



Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels

Fifth Meeting of Advisory Committee

Mar del Plata, Argentina, 13 – 17 April 2010

**Progress on Developing a
Bycatch Data Reporting System**

**Author: Seabird Bycatch Working Group
ACAP Secretariat**

‘This paper is presented for consideration by ACAP and may contain unpublished data, analyses, and/or conclusions subject to change. Data in this paper shall not be cited or used for purposes other than the work of the ACAP Secretariat, ACAP Advisory Committee or their subsidiary Working Groups without the permission of the original data holders.’

Progress on Developing a Bycatch Data Reporting System

Purpose

The ACAP Advisory Committee's Seabird Bycatch Working Group (SBWG) propose, and seek the Advisory Committee's in-principle continued support, for a way to develop a bycatch data collection and reporting system for use by Parties. This proposal stems from discussions initiated by the SBWG at its 2nd Meeting, held in August 2008 in Hermanus, South Africa and continued at the 3rd Meeting of the Parties in April 2009 in Bergen, Norway.

Background

The ACAP Action Plan calls on the Advisory Committee to regularly review and update data on the mortality of albatrosses and petrels in commercial and other relevant fisheries (ACAP Action Plan 5.1(f)). At present, although ACAP Parties report regularly on the steps taken to implement the Agreement, the SBWG notes that few data are provided to allow a succinct and accurate assessment of the current levels of incidental mortality of ACAP-listed species in fisheries of ACAP Parties. Submission of fishery-specific bycatch information could be included in the Parties' regular reporting of the implementation of the Agreement. Additionally, information could also include whether or not, and what type of, bycatch mitigation measures are used and/or required as knowledge of trends in mitigation use and effectiveness will aid in bycatch reduction efforts.

MOP2: The 2nd Session of the Meeting of the Parties (MOP2) acknowledged that the outputs of the various working groups, including the SBWG, could be used in the future development and refinement of a suite of indicators to measure the success of ACAP (MOP2 Final Report, Annex 8, Resolution 2.8). Thus, the bycatch trends for ACAP species could serve as one of the performance indicators for the Agreement.

SBWG-2 at AC4: The SBWG reviewed a draft seabird bycatch data template (SBWG-2 Doc 15) at a meeting preceding AC4 in Hermanus, South Africa, and engaged in extensive discussion regarding the Advisory Committee's collection of seabird bycatch data from the Parties. The SBWG agreed that prior to the Parties submitting seabird bycatch data (and fishing information pertinent to whether or not seabirds may become bycatch), certain action tasks should be completed during the next intersessional period if at all possible (see Table 1, Timetable for Bycatch Data Collection).

MOP3: At the 3rd Meeting of the Parties (MOP3) the Advisory Committee presented the objectives, principles, application and scope of data collection that were identified through intersessional work carried out by the Seabird Bycatch Working Group (MOP3 Info Doc 1; see text box, next page).

In its report to the MOP3, the Advisory Committee noted progress with actions under Article IX of the Agreement (see MOP3 Doc 12, section 2.2). With respect to the assessment of bycatch levels, the Advisory Committee noted that improved knowledge of the level of bycatch in all major fisheries known to kill these birds is urgently needed. For many of the world's fisheries, independent observer coverage is either nonexistent or falls below the level required to accurately estimate bycatch levels. Key areas for data collection and collation still need to be agreed and tasks have been identified for intersessional work to progress the

incorporation of bycatch data provision into the reporting required of Parties under the implementation of the Agreement. This will form an important component of the work of SBWG during the next triennium.

(From MOP3 Info Doc 1)

Objectives for Bycatch Data Collection and Reporting from ACAP Parties

To regularly review and update data on the current levels and trends of incidental mortality of ACAP-listed albatrosses and petrels in relevant fisheries and to assess the implementation and effectiveness of bycatch mitigation measures in those fisheries.

To assist in determining the effectiveness of the Agreement.

