



Agreement on the Conservation  
of Albatrosses and Petrels

## **ACAP REVIEW AND BEST PRACTICE ADVICE FOR REDUCING THE IMPACT OF PELAGIC LONGLINE FISHERIES ON SEABIRDS**

*Reviewed at the Ninth Meeting of the Advisory Committee  
La Serena, Chile, 9 – 13 May 2016*

### **INTRODUCTION**

The incidental mortality of seabirds in pelagic longline fisheries continues to be a serious global concern, especially for threatened albatrosses and petrels. The need for international cooperation in addressing this concern was a major reason for establishing the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP). In pelagic longline fisheries seabirds are killed when they become hooked or entangled and drowned while foraging for baits on longline hooks as the gear is deployed. Seabirds can also be hooked or entangled as the gear is hauled; however, many of these seabirds can be released alive with careful handling.

There have been significant efforts internationally to develop mitigation measures to avoid or minimise the risk of incidental catch of seabirds in longline fisheries. Although most mitigation measures are broadly applicable, the application and specifications of some will vary with local methods and gear configurations. ACAP has comprehensively reviewed the scientific literature dealing with seabird bycatch mitigation in pelagic longline fisheries (see review section below) and this document is a summary of the advice informed by the review. Most of this scientific literature relates to large vessels, with lesser research attention given to small vessels and gear configurations and methods used in artisanal or semi-industrial fleets. Seabird bycatch mitigation advice for these fisheries is currently under development.

This document provides advice about best practices for reducing the impact of pelagic longline fishing on seabirds. ACAP's best practice advice is that the simultaneous use of weighted branch lines, bird scaring lines and night setting is the most effective approach to mitigate seabird bycatch in pelagic longline fisheries. Two hook-shielding devices, the 'Hook Pod' and the 'Smart Tuna Hook', have recently (2016) been assessed and on the basis of this assessment have been included in the list of best practice measures for mitigating seabird bycatch in pelagic longline fisheries. These best practice bycatch mitigation measures should be applied in areas where fishing effort overlaps with seabirds vulnerable to bycatch to reduce the incidental mortality to the lowest possible levels. The ACAP review process recognises that factors such as safety, practicality and the characteristics of the fishery should also be taken into account when considering the efficacy of seabird bycatch mitigation measures and consequently in the development of advice and guidelines on best practice.

This document also provides information regarding measures that are currently under active development, and which show promise as future best practices in pelagic longline fisheries. ACAP will continue to monitor the development of these improving practices and the results of scientific research about their effectiveness.

Additionally, this document provides information about mitigation measures that are not recommended. A wide range of potential seabird bycatch mitigation measures have been proposed over time; however, not all of these have proven effective. ACAP considers that certain mitigation measures are ineffective, based either on scientific studies, or a lack of evidence in substantiation of claims made about the mitigation measure.

The document comprises two components. The first component provides a summary of ACAP's advice regarding best practice measures for reducing seabird bycatch in pelagic longline fisheries, and the second component outlines the review of mitigation measures that have been assessed for pelagic longline fisheries.



## ACAP SUMMARY ADVICE FOR REDUCING THE IMPACT OF PELAGIC LONGLINE FISHERIES ON SEABIRDS

*Reviewed at the Ninth Meeting of the Advisory Committee  
La Serena, Chile, 9 – 13 May 2016*

### BEST PRACTICE MEASURES

ACAP recommends that the most effective way to reduce seabird bycatch in pelagic longline fisheries is to use the following **three best practice measures** (branch line weighting, night setting and bird scaring lines) **simultaneously**:

#### 1. Branch line weighting

Branch lines should be weighted to sink the baited hooks rapidly out of the diving range of feeding seabirds. Studies have demonstrated that branch line weighting where there is more mass closer to the hooks, sink most rapidly and consistently; thereby, dramatically reducing seabird attacks on baits and most likely reducing mortalities. Studies of a range of weighting regimes, including placing weights at the hook, have shown no negative effect on target catch rates. Continued refinement of line weighting configurations (mass, number and position of weights and materials) with regard to effectively reducing seabird bycatch and safety concerns through controlled research and application in fisheries, is encouraged.

Increased weighting will shorten but not eliminate the distance behind the vessel in which birds can be caught. Line weighting has been shown to improve the effectiveness of other mitigation methods such as night setting and bird scaring lines, in reducing seabird bycatch. Line weighting is integral to the fishing gear and, compared to bird scaring lines and night setting, has the advantage of being more consistently implemented, hence facilitating compliance and port monitoring. On this basis it is important to enhance the priority accorded to line weighting, providing certain pre-conditions can be met, among other things: (a) weighting regime adequately specified; (b) safety issues adequately addressed; and (c) issues concerning application to artisanal fisheries being taken into account.

Current recommended minimum standards for branch line weighting configurations include the following:

- (a) 40 g or greater attached within 0.5 m of the hook; or
- (b) 60 g or greater attached within 1 m of the hook; or
- (c) 80 g or greater attached within 2 m of the hook.

## **2. Night setting**

Setting longlines at night (defined as the time between the end of nautical twilight and before nautical dawn as set out in the Nautical Almanac tables for relevant latitude, local time and date.) is highly effective at reducing incidental mortality of seabirds because the majority of vulnerable seabirds are inactive at night. However, night setting is not as effective for crepuscular/ nocturnal foragers (e.g. White-chinned Petrels, *Procellaria aequinoctialis*). The effectiveness of this measure may be reduced during bright moonlight and when using intense deck lights, and is less practical in high latitudes during summer, when the time between nautical dusk and dawn is limited.

## **3. Bird scaring lines**

Properly designed and deployed bird scaring lines (BSLs) deter birds from sinking baits, dramatically reducing seabird attacks and related mortalities. A bird scaring line runs from a high point at the stern to a device or mechanism that creates drag at its terminus. Brightly coloured streamers hanging from the aerial extent of the line scare birds from flying to and under the line, preventing them from reaching the baited hooks.

Bird scaring lines should be the lightest practical strong fine line. Lines should be attached to the vessel with a barrel swivel to minimise rotation of the line from torque created as it is dragged behind the vessel. Long streamers should be attached with a swivel to prevent them from rolling up onto the BSL. Towed objects should be attached at the terminus of the BSL to increase drag. BSLs are at risk of tangling with float lines leading to lost bird scaring lines, interruptions in vessel operations and in some cases lost fishing gear. Alternatives, such as adding short streamers to the in-water portion of the line, can enhance drag while minimising tangles with float lines. Weak links (breakaways) should be incorporated into the in-water portion of the line for safety reasons and to minimize operational problems associated with lines becoming tangled.

Given operational differences in pelagic longline fisheries due to vessel size and gear type, bird scaring lines specifications have been divided into recommendations for vessels greater than 35 metres and those less than 35 metres in length.

### **3. a) Recommendations for vessels >35 m total length**

Simultaneous use of two BSLs, one on each side of the sinking longline, provides maximum protection from bird attacks under different wind conditions. The setup for BSLs should be as follows:

- BSLs should be deployed to maximise the aerial extent, which is a function of vessel speed, height of the attachment point to the vessel, drag, and weight of bird scaring line materials.
- To achieve a minimum recommended aerial extent of 100 m, BSLs should be attached to the vessel such that they are suspended from a point a minimum of 8 m above the water at the stern.
- BSLs should contain a mix of brightly coloured long and short streamers placed at intervals of no more than 5 m. Long streamers should be attached to the line with swivels to prevent streamers from wrapping around the line. All long streamers should reach the sea-surface in calm conditions.
- Baited hooks should be deployed within the area bounded by the two BSLs. If using bait-casting machines, they should be adjusted so as to land baited hooks within the area bounded by the BSLs.

