



Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels

Fourth Meeting of Seabird Bycatch Working Group

Guayaquil, Ecuador, 22 – 24 August 2011

Review of bycatch data reporting by Parties

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‘This paper is presented for consideration by ACAP and may contain unpublished data, analyses, and/or conclusions subject to change.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.’

Review of bycatch data reporting by Parties

The purpose of this paper is to review and provide advice on the data submission process in order to improve the reporting system for future years.

Background

Following discussions at SBWG3 and AC5, the Secretariat developed a web-based reporting system to collect bycatch data (see AC5 Inf 10). Parties and Range States were then invited to complete the online forms as part of the Advisory Committee Report (see AC6 Doc 16). Some fields were pre-populated with information derived from questionnaires sent out to Parties as part of the metadata trial prior to AC5. Twelve Parties and Range States provided data via the web-based forms, for a total of 79 fisheries (Annex 1). An example of a completed fishery report is provided in Annex 2.

Overall, the system performed well during this first round of reporting. However, a number of issues were identified by users and the Secretariat which are noted here for consideration by the Working Group. Parties are also welcome to provide ideas for further development of the forms intersessionally to the Secretariat.

Functionality issues

1. Problem of working in three languages, e.g. drop down lists only available in English, text fields completed in any of the three languages presents a challenge for data analysis that needs to take account of those text fields.
2. Volume of information in text fields which are currently not character limited. For example some fishery descriptions exceeded 600 words in length. Is this level of detail useful or should we make text fields character limited?
3. Parties were asked to complete data forms within three months, which some Parties indicated was inadequate. How much time is required to complete this task? Note that this round of reporting asked for data dating back to 2004, while future requests will focus on latest year of data only. Forms can be made available independently of the Advisory Committee report, to allow ongoing data updates.
4. Instructions explaining how to navigate through the forms need to be expanded/improved.

Content issues

1. Feedback from users indicated that some of the questions are ambiguous or the scope of the question is unclear. The Secretariat is working through these issues to provide clarity for future data submissions. Particular questions asked included:
 - a) is ACAP interested in all territorial waters or only where the current ACAP-listed species occur?
 - b) is ACAP interested in bycatch in all fisheries (including net fisheries)?

- c) Q.1 - in reporting fleet information, is information required for the number of vessels licenced to fish, or the number of vessels that actually operated within a reporting period?
- d) Q.5 – monitored for bycatch – *“which number to report under the quota-based system where only total metric tons are recorded? When an observer samples a catch, they look at some percentage of the catch in a single tow. So, would ACAP want to know the actual tonnage of fish that observers looked at (would equate to the actual number of hooks observed), or would they want the sum of the tows where an observer did a sample”.*
- e) Q.6 - is ACAP interested in all seabirds caught in those fisheries (those fisheries ACAP is interested in) or only albatrosses/petrel/and perhaps shearwaters?
- f) Q.6 & 7 - what is meant by caught – define interaction: birds that are killed only, or ones that got hooked and landed on deck but were released, collided and flew off etc.
2. The way the reports are currently structured, including the Bycatch Data request Form, includes no requirement for Parties to report on specific measures taken to ensure vessels flagged to their State are complying with RFMO measures (resolutions) to reduce seabird bycatch on the High Seas. Section 2 of the Bycatch Data request Form enables Parties to record the geographic range of the vessels which should enable them to report activity on the high seas, but this is not linked to the bycatch data, observer coverage of mitigation measures reported. Does the Seabird Bycatch Working Group feel that bycatch and effort data should be reported by Parties for activities on the high seas?

Data analysis

Although the data provided for some fisheries is sparse, it is now possible to collate and present the information in various ways to facilitate analysis by the Working Group. AC6 Doc 17 provides some examples of the way in which data can be summarised. The Seabird Bycatch Working Group is asked to advise:

- any analysis they feel should be undertaken in the intersessional period;
- what data extracts will be required for any such analyses; and
- a proposed mechanism for conducting analyses, noting that the Secretariat has limited capacity at present for this work.