Rationale for Bycatch Data Collection and Reporting

The rationale for the proposed data collection stems directly from the Agreement and the Action Plan, including:

- 1) Parties' obligations to take measures to reduce/eliminate bycatch (Action Plan 3.2.1);
- 2) the Advisory Committee's obligation to report to the MOP and, in particular, the requirement that reports should include reviews and updating on a regular basis of data on the mortality of albatrosses and petrels in, *inter alia*, commercial, and other relevant fisheries (Action Plan 5.1(f); and
- 3) Parties' obligation to report on implementation of the Agreement (Article IX(6)(d)).

Principles of Bycatch Data Collection and Reporting

As part of their reporting, Parties should annually submit summarized (ie aggregated), fishery-specific information on bycatch and bycatch mitigation to the Secretariat prior to each meeting of the Advisory Committee and each session of the Meeting of the Parties.

This information will form part of Parties' regular reporting on their implementation of the Agreement.

The Advisory Committee and its Seabird Bycatch Working Group will regularly review and update the submitted information and will produce analyses:

- of the levels and trends of the mortality of ACAP-listed species of albatrosses and petrels in relevant fisheries of ACAP Parties; and
- of the use of bycatch mitigation measures by ACAP Parties, including their effectiveness, trends and other relevant aspects, especially those that would assist ACAP and ACAP Parties to take appropriate conservation and management measures to reduce or eliminate bycatch and to identify "best practice".

Bycatch levels and trends for ACAP listed species and the use and effectiveness of bycatch mitigation measures will be used as indicators of the effectiveness of the Agreement.

The MOP3 noted that in order to achieve the most important outcomes over the next triennium, one of the actions that would be required would be the development of a process for reporting information on bycatch and fishing effort, the collation of data from many sources, including from national reports of Parties, on distribution of fishing effort and mortality of albatrosses/petrels attending fisheries and its incorporation into the ACAP database (see MOP3 Final Report, paragraph 7.1.10 and 7.1.11(ii and iii)).

AC5: Consistent with the timetable outlined by the Seabird Bycatch Working Group, the next steps were to:

- 1) learn what types of bycatch data are available from the Parties through a survey,
- 2) develop a prototype bycatch data collection form, and
- 3) test the prototype on a representative sample of ACAP Parties.

A meta-data questionnaire was developed jointly by a sub-group of the SBWG and the ACAP Secretariat to learn from Parties what data are currently available, including information on how their fisheries are monitored and bycatch data collected (e.g. observer program) or self-

reported (e.g. fishing logbooks). Prior to AC5, the Secretariat distributed and administered this meta-data survey (Attachment A) to all Parties and the United States, as well as compiling the responses in a summary form (Attachment B).

A ‘bycatch data request’ questionnaire was developed jointly by a sub-group of the SBWG and the ACAP Secretariat as a prototype bycatch data collection form (Attachment C). We were interested in testing the data collection process with a sample of Parties and getting feedback on the questionnaire itself, prior to a subsequent time when all Parties would be asked to submit bycatch data to the ACAP Secretariat. Kim Rivera (USA) continued with the facilitation of this effort.

SBWG-3:

Responses to Meta-Data Questionnaire

Questionnaire responses were submitted by: Argentina, Chile, Ecuador, France, New Zealand, Peru, South Africa, Spain, Uruguay, UK and also by the United States. The following items of interest were noted in the meta-data survey responses:

- All submissions reported some level of observer coverage in at least some of its monitored fisheries (Q#1).
- The vast majority of respondents noted that greater than 50% of the observers were trained in seabird identification and data collection (Q#2).
- With few exceptions, the respondents noted that they could share this data with ACAP (Q#7).
- The vast majority of respondents recorded the annual bycatch data by seabird species (Q#10).

Responses to Bycatch Data Request

Two Parties volunteered to complete this prototype bycatch data collection (Australia, Chile). Overall, the questions appear to be sufficient to collect information about the bycatch of ACAP-listed species from Parties, that in turn could be used by ACAP to monitor the implementation of the Agreement as well as its effectiveness at maintaining a favourable conservation status of the ACAP-listed species.

Two possible revisions to the questionnaire were identified upon review of the responses: 1) Clarify in question #7 if the bycatch composition by species is to be reported as the observed number of birds or the estimated number of birds; and 2) Expand question #8.3 to provide examples of the types of detailed information about mitigation measures or other fishing operation characteristics that could impact the number of birds being caught. Proposed revisions to the questionnaire are noted in ‘track changes’ in Attachment C.