If large vessels use only one BSL, it should be deployed windward of the sinking baits. If baited hooks are set outboard of the wake, the BSL attachment point to the vessel should be positioned several metres outboard of the side of the vessel that baits are deployed.

### **3. b) Recommendations for vessels <35 m total length**

Two designs have been shown to be effective:

1. a design with a mix of long and short streamers, that includes long streamers placed at 5 m intervals over the first 55 m of the BSL, and
2. a design that does not include long streamers. Short streamers (no less than 1 m in length) should be placed at 1 m intervals along the length of the aerial extent.

In all cases, streamers should be brightly coloured. To achieve a minimum recommended aerial extent of 75 m, BSLs should be attached to the vessel such that they are suspended from a point a minimum of 7 m above the water at the stern.

## **ACAP ALSO REGARDS THE FOLLOWING TWO MEASURES AS BEST PRACTICE:**

### **4. Hook-shielding devices**

Hook-shielding devices encase the point and barb of baited hooks to prevent seabird attacks during line setting until a prescribed depth is reached (a minimum of 10 meters), or until after a minimum period of immersion has occurred (a minimum of 10 minutes) that ensures that baited hooks are released beyond the foraging depth of most seabirds. The following performance requirements are used by ACAP to assess the efficacy of hook-shielding devices in reducing seabird bycatch:

- (a) the device shields the hook until a prescribed depth of 10 m or immersion time of 10 minutes is reached;
- (b) the device meets current recommended minimum standards for branch line weighting described in Section 1;
- (c) experimental research has been undertaken to allow assessment of the effectiveness, efficiency and practicality of the technology against the ACAP best practice seabird bycatch mitigation criteria developed for assessing and recommending best practice advice on seabird bycatch mitigation measures.

Devices assessed as having met the performance requirements listed above will be considered best practice. At this time, the following devices have been assessed as meeting these performance requirements and are therefore considered to represent best practice:

1. 'Hook Pod' – 68 g minimum weight that is positioned at the hook, encapsulating the barb and point of the hook during setting, and remains attached until it reaches 10 m in depth, when the hook is released (Sullivan *et al.* 2016, Barrington 2016a).
2. 'Smart Tuna Hook' – 40 g minimum weight that is positioned at the hook, encapsulating the barb and point of the hook during setting, and remains attached for a minimum period of 10 minutes after setting, when the hook is released (Baker *et al.* 2016, Barrington 2016b)

The assessment of these devices as best practice is conditional on continuing to meet the above performance requirements.

## **5. Time-Area fishery closures**

The temporary closure of important seabird foraging areas (e.g. areas adjacent to important seabird colonies during the breeding season or highly productive waters when large numbers of aggressively feeding seabirds are present) to fishing will eliminate incidental mortality of seabirds in that area.

## OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

**Side-setting with line weighting and bird curtain (North Pacific):** Research conducted in the North Pacific indicates that side-setting was more effective than other simultaneously trialled mitigation measures, including setting chutes and blue-dyed bait (Gilman *et al.*, 2003b). It should be noted that these tests were conducted in a single pilot scale trial of 14 days in the Hawaiian pelagic longline fishery for tuna and swordfish with an assemblage of surface-feeding seabirds (Gilman *et al.*, 2003b). This method requires testing in the Southern Ocean with deeper-diving species and at a larger spatial scale, before it can be considered as a recommended approach beyond the pilot fishery.

Side-setting **must** be used in combination with ACAP best practice recommendations for line weighting in order to increase sink rates forward of the vessel's stern, and hooks should be cast well forward of the setting position, but close to the hull of the vessel, to allow hooks time to sink as far as possible before they reach the stern. Bird curtains, a horizontal pole with vertical streamers, positioned aft of the setting station, may deter birds from flying close to the side of the vessel. The combined use of side-setting, line weighting and a bird curtain should be considered as a single measure.

**Mainline tension:** Setting longlines into propeller turbulence (wake) should be avoided because it slows the sink rates of baited hooks.

**Live vs. dead bait:** Use of live bait should be avoided. Individual live baits can remain near the water surface for extended periods, thus increasing the likelihood of seabird captures.

**Bait hooking position:** Baits hooked in either the head (fish), or tail (fish and squid) are recommended because they sink significantly faster than baits hooked in the mid-back (fish) or upper mantle (squid).

**Offal and discard discharge management:** Offal and discards should not be discharged during line setting. During line hauling, offal and used baits should preferably be retained or discharged on the opposite side of the vessel from that on which the line is hauled. All hooks should be removed and retained on board before discards are discharged from the vessel.

## MEASURES UNDER DEVELOPMENT

**Technologies that control depth of release of baited hooks:** New technologies that set or release baited hooks at depth (underwater setting device) or disarm hooks to specific depths, thus preventing seabird access to baits, are currently under development and undergoing sea trials.

## MITIGATION MEASURES THAT ARE NOT RECOMMENDED

ACAP considers that the following measures lack scientific substantiation as technologies or procedures for reducing the impact of pelagic longlines on seabirds.

**Line shooters:** No experimental evidence of effectiveness in pelagic longline fisheries.

**Olfactory deterrents:** No evidence of effectiveness in pelagic longline fisheries.

**Hook size and design:** Changes to hook size and design may reduce the chance of seabird mortality in longline fisheries, but have not been adequately studied.

**Blue dyed bait:** No experimental evidence of effectiveness in pelagic longline fisheries. Insufficiently researched.

**Bait thaw status:** No evidence that the thaw status of baits has any effect on the sink rate of baited hooks set on weighted lines.

The ACAP review of seabird bycatch mitigation measures for pelagic longline fisheries is presented in the following section.





Agreement on the Conservation  
of Albatrosses and Petrels

## **ACAP REVIEW OF SEABIRD BYCATCH MITIGATION MEASURES FOR PELAGIC LONGLINE FISHERIES**

*Reviewed at the Ninth Meeting of the Advisory Committee  
La Serena, Chile, 9 – 13 May 2016*

### **INTRODUCTION**

A range of technical and operational mitigation methods have been designed or adapted for use in pelagic longline fisheries. These methods aim to reduce incidental mortality of seabirds by avoiding peak areas and periods of seabird foraging activity, reducing the time baited hooks are available to birds, actively deterring birds from baited hooks, making the vessel less attractive to birds, and minimising the visibility of baited hooks. Apart from being technically effective at reducing seabird bycatch, mitigation methods need to be easy and safe to implement, cost effective, enforceable and should not reduce catch rates of target species.

The suite of mitigation measures available may vary in their feasibility and effectiveness depending on the area, seabird assemblages, fishery and vessel type, and gear configuration. Some of the mitigation methods are well established and explicitly prescribed in pelagic longline fisheries; however, additional measures are undergoing further testing and refinements.

