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Areas closed to all bottom fishing</td>
<td>0.5% 0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas where bottom fishing is permitted</td>
<td>38.9% 12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>49,823 398 km(^2) seamounts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deep-sea bottom trawling continues to be the most pervasive form of bottom fishing on the high seas. The numbers of vessels engaged in bottom fisheries on the high seas in the years leading up to 2006 continue to authorize vessels to bottom fish on the high seas today. The majority of vessels currently authorized to bottom fish on the high seas are flagged to a relatively small number of States, including several species of deep-sea sharks taken as bycatch species, such as or are likely to be slow-growing, long-lived, low-fecundity species particularly vulnerable to overexploitation. In the North Pacific, for example, over 130 species have been reported in deep-sea fisheries. However, in the South Pacific, for example, the stock of the main target species in the deep-sea fisheries is assessed based on a “depletion analysis” which essentially is an after-the-fact assessment of the status of the stock to determine how much it has been depleted by fishing in a given year.

Endangered species

A number of deep-sea species in the Northeast Atlantic have been classified by the IUCN as vulnerable, endangered or critically endangered. These include three of the main species targeted in deep-sea fisheries the region – orange roughy, roundnose grenadier and blue ling – as well as several species of deep-sea sharks taken as bycatch in deep-sea fisheries.7

Flag States

Most flag States whose vessels engaged in bottom fisheries on the high seas in the past ten years regarding the destructive impact of bottom trawling on deep-sea species, ecosystems, biodiversity and, more recently, the capacity of deep-sea species and sediment ecosystems to capture and sequester carbon.

Insensitive move-on rules

“Move-on” rules require fishers to cease fishing when they encounter a VME. They are often the only conservation measure in place to protect VMEs in areas where bottom fishing is permitted (so-called “open” or “existing” bottom fishing areas generally corresponding to an historical bottom fisheries footprint). Yet these rules are of limited value given the high threshold levels required to trigger cessation of fishing and movement from the area and the reliance on skippers to report the encounter. Even under the best case scenario, the move-on rules established by most RFMOs are not likely to prevent continued damage to VMEs from bottom trawl fishing because significant damage will likely have already occurred as a result of an “encounter”. Outside the CCAMLR area few (if any) areas have been closed as a result of the move-on rule over the past ten years.

Overfished stocks

Many deep-sea species for which stock assessments have been conducted and/or quotas have been established are considered overexploited or depleted. Unregulated catch in deep-sea fisheries

Information provided by observer programs and other sources indicates that hundreds of species are caught as either target or bycatch species in bottom fisheries on the high seas. Yet only a few dozen species are subject to quotas or catch limits. Quotas have been established by SEAFO, NAFO and NEAFCC for a number of the target species taken in deep-sea fisheries. However, in the South Pacific for example, over 130 species have been reported caught in the high seas bottom fisheries. Yet there are no restrictions on the catch of any species other than a general measure adopted by SPARPMO to limit each Contracting Party to a level of “bottom fishing catch” that does not exceed its annual average level between 2002 and 2006.

Lack of information on status of stocks

For most deep-sea species there is insufficient information to determine the status of the stocks or the impact of fishing on the species (in particular bycatch species), although most are recognized as or are likely to be slow-growing, long-lived, low-fecundity species particularly vulnerable to overexploitation. In the North Pacific, for example, the stock of the main target species in the deep-sea fisheries is assessed based on a “depletion analysis” which essentially is an after-the-fact assessment of the status of the stock to determine how much it has been depleted by fishing in a given year.

Flag States

Most flag States whose vessels engaged in bottom fisheries on the high seas in the years leading up to the adoption of resolution 61/105 in 2006 continue to authorize vessels to bottom fish on the high seas today. The majority of vessels currently authorized to bottom fish on the high seas are flagged to a relatively small number of States, including several EU member states (e.g. Spain and Portugal); New Zealand; Japan; Russian Federation; Republic of Korea; Australia; and the Cook Islands.