Recommendation

Recognizing the importance of the submission, collection, and analysis of bycatch data for the implementation of the Agreement, the Advisory Committee is requested to:

Continue to support the proposed development of a bycatch data reporting system, including the annual collection of bycatch data, and amend the format for national reports on implementation of the Agreement (see AC5 Doc 16), in consultation with its Seabird Bycatch Working Group.

Consider that this collection of bycatch data through the national reporting system on implementation of the Agreement could serve as a possible ACAP indicator to measure the

success of the Parties in achieving and maintaining a favourable conservation status for albatrosses and petrels listed in Annex 1 of the Agreement (see AC5 Doc 28).

Table 1. Timetable for Bycatch Data Collection

Action	Status or Proposed timing
Develop written statement of the objectives, principles, application and scope of the data collection.	Completed 2009; see MOP3 Inf Doc 1
A survey of the Parties to learn what data are available including detailed information on how the fisheries are monitored and bycatch data collected (e.g. observer program, fishing logbooks) (see <u>Attachment</u>).	2009-2010; This AC5 Info paper
Create bibliography of ACAP Parties' bycatch data.	2010
Develop a prototype bycatch data collection protocol (see <u>Attachment</u>).	Completed 2009
Test prototype on a sample of ACAP Parties.	2009-10; Results reported here in this paper AC5 Info paper
Revise prototype as suggested by SBWG-3	AC5 2010
Progress Report to Advisory Committee	AC5 2010
Agreement by AC5 to recommend that Parties revise reporting requirements to include bycatch data collection system	AC5 2010
Incorporate the adopted bycatch data collection system into Parties' reporting.	2010-2011
Develop methods for analyses of data relating to (as above): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the levels and trends of the mortality of ACAP-listed species • the use of bycatch mitigation measures by ACAP Parties 	2010-11
Conduct analyses of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the levels and trends of the mortality of ACAP-listed species • the use of bycatch mitigation measures by ACAP Parties 	2011 and ongoing



Agreement on the Conservation
of Albatrosses and Petrels

ACAP BYCATCH META-DATA QUESTIONNAIRE

The ACAP Action Plan calls on the Advisory Committee to regularly review and update data on the mortality of albatrosses and petrels in commercial and other relevant fisheries (ACAP Action Plan 5.1(f)). At present, although ACAP Parties report regularly on the steps taken to implement the Agreement, few data are provided to allow a succinct and accurate assessment of the current levels of incidental mortality of ACAP-listed species in fisheries of ACAP Parties. At AC4 it was agreed that all Parties would 'work together intersessionally to advance this initiative' (AC4 Report, para 13.17).

The Advisory Committee agreed (refer item 4.8 of the AC Work Programme) that prior to the Parties submitting seabird bycatch data, including fishing information pertinent to whether or not seabirds may become bycatch, that Parties would be surveyed to learn what data are currently available, including information on how their fisheries are monitored and bycatch data collected (e.g. observer program) or are self-reported (e.g. fishing logbooks).

The following questionnaire has been developed to collect this information. Please fill out this questionnaire as fully as possible, by placing Y (yes) or N (no) in the tick boxes, and providing written information where space is available. Please fill out pages 2 and 3 for each monitored fishery, either by copying and pasting these pages as required within this document, or saving multiple copies of this document for distribution to appropriate agencies/dataholders. If samples of vessel logbooks or observer data forms (blank or filled out) could be returned with this questionnaire that would also be greatly appreciated.

To enable consideration of this information at AC5 it will be necessary to return the completed questionnaire to the Secretariat no later than **12 December 2009**. Completed questionnaires and accompanying sample observer data forms or logbooks can be emailed back to Wieslawa.Misiak@acap.aq, or posted to: ACAP Secretariat, GPO Box 824, Hobart TAS 7001, Australia.