The Seabird Bycatch Working Group (SBWG) of ACAP has comprehensively reviewed the scientific literature dealing with seabird bycatch mitigation in pelagic fisheries and this document is a distillation of that review. At each of its meetings, the SBWG review any recent research or information regarding seabird bycatch mitigation, and update the review and best practice advice accordingly. Currently, the simultaneous use of weighted branch lines, bird scaring lines and night setting, or the use of one of two assessed hook-shielding devices, the 'Hook Pod' and the 'Smart Tuna Hook', is considered best practice mitigation for reducing seabird bycatch in pelagic longline fisheries.

### **THE ACAP REVIEW PROCESS**

At each of its meetings, the ACAP SBWG considers any new research or information pertaining to seabird bycatch mitigation in pelagic longline fisheries. The following criteria are used by ACAP to guide the assessment process, and to determine whether a particular fishing technology or measure can be considered best practice to reduce the incidental mortality of albatrosses and petrels in fishing operations.

## Best Practice Seabird Bycatch Mitigation Criteria and Definition

- i. Individual fishing technologies and techniques should be selected from those shown by experimental research to significantly<sup>1</sup> reduce the rate of seabird incidental mortality<sup>2</sup> to the lowest achievable levels. Experience has shown that experimental research comparing the performance of candidate mitigation technologies to a control of no deterrent, where possible, or to status quo in the fishery, yields definitive results. Analysis of fishery observer data after it has been collected on the relative performance of mitigation approaches are plagued with a myriad of confounding factors. Where a significant relationship is demonstrated between seabird behaviour and seabird mortality in a particular system or seabird assemblage, significant reductions in seabird behaviours, such as the rate of seabirds attacking baited hooks, can serve as a proxy for reduced seabird mortality. Ideally, when simultaneous use of fishing technologies and practices is recommended as best practice, research should demonstrate significantly improved performance of the combined measures.
- ii. Fishing technologies and techniques, or a combination thereof, shall have clear and proven specifications and minimum performance standards for their deployment and use. Examples would include: specific bird scaring line designs (lengths, streamer length and materials; etc.), number (one vs. two) and deployment specifications (such as aerial extent and timing of deployment); night fishing defined by the time between the end of nautical dusk and start of nautical dawn; and, line weighting configurations specifying mass and placement of weights or weighted sections.
- iii. Fishing technologies and techniques shall be demonstrated to be practical, cost effective and widely available. Commercial fishing operators are likely to select for seabird bycatch reduction measures and devices that meet these criteria including practical aspects concerning safe fishing practices at sea.
- iv. Fishing technologies and techniques should, to the extent practicable, maintain catch rates of target species. This approach should increase the likelihood of acceptance and compliance by fishers.
- v. Fishing technologies and techniques should, to the extent practicable not increase the bycatch of other taxa. For example, measures that increase the likelihood of catching other protected species such as sea turtles, sharks and marine mammals, should not be considered best practice (or only so in exceptional circumstances).
- vi. Minimum performance standards and methods of ensuring compliance should be provided for fishing technologies and techniques, and should be clearly specified in fishery regulations. Relatively simple methods to check compliance should include, but not be limited to, port inspections of branch lines to determine compliance with branch line weighting, determination of the presence of davits (tori poles) to support bird scaring lines, and inspections of bird scaring lines for conformance with design requirements. Compliance monitoring and reporting should be a high priority for enforcement authorities.

---

<sup>1</sup> Any use of the word 'significant' in this document is meant in the statistical context

<sup>2</sup> This may be determined by either a direct reduction in seabird mortality or by reduction in seabird attack rates, as a proxy

On the basis of these criteria, the scientific evidence for the effectiveness of mitigation measures or fishing technologies/techniques in reducing seabird bycatch is assessed, and explicit information is provided on whether the measure is recommended as being effective, and thus considered best practice, or not. The ACAP review also indicates whether the measure needs to be combined with additional measures, and provides notes and caveats for each measure, together with information on performance standards and further research needs. Following each meeting of ACAP's SBWG and Advisory Committee, this review document and ACAP's best practice advice, is updated (if required). A summary of ACAP's current best practice advice is provided in the preceding section of this document.

## SEABIRD BYCATCH MITIGATION FACT SHEETS

A series of seabird bycatch mitigation fact sheets have been developed by ACAP and BirdLife International to provide practical information, including illustrations, on seabird bycatch mitigation measures (<http://www.acap.aq/en/resources/bycatch-mitigation/mitigation-fact-sheets>). The sheets, which include information on the effectiveness of the specific measure, their limitations and strengths and best practice recommendations for their effective adoption, are linked to the ACAP review process, and are updated following ACAP reviews. Links to the available fact sheets are provided in the relevant sections below. The mitigation fact sheets are currently available in [English](#), [French](#), [Spanish](#), [Portuguese](#), [Japanese](#), [Korean](#) and [Mandarin](#).

## BEST PRACTICE MEASURES

### 1. Branchline weighting

#### ***Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries***

**Proven and recommended mitigation method.** Should be used in combination with night setting and bird scaring lines (Brothers 1991; Boggs 2001; Sakai *et al.* 2001; Brothers *et al.* 2001; Anderson & McArdle 2002; Hu *et al.* 2005; Melvin *et al.* 2013; 2014).

#### ***Notes and Caveats***

Branch lines should be weighted to sink the baited hooks rapidly out of the diving range of feeding seabirds. Studies have demonstrated that branch line weighting where there is more mass closer to the hooks, sink most rapidly and consistently (Gianuca *et al.* 2013; Robertson *et al.* 2010a; 2013), reduces seabird attacks on baits (Gianuca *et al.* 2013; Ochi *et al.* 2013) and seabird mortalities (Jiménez *et al.* 2013). Studies of a range of weighting regimes, including placing weights at the hook, have shown no negative effect on target catch rates (Jiménez *et al.* 2013; Robertson *et al.* 2013; Gianuca *et al.* 2013).

Increased weighting will shorten but not eliminate the distance behind the vessel in which birds can be caught. Line weighting has been shown to improve the effectiveness of other mitigation methods such as night setting and bird scaring lines, in reducing seabird bycatch (Brothers 1991; Boggs 2001; Sakai *et al.* 2001; Anderson & McArdle 2002; Gilman *et al.* 2003a, Hu *et al.* 2005; Melvin *et al.* 2013; 2014). Line weighting is integral to the fishing gear and, compared to bird scaring lines and night setting, has the advantage of being more consistently implemented, hence facilitating compliance and port monitoring. On this basis it

is important to enhance the priority accorded to line weighting, providing certain pre-conditions can be met, among other things: (a) that the weighting regime is adequately specified; (b) safety issues are adequately addressed; and (c) issues concerning application to artisanal fisheries being taken into account.

### ***Minimum standards***

On the basis of sink-rate data (Barrington et al. 2016) and seabird attack and bycatch rates, current recommended minimum standards for branch line weighting are as follows:

- (a) 40 g or greater attached within 0.5 m of the hook; or
- (b) 60 g or greater attached within 1 m of the hook; or
- (c) 80 g or greater attached within 2 m of the hook.

### ***Need for combination***

Should be combined with bird scaring lines and night setting.

### ***Implementation monitoring***

**Vessels <35 m total length:** Line weights crimped into branch lines are very difficult to remove at sea. Inspection before departure from port of all gear bins on vessels is therefore considered an acceptable form of implementation monitoring.