Numbers of vessels

The numbers of vessels engaged in bottom fisheries and/or the volume of catch in deep-sea fisheries on the high seas has varied considerably over the past 15 years in at least two ocean regions (Northwest Atlantic and Southern Indian Ocean). But in general it appears that the number of such vessels has declined somewhat over the past few
years compared to the estimated numbers of vessels involved in high seas bottom fishing in the years 2001 (RUDN) and 2006 (UN FAO). In several regions the number of vessels authorized to fish is considerably higher than the number that has actually engaged in bottom fishing in recent years.

As indicated, the extent to which the UNGA resolutions have been implemented varies widely by region. For example, has adopted and implemented measures consistent with the resolutions that require comprehensive impact assessments for high seas bottom fisheries in the Southern Ocean and prohibits bottom trawling in all high seas areas. It has also established measures to limit the bycatch of a number of deep-sea species, implemented a comprehensive scientific observer program, and continues to conduct scientific research into the impact of bottom longline fishing on VMEs.

By contrast, multilateral implementation of the resolutions in the Southern Indian Ocean has been non-existent. Although some flag States have adopted unilateral measures, no regional measures have been adopted despite continued high seas bottom fishing in the region over the past ten years. While the RFMO responsible, SIOFA, has had two meetings of the Contracting Parties since the entry into force of the SIOFA convention in 2012, it has adopted no interim or actual measures to regulate bottom trawling. Even a proposal for a ban on bottom gillnet fishing put forward at the last meeting of the Contracting Parties was not adopted.

In the Southwest Atlantic – a region of extensive deep-sea bottom fishing, where no RFMOs or is under negotiation – the UNGA called on flag States to unilaterally implement the provisions of the resolutions. Here flag State practice has varied widely. Management measures consistent with the resolutions have been implemented by the EU and Spanish fleets operating on the high seas in the region. These include area closures to protect VMEs on the basis of an extensive impact assessment conducted by the Spanish Institute of Oceanography. However, as far as the DSCC is aware, none of the other flag States whose vessels bottom fish in the region have implemented similar measures.

The DSCC recommendations in 2016 can be summarized as follows:

1. Impact assessments

2. Area closures

3. Significant adverse impacts

4. VME criteria and the ecological role of VME species

5. Cumulative impact assessments

Conclusions and recommendations

UNGA Resolutions 61/105, 64/72, and 66/68 are the products of extensive negotiation and review by the UNGA over the past ten years.

They express the will and commitment of the international community of nations to ensure effective management of deep-sea fisheries in the context of the ecosystem approach and precautionary approach. Moreover, they have important implications for the conservation of biodiversity and the protection and preservation of the marine environment in areas beyond national jurisdiction. As such, the specific actions called for in the resolutions regarding managing deep-sea fisheries to prevent significant adverse impacts on VMEs and the sustainable exploitation of fish stocks reflect important obligations in Articles 5 and 6 of the 1987 UN Fish Stocks Agreement and Part XII of the Law of the Sea Convention.

While important progress has been made to implement the provisions of the UNGA resolutions, there are numerous shortcomings. These shortcomings are not trivial. The UNGA placed increasing emphasis in 2009 and again in 2011 on the need to conduct prior impact assessments or else ensure that such fisheries are not related to occur. The international community expended considerable effort in negotiating internationally agreed standards and guidelines for conducting such assessments as reflected in the UN FAO Guidelines. However, there are numerous instances where RFMOs have allowed areas to remain open to bottom fishing where VMEs are known or likely to occur, without having assessed the bottom fisheries in these areas to determine whether significant adverse impacts would occur. In some cases, within the areas where bottom fishing is permitted, VMEs identified by scientific bodies have been closed, or have only partially been closed, to avoid damaging these ecosystems.

In determining whether significant adverse impacts will not, or are not likely to, occur.

In 2004, the DSCC called for a moratorium on bottom trawl fishing on the high seas unless or until these fisheries are managed consistently with international law. The UNGA essentially agreed in 2006 by calling to include all bottom fisheries.

In 2016, the DSCC recommended an extension of the moratorium, including the DSCC’s call for an extension of the moratorium to include all bottom fisheries.

In the areas where bottom fishing is permitted, VMEs identified by scientific bodies have been closed, or have only partially been closed, to avoid damaging these ecosystems.

In determining whether significant adverse impacts will not, or are not likely to, occur.

The questions for the UNGA review this year are what more needs to be done and how much longer will it, or should it, take to fully implement the resolutions?
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