Country:			
Fishery	monitored for seabird bycatch	not monitored for seabird bycatch	not monitored but might pose a risk of seabird bycatch
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			

Monitored Fishery (name and type):	
Agency responsible for management:	
Name of person filling out this form:	
Institution/Organization:	
Phone:	
Email:	

FLEET INFORMATION

1. How is this fishery monitored? Independent observer Logbook
 Sample observer data form (blank or filled out) attached? Sample logbook (blank or filled out) attached?

2. Are observers trained in seabird identification and data collection?

3. If yes, what % are trained? <5% 5-20% 21-50% >50%

4. When did observer programme start?

5. What years were data collected (e.g. 1999, 2000-2005)?

6. Is this a long-term/ongoing programme? 7. Can this data be shared with ACAP?

8. What % of fleet is observed for seabird bycatch?
 <10% 10-25% 26-50% 51-75% >75%

9. What is the % of hooks/sets/tows/shots/hauls (delete those not applicable) observed per vessel?
 <10% 10-25% 26-50% 51-75% >75%

BYCATCH INFORMATION

10. How is the **annual bycatch** data for this fishery recorded?
 by species by taxa groupings (e.g. petrels, shy-type albatrosses) by total seabirds

11. Is the **type of interaction** (e.g. caught at longline set/haul, warp strike, net entanglement) recorded?

12. Is **bird life status** (e.g. bird dead, injured, alive) recorded?

VESSEL INFORMATION

13. Is total (actual or estimated) **target species catch** data collected?

14. Are **operational details** of vessels recorded (e.g. setting/hauling start and end time, setting speed, presence of fishery discards)?

15. Are **fishing gear** characteristics recorded (e.g. weights on lines, spacing of weights, net weights, mesh size)?

16. Is **environmental data** collected during fishing operations (e.g. sea state, wind speed and direction)?

MITIGATION MEASURES

17. Are any **mandatory mitigation** measures implemented in this fishery (e.g. night setting, streamer lines, additional weights on lines)?

18. If yes, when were the mandatory mitigation measures first introduced?

19. Are any **voluntary mitigation** measures used in this fishery (e.g. night setting, streamer lines, additional weights on lines)?

20. If yes, when were the voluntary mitigation measures first introduced?

21. Are any of the mitigation measures monitored for effectiveness?

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

22. Do you have any comments or feedback about this questionnaire or any other information about this fishery not covered above?