**Vessels >35 m total length:** It is possible to remove and/or re-configure gear at sea. Consequently, implementation monitoring requires using appropriate methods (e.g., observer inspection of line setting operations; video surveillance; at-sea compliance checks). Video surveillance may be possible, subject to the mainline setter being fitted with motion sensors to trigger cameras.

### ***Research needs***

Continued refinement of line weighting configurations (mass, number and position of weights and materials) with regard to effectively reducing seabird bycatch and safety concerns, through controlled research and application in fisheries, is encouraged. Studies should also include evaluations of the effects of branch line weighting on the catch rate of pelagic fish and provide data that allow evaluation of the relative safety and practicality attributes of various weighting configurations.

### ***Mitigation Fact Sheet***

<https://www.acap.aq/en/bycatch-mitigation/bycatch-mitigation-fact-sheets>

## **2. Night setting**

### ***Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries***

**Proven and recommended mitigation method.** Should be used in combination with weighted branch lines and bird scaring lines (Duckworth 1995; Gales *et al.* 1998; Klaer & Polacheck 1998; Brothers *et al.* 1999; McNamara *et al.* 1999; Gilman *et al.* 2005; Baker & Wise 2005; Jiménez *et al.* 2009; Melvin *et al.* 2013; 2014).

**Notes and Caveats**

Setting longlines at night (defined as the time between the end of nautical twilight and before nautical dawn as set out in the Nautical Almanac tables for relevant latitude, local time and date) is highly effective at reducing incidental mortality of seabirds because the majority of vulnerable seabirds are inactive at night. However, night setting is not as effective for crepuscular/ nocturnal foragers (e.g. White-chinned Petrels, *Procellaria aequinoctialis*). Consequently, night setting should be used in combination with weighted branch lines and bird scaring lines (Klaer & Polacheck 1998; Brothers *et al.* 1999; McNamara *et al.* 1999; Gilman *et al.* 2005; Baker & Wise 2005; Jiménez *et al.* 2009; Melvin *et al.* 2013; 2014). The effectiveness of this measure may be reduced during bright moonlight and when using intense deck lights, and is less practical in high latitudes during summer, when the time between nautical dusk and dawn is limited.

**Minimum standards**

No setting should take place between nautical dawn and nautical dusk. Nautical dawn and nautical dusk are defined as set out in the Nautical Almanac tables for relevant latitude, local time and date.

**Need for combination**

Should be used in combination with bird scaring lines and weighted branch lines.

**Implementation monitoring**

Requires Vessel Monitoring Systems (VMS) or fishery observers. Vessel speed and direction vary between transiting, line setting, line hauling and when vessels are stationary on fishing grounds. VMS-derived assessment of vessel activity in relation to time of nautical dawn and dusk are considered acceptable for implementation monitoring. Alternatively VMS-linked sensors fitted to mainline setting and hauling drum could be used to indicate compliance, as could sensors to trigger video surveillance cameras. This facility is currently unavailable and requires development.

**Research needs**

Assessing the effectiveness of bird scaring lines and branchline weighting at night needs to be determined, possibly by way of using thermal or night vision technologies.

**Mitigation Fact Sheet**

<https://www.acap.aq/en/bycatch-mitigation/bycatch-mitigation-fact-sheets/1824-fs-05-demersal-pelagic-longline-night-setting/file>

**3.a) Bird scaring lines for vessels >35 m in total length****Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries**

**Proven and recommended mitigation method.** Should be used in combination with weighted branch lines and night-setting. (Imber 1994; Uozumi & Takeuchi 1998; Brothers *et al.* 1999; Klaer & Polacheck 1998; McNamara *et al.* 1999; Boggs 2001; CCAMLR 2002; Minami & Kiyota 2004; Melvin 2003). For vessels >35 m in length, the use of two bird scaring lines (BSLs) is considered best practice. BSLs with the appropriate aerial extent can be more

easily rigged on large vessels. Two BSLs are considered to provide better protection of baited hooks in crosswinds than single BSLs (Melvin *et al.* 2004; 2013; 2014; Sato *et al.* 2013). Hybrid BSLs (with long and short streamers) are more effective than BSLs with short streamers only in deterring diving seabirds (e.g. White-chinned Petrels, Melvin *et al.* 2010; 2013; 2014).

### **Notes and Caveats**

Properly designed and deployed BSLs deter birds from sinking baits, dramatically reducing seabird attacks and related mortalities. A bird scaring line runs from a high point at the stern to a device or mechanism that creates drag at its terminus. Brightly coloured streamers hanging from the aerial extent of the line scare birds from flying to and under the line, preventing them from reaching the baited hooks. It is important to note that the BSLs only provide protection to the baited hooks within the area protected by its aerial extent. This is why it is particularly important to use BSLs in combination with weighted branch lines (and night setting), which ensure that the baited hooks have sunk beneath the diving depth of most seabirds beyond the aerial extent of the BSLs. The presence of diving species increases the vulnerability of surface foragers (e.g., albatrosses) due to secondary interactions (i.e. albatrosses attacking baited hooks that are brought back to the surface by diving birds).

BSLs should be the lightest practical strong fine line. Lines should be attached to the vessel with a barrel swivel to minimise rotation of the line from torque created as it is dragged behind the vessel. Long streamers should be attached with a swivel to prevent them from rolling up onto the BSL. BSLs are at risk of tangling with float lines leading to lost BSLs, interruptions in vessel operations and in some cases lost fishing gear.

BSLs potentially increase the likelihood of entanglements, particularly if the attachment points on davits (tori poles) are insufficiently outboard of vessels. To achieve a minimum aerial extent BSLs should be attached to the vessel such that it is suspended from a point a minimum of 8 m above the water at the stern. Towed objects should be attached at the terminus of the BSL to increase drag. Adding short streamers to the in-water portion of the line, can enhance drag while minimising tangles with float lines. Weak links (breakaways) should be incorporated into the in-water portion of the line for safety reasons and to minimize operational problems associated with lines becoming tangled.

### **Minimum standards**

Simultaneous use of two BSLs, one on each side of the sinking longline, provides maximum protection from bird attacks under different wind conditions (Melvin *et al.* 2004; 2013; 2014; Sato *et al.* 2013). The setup for BSLs should be as follows:

- BSLs should be deployed to maximise the aerial extent, which is a function of vessel speed, height of the attachment point to the vessel, drag, and weight of bird scaring line materials.
- To achieve a minimum recommended aerial extent of 100 m, BSLs should be attached to the vessel such that they are suspended from a point a minimum of 8 m above the water at the stern.
- BSLs should contain a mix of brightly coloured long and short streamers placed at intervals of no more than 5 m. Long streamers should be attached to the line with swivels to prevent streamers from wrapping around the line. All long streamers should reach the sea-surface in calm conditions.

- Baited hooks should be deployed within the area bounded by the two BSLs. If using bait-casting machines, they should be adjusted so as to land baited hooks within the area bounded by the BSLs.

If large vessels use only one BSL, it should be deployed windward of the sinking baits. If baited hooks are set outboard of the wake, the BSL attachment point to the vessel should be positioned several meters outboard of the side of the vessel that baits are deployed.

### ***Need for combination***

Should be used in combination with appropriate line weighting and night setting.

### ***Implementation monitoring***

Requires fisheries observers, video surveillance or at-sea surveillance (e.g. patrol boats or aerial over-flights).

### ***Research needs***

Developing methods that minimise entanglements of the in-water portion of BSLs with longline floats remains the highest priority for research on bird-scaring lines. Other research priorities include: (1) evaluating the effectiveness of one vs. two BSLs; and, (2) BSLs design features including streamer lengths, configurations and materials.

### ***Mitigation Fact Sheet***

<https://www.acap.aq/en/bycatch-mitigation/bycatch-mitigation-fact-sheets/1497-fs-07a-pelagic-longline-streamer-lines-vessels-35-m/file>

## **3.b. Bird scaring lines for vessels <35m in total length**

### ***Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries***

**Proven and recommended mitigation method.** For vessels <35 m in length, a single BSL in combination with night setting and appropriate line weighting, has been found to be effective for mixed and short BSLs (ATF 2011; Domingo *et al.* 2011, Gianuca *et al.* 2013).

### ***Notes and Caveats***

Vessels <35 m total length should deploy BSLs with a minimum aerial extent of 75 m. To achieve this minimum aerial extent, BSLs should be attached to the vessel such that it is suspended from a point a minimum of 7 m above the water at the stern. The use and further development of a suitable towed device to prevent tangling with fishing gear is essential to improve adoption and compliance. Diving species increase vulnerability of surface foragers (albatrosses) due to secondary interactions.

### ***Minimum standards***

To achieve a minimum recommended aerial extent of 75 m, BSLs should be attached to the vessel such that they are suspended from a point a minimum of 7 m above the water at the stern. Short streamers (>1 m) should be placed at 1 m intervals along the length of the aerial extent. Two designs have been shown to be effective: (i) a mixed design that includes long streamers (placed at 5 m intervals over the first 55 m of the BSL) and short streamers; and,

(ii) a design that only includes short streamers. In all cases, BSLs should be brightly coloured and the lightest practical strong fine line. Lines should be attached to the vessel with a barrel swivel to minimise rotation of the line from torque (created as it is dragged behind the vessel).

Towed devices to create drag can tangle with float lines leading to interruptions in vessel operations and in some cases lost fishing gear. Short streamers can be tied into the line to 'bristle' the line (creating a bottlebrush like configuration) to generate drag while minimising the chance of fouling streamer lines on float lines. Breakaways should be incorporated in the in-water extent of BSLs, to minimise safety and operational problems.

#### ***Need for combination***

Should be used with appropriate line weighting and night setting.

#### ***Implementation monitoring***

Requires fisheries observers, video surveillance, or at-sea surveillance (e.g. patrol boats or aerial over-flights).

#### ***Research needs***

Developing methods that minimise entanglements of the in-water portion of BSLs with longline floats remains the highest priority for research on bird-scaring lines. Other research priorities include: (i) evaluating the effectiveness of one vs. two BSL, (ii) BSL design features including steamer lengths, configurations and materials, especially for very small vessels.

#### ***Mitigation Fact Sheet***

<https://www.acap.aq/en/bycatch-mitigation/bycatch-mitigation-fact-sheets/1867-fs-07b-pelagic-longline-streamer-lines-vessels-less-than-35-m/file>

## **4. Hook-shielding devices**

### ***Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic longline fisheries***

**Proven and recommended mitigation method.** Hook-shielding devices encase the point and barb of baited hooks to prevent seabird attacks during line setting until a prescribed depth is reached (a minimum of 10 meters), or until after a minimum period of immersion has occurred (a minimum of 10 minutes) that ensures that baited hooks are released beyond the foraging depth of most seabirds. The following performance requirements are used by ACAP to assess the efficacy of hook-shielding devices in reducing seabird bycatch:

- (a) the device shields the hook until a prescribed depth of 10 m or immersion time of 10 minutes is reached
- (b) the device meets current recommended minimum standards for branch line weighting described in Section 1
- (c) experimental research has been undertaken to allow assessment of the effectiveness, efficiency and practicality of the technology against the ACAP best practice seabird bycatch mitigation criteria developed for assessing and recommending best practice advice on seabird bycatch mitigation measures



At this time, the 'Hook Pod' (Sullivan *et al.* 2016, Barrington 2016a) and the 'Smart Tuna Hook' (Baker *et al.* 2016, Barrington 2016b) have been assessed as having met the performance requirements and are therefore considered to represent best practice.

### **Notes and Caveats**

The assessment of these two devices as best practice is conditional on continuing to meet the above performance requirements.

### **Minimum standards**

**'Hook Pod'** – 68 g minimum weight that is positioned at the hook, encapsulating the barb and point of the hook during setting, and remains attached until it reaches 10 m in depth, when the hook is released.

**'Smart Tuna Hook'** – 40 g minimum weight that is positioned at the hook, encapsulating the barb and point of the hook during setting, and remains attached for a minimum period of 10 minutes after setting, when the hook is released.

### **Need for combination**

Both of these assessed hook-shielding devices have been designed as stand-alone measures that do not need to be combined with other mitigation measures. However, it is useful to note that they integrate two performance components: i) protecting and ii) increasing the sink rate of the baited hooks to reduce the opportunities for seabirds to access them.

### **Implementation monitoring**

A combination of port-based inspections and vessel based monitoring and surveillance (e.g. observer inspection of line setting operations; video surveillance; at-sea compliance checks) will be required to assess use and compliance.

### **Research needs**

Conduct further field research to evaluate the relative contributions of the sink rates and hook protection components of hook-shielding devices in reducing seabird bycatch.

## **5. Time - Area closures**

### **Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries**

**Proven and recommended mitigation method.** Avoiding fishing in peak areas and/or during periods of intense foraging activity, has been used effectively to reduce rapidly and substantially bycatch in longline fisheries.

### **Notes and Caveats**

This is an important and effective management response, especially for high-risk areas, and when other measures prove ineffective. Although this can be highly effective in targeted locations and/or during a specific season, time-area closures may displace fishing effort into areas that are not as well regulated, leading to greater incidental mortality levels.

### **Minimum standards**

None defined, but highly recommended.

### ***Need for combination***

Must be combined with other measures, both in the targeted areas when the subsequently opened again for fishing, and also in adjacent areas to ensure displacement of fishing effort does not merely lead to a spatial shift in the incidental mortality.

### ***Implementation monitoring***

Vessels equipped with VMS combined with monitoring of activities by appropriate management authority is considered appropriate monitoring. Areas/seasons should be patrolled to ensure effectiveness if Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) fishing activities are suspected.

### ***Research needs***

Further research is required on the seasonal variability in patterns of seabird distribution and behaviour in relation to fisheries, including whether closing areas to fishing causes a shift in the distribution of seabirds to adjacent areas.

## **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

### **Side-setting with line weighting and bird curtain**

#### ***Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries***

Shown to be more effective than other simultaneously tested mitigation measures, including setting chutes and blue dyed bait, on relatively small vessels in the Hawaiian pelagic longline tuna and swordfish fisheries (Gilman *et al.* 2003b). **Effectiveness in southern hemisphere fisheries has not been researched and consequently it is not recommended as a proven mitigation measures in these fisheries at this time** (Brothers & Gilman 2006; Yokota & Kiyota 2006).