Country	Number of Fisheries	Fleet information							Bycatch info			Vessel Information				Mitigation Measures			
		How fishery monitored	% observers trained	Observer programme start?	Longterm/ongoing	Can share w ACAP?	% fleet observed for seabird bycatch	% of effort observed	How bycatch recorded	Type of interaction recorded?	Life status recorded?	Target spp data collected?	Operational details recorded?	Fishing gear info recorded?	Enviro data collected?	Mandatory mitigation measures?	When introduced?	Voluntary mitigation measures?	Any measures monitored for effectiveness?
New Zealand	6	all obs	all >50	1995-2006	all Y	all Y	1 <10, 5 10-25	4 51-75, 2 >75	all sp	all Y	all Y	all Y	all Y	all Y	all Y	5Y, 1N	1990-2008	3Y, 1N, 1 variable	3Y, 1N
Ecuador	1			June 2009		Y				Y	Y				N	N		N	
Uruguay	3	all obs & lgbk	2 >50, 1 <5	1998-2008	all Y		26-50, >75, <10	>75, 26-50, 51-75	all sp	all Y	all Y	all Y	all Y	all Y	all Y	2Y, 1N		1 Y	2Y
South Africa	2	1 obs, 1 obs & lgbk	all >50		all Y	all Y	>75, 10-25	1 >75	1 sp, 1 total birds	all Y	all Y	all Y	all Y	all Y	all Y	all Y		all Y	1Y, 1N
UK	9	all obs & lgbk	all >50	1986-2002	all Y	all Y	4 >75, 2 26-50, 2 10-25, 1 <10	3 <10, 2 10-25, 1 26-50, 1 >75, 1 75 sets 35 hauls	all Y	all Y	all Y	all Y	all Y	all Y	all Y	8Y, 1N	1991-2007	5Y, 4N	8Y, 1NA
US	15	1 lgbk, 3 obs & lgbk, 11 obs	14 >50, 1 NA	late 1960s-2004	14Y, 1NA	2Y, 2N	6 <10, 4 10-25, 2 >75	11 >75, 1 10-25	14 sp, 1NA	12Y, 3N	12Y, 3N	all Y	all Y	3Y, 12N	2Y, 13N	3Y, 12N	c.2000-2004	3Y, 2?, 10N	3Y, 2N, 4NA
Peru	4	all obs	3 >50, 1 21-50	1998-2009	2Y, 2N	all Y	all <10	3 >75, 1 <10	all sp	all Y	all Y	all Y	all Y	all Y	2Y, 2N	all N		all N	
Argentina	7, reported 2	2 obs	2 21-50	1984	2Y	2Y, 2N	2 10-25	2 >75	2 sp	2Y	2Y	2Y	2Y	2Y	2Y	2Y	2009	2N	2N
Spain	15	2 obs & lgbk, 5 obs	7 >50	1980-2003	7Y	5Y, 1N	3 <10, 1 10-25, 1 <10 & 10-25, 2 >75	7 >75	6 sp, 1 taxa grps	6Y, 2N	7Y, 1N	9Y	8Y, 1N	8Y, 1N	9Y	7N, 2Y		7N, 2Y	1Y, 1N
Chile	15, reported 4	4 obs & lgbk	3 >50, 1 not trained	1993-2004	4Y	4Y	3 >75, 1 10-25	2 >75, 1 26-50, 1 51-75	2 sp, 2 total birds	3Y, 1N	4Y	4Y	4Y	4Y	4Y	3Y, 1N		4N	2N, 2Y
France	1	obs & lgbk	>50	2000	1Y	1Y	>75	25	sp	1Y	1Y	1Y	1Y	1Y	1Y	2002	1Y	1Y	
Australia																			
Brazil																			
Norway																			

obs - observers
lgbks - logbooks
sp - species
taxa grps - taxa groups
Y - Yes
N - No

AC5 Inf 10 ATTACHEMENT C
Agenda items 9.1, 16



Agreement on the Conservation
of Albatrosses and Petrels

ACAP BYCATCH DATA REQUEST

The ACAP Action Plan calls on the Advisory Committee to regularly review and update data on the mortality of albatrosses and petrels in commercial and other relevant fisheries (ACAP Action Plan 5.1(f)). At present, although ACAP Parties report regularly on the steps taken to implement the Agreement, few data are provided to allow a succinct and accurate assessment of the current levels of incidental mortality of ACAP-listed species in fisheries of ACAP Parties. At AC4 it was agreed that all Parties would 'work together intersessionally to advance this initiative' (AC4 Report, para 13.17).

The following form was developed to trial the collection of bycatch data from selected Parties, prior to the final version being distributed to all Parties post AC5. Please fill out this form as fully as possible, by placing Y (yes), N (no), or NA (not applicable) in the tick boxes, or providing written information where space is available. Please complete the form for each fishery, either by copying and pasting pages 2-6 within this document, or by saving multiple copies of this document for distribution to appropriate agencies/dataholders.

Please return the completed form to the Secretariat no later than **10 December 2009** to allow sufficient time for the preparation of a consolidated paper for consideration at AC5. Completed forms and any feedback/questions should be emailed to Wieslawa.Misiak@acap.ag, or posted to: ACAP Secretariat, GPO Box 824, Hobart TAS 7001, Australia.

AC5 Inf 10 ATTACHEMENT C
Agenda items 9.1, 16



Country:	
Fishery (name and type):	
Agency responsible for management:	
Name of person filling out this form:	
Institution/Organisation:	
Phone:	
Email:	

FLEET INFORMATION

1. Fleet details (number of vessels by year)	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
1.1 Total number of active licenses:					
1.2 Size by length (metres):					
0-15					
16-30					
31-60					
61-120					
>120					
1.3 Size by tonnage:					
0-10					
11-50					
51-100					
101-500					
>500					

2. Fishing areas (please describe the geographic range for each year or include maps)

Maps attached?