#### ***Notes and Caveats***

Hooks must be sufficiently below the surface and protected by a bird curtain by the time they reach the stern of the vessel. In Hawaii, side-setting trials were conducted with a bird curtain and 45-60 g weighted swivels placed within 0.5 m of hooks. Japanese research concludes it must be used in combination with other measures (Yokota & Kiyota 2006). The Hawaiian trial was conducted in an area with an assemblage of largely surface-feeding seabirds, and this measure requires testing in other fisheries and areas where seabird abundance is higher and secondary ingestion (hooks retrieved by diving birds and secondarily – subsequently - attacked by surface foragers) is more important. Hence, it cannot be recommended for use in other fisheries at this time.

#### ***Minimum standards***

Clear definition of side setting is required. Hawaiian definition is a minimum of only 1 m forward of the stern, which is likely to reduce effectiveness. The distance forward of the stern refers to the position from which baits are manually deployed. Baited hooks must be thrown by hand forward of the bait deployment location if they are to be afforded “protection” by being close to the side of the vessel.

### ***Need for combination***

Lines set from the side of vessels must be appropriately weighted in accordance with ACAP best practice advice and protected by an effective bird curtain.

### ***Implementation monitoring***

Requires fisheries observers or video surveillance.

### ***Research needs***

Currently untested in Southern Hemisphere fisheries against assemblages of diving seabirds (e.g. *Procellaria* sp. Petrels and *Puffinus* sp. Shearwaters) and albatrosses - urgent need for research.

### ***Mitigation Fact Sheet***

<https://www.acap.aq/en/bycatch-mitigation/bycatch-mitigation-fact-sheets/769-fs-09-pelagic-longline-side-setting/file>

### **Blue dyed bait**

#### ***Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries***

**Unproven and not recommended as a mitigation method** (Boggs 2001; Gilman *et al.* 2003b; Minami & Kiyota 2001; Minami & Kiyota 2004; Lydon & Starr 2005, Cocking *et al.* 2008; Ochi *et al.* 2011).

#### ***Notes and Caveats***

New data suggests only effective with squid bait (Cocking *et al.* 2008). Onboard dyeing requires labour and is difficult under stormy conditions. Results are inconsistent across studies.

#### ***Minimum standards***

Mix to standardised colour placard or specify (e.g. use 'Brilliant Blue' food dye [Colour Index 42090, also known as Food Additive number E133] mixed at 0.5% for minimum 20 minutes).

#### ***Need for combination***

Must be combined with bird scaring lines or night setting.

#### ***Implementation monitoring***

The current practice of dyeing bait on board vessels at sea requires observer presence or video surveillance to monitor implementation. Assessment of implementation in the absence of on-board observers or video surveillance requires baits be dyed on land and monitored through port inspection of all bait on vessels prior to departure on fishing trips.

#### ***Research needs***

Further testing is needed in the Southern Ocean.

### **Mitigation Fact Sheet**

<https://www.acap.aq/en/bycatch-mitigation/bycatch-mitigation-fact-sheets/770-fs-10-pelagic-longline-blue-dyded-bait-squid/file>

#### **Line shooter**

##### ***Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries***

**Unproven and not recommended as a mitigation measure** (Robertson *et al.* 2010b).

##### ***Notes and Caveats***

Use of a line shooter to set gear deep cannot be considered a mitigation measure. Mainline set into propeller turbulence with a line shooter without tension astern (*e.g.* slack), as is the case in deep setting, significantly slows the sink rates of hooks (Robertson *et al.* 2010b).

##### ***Minimum standards***

Not Applicable.

##### ***Need for combination***

Not Applicable.

##### ***Implementation monitoring***

Not Applicable.

##### ***Research needs***

Not Applicable.

### **Mitigation Fact Sheet**

<https://www.acap.aq/en/bycatch-mitigation/bycatch-mitigation-fact-sheets/771-fs-11-pelagic-longline-bait-caster-and-line-shooter/file>

#### **Bait caster**

##### ***Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries***

**Unproven and not recommended as a mitigation measure** (Duckworth 1995; Klaer & Polacheck 1998).

##### ***Notes and Caveats***

Not a mitigation measure unless bait casting machines are available with the capability to control the distance at which baits are cast. This is necessary to allow accurate delivery of baits under a bird scaring line. Current machines (without variable power control) likely to deploy baited hooks well beyond the streaming position of bird scaring lines, increasing risks to seabirds. Few commercially-available machines have variable power control. Needs more development.

##### ***Minimum standards***

Not Applicable.

***Need for combination***

Not Applicable.

***Implementation monitoring***

Not Applicable

***Research needs***

Develop (and implement) casting machine with a variable power control.

***Mitigation Fact Sheet***

<https://www.acap.aq/en/bycatch-mitigation/bycatch-mitigation-fact-sheets/771-fs-11-pelagic-longline-bait-caster-and-line-shooter/file>

**Underwater setting chute**

***Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries***

**Unproven and not recommended as a mitigation measure** (Brothers 1991; Boggs 2001; Gilman *et al.* 2003a; Gilman *et al.* 2003b; Sakai *et al.* 2004; Lawrence *et al.* 2006).

***Notes and Caveats***

In pelagic fisheries, existing equipment is not yet sturdy enough for large vessels in rough seas. Problems with malfunctions and performance inconsistencies have been reported (e.g. Gilman *et al.* 2003a, and Australian trials cited in Baker & Wise 2005).

***Minimum standards***

Not yet established

***Need for combination***

Not recommended for general application at this time.

***Implementation monitoring***

Not Applicable.

***Research needs***

Design problems to overcome.

**Management of offal discharge**

***Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries***

**Unproven and not recommended as a primary mitigation measure in pelagic longline fisheries, but should be considered good practice** (McNamara *et al.* 1999; Cherel *et al.* 1996).

***Notes and Caveats***

This should be considered a supplementary measure (i.e. used in addition to primary best practice mitigation measures). Offal attracts birds to vessels, and also conditions birds to attend vessels. Where practical, the discharge of offal should be eliminated or restricted to

periods when not setting or hauling. Strategic discharge during line setting (dumping of homogenised offal to the side of the vessel during setting to attract birds to this area and away from the baited hooks, Cherel *et al.* 1996)) can increase interactions and should be discouraged. Offal retention and/or incineration may be impractical on small vessels.

***Minimum standards***

Not yet established for pelagic fisheries. In the Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR), discharge of offal is prohibited during line setting for demersal longline fisheries. During line hauling, storage of waste is encouraged, and if discharged must be discharged on the opposite side of the vessel to the hauling bay.

***Need for combination***

Must be combined with other measures.

***Implementation monitoring***

Requires offal discharge practices and events to be monitored by fisheries observers or video surveillance.

***Research needs***

Further information needed on opportunities and constraints for the application of offal management in pelagic fisheries (short and long term).

**Live bait**

***Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries***

**Not recommended, as use of live bait may lead to increased rates of seabird bycatch** (Robertson *et al.* 2010a; Trebilco *et al.* 2010).

***Notes and Caveats***

Live fish bait sinks significantly slower than dead bait (fish and squid), increasing the exposure of baits to seabirds. Use of live bait is associated with higher seabird bycatch rates.

***Minimum standards***

Not Applicable.

***Need for combination***

Not Applicable.

***Implementation monitoring***

Not Applicable.

***Research needs***

Not Applicable.