AC5 Inf 10 ATTACHEMENT C
Agenda items 9.1, 16

3.1 Is there an **observer program** operating in this fishery?

3.2 If YES please provide further details, including year when first introduced:

3.3 Are observers specifically tasked with recording seabird and other bycatch data?

3.4 Are there other tasks for observers that take priority over seabird and other bycatch data?

3.5 If YES, please provide further details:

4. Fishing effort (total number of hooks set/number of tows/other parameter by fleet):	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Q1 (Jan-Mar)					
Q2 (Apr-Jun)					
Q3 (Jul-Sep)					
Q4 (Oct-Dec)					
Annual					

5. Number of hooks/tows/other observed for seabird bycatch of total set	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Q1 (Jan-Mar)					
Q2 (Apr-Jun)					
Q3 (Jul-Sep)					
Q4 (Oct-Dec)					
Annual					

AC5 Inf 10 ATTACHEMENT C
Agenda items 9.1, 16

BYCATCH INFORMATION

6. Estimated total annual bycatch of seabirds (number of birds or rate)	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Q1 (Jan-Mar)					
Q2 (Apr-Jun)					
Q3 (Jul-Sep)					
Q4 (Oct-Dec)					
Annual					

7. Composition of bycatch for each year monitored (estimated number of birds or rate)					
Species	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
<i>Diomedea amsterdamensis</i>					
<i>Diomedea antipodensis</i>					
<i>Diomedea dabbenena</i>					
<i>Diomedea epomophora</i>					
<i>Diomedea exulans</i>					
<i>Diomedea sanfordi</i>					
<i>Phoebastria albatrus</i>					
<i>Phoebastria immutabilis</i>					
<i>Phoebastria irrorata</i>					
<i>Phoebastria nigripes</i>					
<i>Phoebetria fusca</i>					
<i>Phoebetria palpebrata</i>					
<i>Thalassarche bulleri</i>					
<i>Thalassarche carteri</i>					
<i>Thalassarche cauta</i>					
<i>Thalassarche chlororhyncos</i>					
<i>Thalassarche chrysostoma</i>					
<i>Thalassarche eremita</i>					
<i>Thalassarche impavida</i>					
<i>Thalassarche melanophrys</i>					
<i>Thalassarche salvini</i>					
<i>Thalassarche steadi</i>					
<i>Macronectes giganteus</i>					
<i>Macronectes halli</i>					
<i>Procellaria aequinoctialis</i>					
<i>Procellaria cinerea</i>					
<i>Procellaria conspicillata</i>					
<i>Procellaria parkinsoni</i>					
<i>Procellaria westlandica</i>					

Comment [kr1]: Clarify if #7 is asking for estimated numbers of each species (then the sum of species caught in #7 should equal the total of estimated birds caught annually and provided in #6) or if the observed number of birds should be recorded. If the latter, are we interested in knowing what type of extrapolation method is used to arrive at the estimate total of bycaught seabirds?

AC5 Inf 10 ATTACHEMENT C
Agenda items 9.1, 16

Unidentified albatrosses					
Petrels					
Shearwaters					
Other species					
Citation/source/data holder:					

MITIGATION MEASURES

8.1 Are any **mitigation measures** currently required in this fishery?

8.2 If YES, list each type for this fishery and year when first introduced:

8.3 Is any detailed information on mitigation collected?

8.4 If YES, please provide further details:

8.5 Is mitigation compliance and /or effectiveness monitored?

8.6 If YES, how is compliance and/or effectiveness monitored?

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

9. Do you have any **comments or suggestions** on how to improve this form (e.g. additional questions that could be included, any clarification needed etc.) or any other information about this fishery not covered above?

One respondent included information about other types of seabird-related data collected by observers—for e.g. offal discharge operational practices. Do we want to include a question that would ask specifically for Parties to specify any other types of seabird or mitigation-related data that are collected?

One respondent questioned if Q#8.3 and 8.4 provided any useful information? Given the above, perhaps #8.3 could be revised to be more specific. For instance, "Is any detailed information on mitigation collected? For instance, information about fishing operational practices that could impact whether birds get caught or not; such as offal discharge practices."