## **Bait thaw status – use of thawed baits rather than frozen baits**

### ***Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries***

**Unproven and not recommended as a primary mitigation measure** (Brothers 1991; Duckworth 1995; Klaer & Polacheck 1998; Brothers *et al.*1999; Robertson & van den Hoff 2010).

### ***Notes and Caveats***

Thawed baits are believed to sink faster than frozen baits. However, Robertson & van den Hoff (2010) concluded that the bait thaw status has no practical bearing on seabird mortality in pelagic fisheries. Baits cannot be separated from others in frozen blocks of bait, and hooks cannot be inserted into baits unless they are partially thawed (it is not practical for fishers to use fully frozen baits). Partially thawed baits sink at similar rates to fully thawed baits.

### ***Minimum standards***

Not Applicable.

### ***Need for combination***

Not Applicable.

### ***Implementation monitoring***

Not Applicable.

### ***Research needs***

Not Applicable.

## **Haul Mitigation**

### ***Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries***

Strategies to reduce seabird hooking during the haul have yet to be developed and properly tested for pelagic longline fisheries.

### ***Notes and Caveats***

The development and testing of seabird bycatch mitigation measures in pelagic longline fisheries has focussed almost exclusively on how minimise or prevent bycatch during setting operations. Although some measures, such as Bird Curtains, have been designed and tested in demersal longline fisheries to reduce the incidence of haul captures, these methods are not directly transferable to pelagic longline fisheries.

### ***Need for combination***

No information

### ***Research needs***

Developing methods that minimize seabird hooking during line hauling in pelagic longline fisheries remain an urgent research priority.

### **Minimum standards**

No information

### **Implementation monitoring**

No information

### **Mitigation Fact Sheet**

Note that this fact sheet is directed mostly at haul mitigation in demersal longline fisheries, and is not directly applicable to pelagic longline fisheries.

<https://www.acap.aq/en/bycatch-mitigation/bycatch-mitigation-fact-sheets/1907-fs-12-demersal-pelagic-longline-haul-mitigation/file>

---

## **REFERENCES**

- Anderson, S. and McArdle, B., 2002. Sink rate of baited hooks during deployment of a pelagic longline from a New Zealand fishing vessel. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research*, 36: 185–195.
- ATF 2011. Developments in experimental mitigation research – Pelagic longline fisheries in Brazil, South Africa and Uruguay. Sixth Meeting of Advisory Committee. *Guayaquil, Ecuador, 29 August – 2 September 2011*.
- Baker, G.B., Candy, S.G. and Rollinson D., 2016. Efficacy of the ‘Smart Tuna Hook’ in reducing bycatch of seabirds in the South African Pelagic Longline Fishery. Abstract only. Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels. Seventh Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group. 2-4 May 2016, La Serena, Chile, SBWG7 Inf 07.
- Baker, G.B., and Wise, B.S. 2005. The impact of pelagic longline fishing on the flesh-footed shearwater *Puffinus carneipes* in Eastern Australia. *Biological Conservation*, 126: 306–316.
- Barrington, J.H.S., 2016a. ‘Hook Pod’ as best practice seabird bycatch mitigation in pelagic longline fisheries. Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels. Seventh Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group. 2-4 May 2016, La Serena, Chile, SBWG7 Doc 10.
- Barrington, J.H.S., 2016b. ‘Smart Tuna Hook’ as best practice seabird bycatch mitigation in pelagic longline fisheries. Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels. Seventh Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group. 2-4 May 2016, La Serena, SBWG7 Doc 09.
- Barrington, J.H.S., Robertson, G. and Candy S.G., 2016. Categorising branch line weighting for pelagic longline fishing according to sink rates. Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels. Seventh Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group. 2-4 May 2016, La Serena, Chile, SBWG7 Doc. 07.
- Boggs, C.H., 2001. Deterring albatrosses from contacting baits during swordfish longline sets. In: Melvin, E., Parrish, J.K. (Eds.), *Seabird Bycatch: Trends, Roadblocks and Solutions*. University of Alaska Sea Grant, Fairbanks, Alaska, pp. 79–94.



- Brothers, N.P. 1991. Approaches to reducing albatross mortality and associated bait loss in the Japanese long-line fishery. *Biological Conservation*, 55: 255–268.
- Brothers, N. and Gilman, E. 2006. Technical assistance for Hawaii-based pelagic longline vessels to modify deck design and fishing practices to side set. Prepared for the National marine Fisheries Service Pacific Islands Regional Office. Blue Ocean Institute, September 2006.
- Brothers, N., Gales, R. and Reid, T. 1999. The influence of environmental variables and mitigation measures on seabird catch rates in the Japanese tuna longline fishery within the Australian Fishing Zone 1991-1995. *Biological Conservation*, 88: 85–101.
- Brothers, N., Gales, R., and Reid, T., 2001. The effect of line weighting on the sink rate of pelagic tuna longline hooks, and its potential for minimising seabird mortalities. CCSBT-ERS/0111/53.
- CCAMLR, 2002. Report of the working group on fish stock assessment. Report of the twenty-first meeting of the Scientific Committee of the Commission for the Conservation of Marine Living Resources. Commission for the Conservation of Marine Living Resources, Hobart.
- Cherel, Y., Weimerskirch, H. and Duhamel, G 1996. Interactions between longline vessels and seabirds in Kerguelen Waters and a method to reduce seabird mortality. *Biological Conservation*, 75: 63–70.
- Cocking, L.J., Double, M.C., Milburn, P.J. and Brando, V.E. 2008. Seabird bycatch mitigation and blue-dyed bait: A spectral and experimental assessment. *Biological Conservation*, 14: 1354–1364.
- Domingo, A., Jiménez, S., Abreu, M., Forselledo, R., and Pons, M. 2011. Effectiveness of tori-line use to reduce seabird bycatch in the Uruguayan pelagic longline fleet. Sixth Meeting of Advisory Committee. *Guayaquil, Ecuador, 29 August – 2 September 2011*.
- Duckworth, K., 1995. Analysis of factors which influence seabird bycatch in the Japanese southern bluefin tuna longline fishery in New Zealand waters, 1989–1993. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 95/26.
- Gales, R., Brothers, N. and Reid, T. 1998. Seabird mortality in the Japanese tuna longline fishery around Australia, 1988-1995. *Biological Conservation*, 86: 37–56.
- Gianuca, D., Peppes, F.V., César, J.H., Sant’Ana, R., and Neves, T. 2013. Do leaded swivels close to hooks affect the catch rate of target species in pelagic longline? A preliminary study of southern Brazilian fleet. Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels, Fifth Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group. La Rochelle, France, 1-3 May 2013, SBWG5 Doc 33.
- Gilman, E., Boggs, C. and Brothers, N. 2003a. Performance assessment of an underwater setting chute to mitigate seabird bycatch in the Hawaii pelagic longline tuna fishery. *Ocean and Coastal Management*, 46: 985–1010.
- Gilman, E., Brothers, N., Kobayashi, D. R., Martin, S., Cook, J., Ray, J., Ching, G., and Woods, B. 2003b. Performance assessment of underwater setting chutes, side setting, and blue-dyed bait to minimise seabird mortality in Hawaii longline tuna and swordfish fisheries. Final report. Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council. Honolulu, Hawaii, USA. 42pp.

- Gilman, E., Brothers, N. and Kobayashi, D. 2005. Principles and approaches to abate seabird bycatch in longline fisheries. *Fish and Fisheries*, 6: 35–49.
- Hu, F., Shiga, M., Yokota, K., Shiode, D., Tokai, T., Sakai, H., and Arimoto, T. 2005. Effects of specifications of branch line on sinking characteristics of hooks in Japanese tuna longline. *Nippon Suisan Gakkaishi* 71: 33–38.
- Imber, M.J., 1994. Report on a tuna long-lining fishing voyage aboard Southern Venture to observe seabird by-catch problems. Science & Research Series 65. Department of Conservation, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Jiménez S, Domingo A, and Brazeiro A. 2009. Seabird bycatch in the Southwest Atlantic: interaction with the Uruguayan pelagic longline fishery. *Polar Biology*, 32: 187–196.
- Jiménez S., Domingo A., Abreu M., Forselledo R., and Pons M. 2013. Effect of reduced distance between the hook and weight in pelagic longline branchlines on seabird attack and bycatch rates and on the catch of target species. Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels, Fifth Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group. La Rochelle, France, 1-3 May 2013, SBWG5 Doc 49.
- Klaer, N. and Polacheck, T. 1998. The influence of environmental factors and mitigation measures on by-catch rates of seabirds by Japanese longline fishing vessels in the Australian region. *Emu*, 98: 305–16.
- Lawrence, E., Wise, B., Bromhead, D., Hindmarsh, S., Barry, S., Bensley, N. and Findlay, J. 2006. Analyses of AFMA seabird mitigation trials – 2001 to 2004. Bureau of Rural Sciences. Canberra.
- Lydon, G. and Starr, P., 2005. Effect of blue dyed bait on incidental seabird mortalities and fish catch rates on a commercial longliner fishing off East Cape, New Zealand. Unpublished Conservation Services Programme Report, Department of Conservation, New Zealand. 12p.
- McNamara B, Torre L, and Kaaialii G. 1999. Hawaii longline seabird mortality mitigation project. Honolulu, HI, USA: Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council.
- Melvin, E.F. 2003. Streamer lines to reduce seabird bycatch in longline fisheries. Washington Sea Grant Program, WSG-AS 00-33.
- Melvin, E. F., Sullivan, B., Robertson, G. and Wienecke, B. 2004. A review of the effectiveness of streamer lines as a seabird bycatch mitigation technique in longline fisheries and CCAMLR streamer line requirements. *CCAMLR Science*, 11: 189–201.
- Melvin, E. F., Guy, T. J. and Reid, L. B. 2010. Shrink and Defend: A Comparison of Two Streamer Line designs in the 2009 South Africa Tuna Fishery. Third Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group, ACAP, SBWG-3 Doc 13 Rev1.
- Melvin, E. F., Guy, T. J. and Reid, L. B. 2011. Preliminary report of 2010 weighted branch line trials in the tuna joint venture fishery in the South African EEZ. Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels, Fourth Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group, Guayaquil, Ecuador, 22 – 24 August 2011, SBWG-4 Doc 07.
- Melvin, E. F., Guy, T. J. and Reid, L. B. 2013. Reducing seabird bycatch in the South African joint venture tuna fishery using bird-scaring lines, branch line weighting and nighttime setting of hooks. *Fisheries Research* 147: 72 - 82.

- Melvin, E. F., Guy, T. J. and Reid, L. B. 2014. Best practice seabird bycatch mitigation for pelagic longline fisheries targeting tuna and related species. *Fisheries Research* 149: 5-18.
- Minami, H. and Kiyota, M. 2001. Effect of blue-dyed bait on reducing incidental take of seabirds. *CCSBT-ERS/0111/61*. 7pp.
- Minami, H. and Kiyota, M., 2004 . Effect of blue-dyed bait and tori-pole streamer on reduction of incidental take of seabirds in the Japanese southern bluefin tuna longline fisheries. *CCSBT-ERS/0402/08*.
- Ochi, D., Sato, N. and Minami, H. 2011 A comparison of two blue-dyed bait types for reducing incidental catch of seabirds in the experimental operations of the Japanese southern bluefin tuna longline. *WCPFC-SC7/EB-WP-09*
- Ochi, D., Sato, N., Katsumata, N., Guy, T., Melvin, E.F. and Minami, H. 2013 At-sea experiment to evaluate the effectiveness of multiple mitigation measures on pelagic longline operation in western North Pacific. *WCPFC-SC9/EB-WP-11*.
- Robertson, G., and van den Hoff, J. 2010. Static water trials of the sink rates of baited hooks to improve understanding of sink rates estimated at sea. Report to the Third meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group of ACAP.
- Robertson, G., Candy, S. G., Wienecke, B., and Lawton, K. 2010a. Experimental determinations of factors affecting the sink rates of baited hooks to minimize seabird mortality in pelagic longline fisheries. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems* 20: 632-643.
- Robertson, G., Candy, S. G. and Wienecke, B. 2010b. Effect of line shooter and mainline tension on the sink rates of pelagic longlines and implications for seabird interactions. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems* 20: 419-427.
- Robertson, G., Candy, S., and Hall, S. 2013. New branch line weighting regimes to reduce the risk of seabird mortality in pelagic longline fisheries without affecting fish catch. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems* 23: 885-900.
- Sakai, H., Fuxiang, H., and Arimoto, T., 2004. Underwater setting device for preventing incidental catches of seabirds in tuna longline fishing, *CCSBT-ERS/0402/Info06*.
- Sakai, H., Hu, F., and Arimoto, T. 2001. Basic study on prevention of incidental catch of seabirds in tuna longline. *CCSBT-ERS/0111/62*.
- Sato, N., Minami, H., Katsumata, N., Ochi, E., Yokawa, K., 2013. Comparison of the effectiveness of paired and single tori lines for preventing bait attacks by seabirds and their bycatch in pelagic longline fisheries. *Fisheries Research* 140: 14-19.
- Trebilco, R., Gales, R., Lawrence, E., Alderman, R., Robertson, G. and Baker, G.B. 2010. Characterizing seabird bycatch in the eastern Australian tuna and billfish pelagic longline fishery in relation to temporal, spatial and biological influences. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems* 20: 531-542.
- Sullivan, B.J., Kibel B., Kibel, P., Yates, O., Potts, J. M., Ingham, B., Domingo, A., Gianuca, D., Jimenez, S., Lebepe, B., Maree, B.A., Neves, T., Peppes, F., Rasehlomi, T., Silva-Costa, A., Wanless, R., 2016. Hook Pod: development and at-sea trialling of a 'one-stop' mitigation solution for seabird bycatch in pelagic longline fisheries. Abstract only. Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels. Seventh Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group. 2-4 May 2016, La Serena, Chile, SBWG7 Inf 06.

Uozumi, Y. and Takeuchi, Y. 1998. Influence of tori pole on incidental catch rate of seabirds by Japanese southern bluefin tuna longline fishery in high seas. CCSBT-WRS/9806/9 revised. 5pp.

Yokota, K. and Kiyota, M. 2006. Preliminary report of side-setting experiments in a large sized longline vessel. WCPFC-SC2-2006/EB WP-15. Paper submitted to the Second meeting of the WCPFC Ecosystem and Bycatch SWG. Manila, 10th August 2006.