Reporting to Meeting of the Parties

AC6 Doc 17 has been prepared by the Secretariat to, amongst other things, succinctly convey information provided on seabird bycatch issues to the Meeting of Parties. Seabird Bycatch Working Group members are asked to review this report and provide comments or advice on the report prepared.

Recommendations

It is recommended that

- improvements to ACAP data collection protocols outlined in this paper and during discussion at the meeting are adopted to improve data provision in future requests to Parties for National Reports.
- relevant sections of the draft Report on the Implementation of the Agreement, to be provided by the Advisory Committee to the MoP (AC6 Doc17), are reviewed.

Annex 1 – List of fisheries identified by Parties and Range States

Fishery	
Argentina	Congeladores - Centolla y Centollon
Argentina	Congeladores - Merluza de Cola, Polaca y Merluza Negra
Argentina	Congeladores - <i>Merluza hubbsi</i>
Argentina	Congeladores - Palangreros
Argentina	Congeladores - Poteros
Argentina	Congeladores - Tangoneros
Argentina	Congeladores - Vieira
Argentina	Costeros - Flota Amarilla de Rawson
Argentina	Costeros - <i>Merluza hubbsi</i>
Argentina	Costeros - Pelagicas - Red de Media Agua
Argentina	Costeros - Trampas
Argentina	Costeros - Variado Costero
Argentina	Fresqueros Altura - <i>Merluza hubbsi</i>
Argentina	Rada o Ria - <i>Merluza hubbsi</i>
Argentina	Rada o Ria - <i>Merluza hubbsi</i> - Palangre
Argentina	Rada o Ria - Variado Costero
Australia	Eastern Tuna and Billfish
Australia	Gillnet, Hook & Trap-longline
Australia	Great Australian Bight
Australia	Heard Island & McDonald Islands - Longline
Australia	Heard Island and McDonald Islands - Trawl
Australia	Macquarie Island - Longline
Australia	Macquarie Island - Trawl
Australia	South-East Trawl including VIT
Australia	Western Tuna and Billfish
Canada	Commercial Pacific Halibut fishery (west coast of Canada)
Canada	Commercial Pacific Salmon gillnet fishery
Canada	Commercial Rockfish (west coast of Canada)
Chile	Palangre pelágico de superficie. Flota artesanal. especie objetivo pez espada.
Chile	Palangre pelágico de superficie. Flota industrial
Chile	Southern hake, pequería merluza del sur, flota palagrera industrial.
Chile	Tootfish's fishery, Bacalao de profundidad Industrial
France	Pêcherie palangrière à la Légine Australe
New Zealand	Deepwater trawl
New Zealand	Demersal longline
New Zealand	Inshore trawl
New Zealand	Middle depth trawl
New Zealand	Pelagic longline
New Zealand	Pelagic trawl
Peru	Cerco : Pesca industrial de cerco para anchoveta
Peru	Espinel artesanal
Peru	Redes agalleras a la deriva
South Africa	Foreign Tuna Longline Vessels - Joint Ventures with South Africa
South Africa	Patagonian Toothfish Longline

South Africa	South African Tuna / Swordfish Longline Sector
Spain	Atlantico Central-Este dirigido a la merluza
Spain	Palangre de Superficie dirigida a pez espada O. Atlantico
Spain	Palangre de Superficie dirigida a pez espada O. Indico
Spain	Palangre de superficie dirigido a grandes pelagicos del mediterraneo (pez espada y atun rojo)
Spain	Palangre de Superficie Pacifico
Spain	Pesquería de Cerco dirigida a Atunes Tropicales Oceano Atlántico, Indico y Pacifico
Spain	Pesquería de Palangre de fondo
Spain	Pesquerías Lejanas Arrastre Gran Altura Norte
Spain	Pesquerías Lejanas: Malvinas (Falkland Islands)*. Arrastre de Gran Altura
United Kingdom	Bluenose/Bluefish (<i>Hyperoglyphe antarctica</i>) - Tristan da Cunha
United Kingdom	Demersal longline fishery for Patagonia toothfish (<i>Dissostichus eleginoides</i>) - Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)*
United Kingdom	Demersal longline fishery for Patagonian toothfish - South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)*
United Kingdom	Finfish demersal trawl fishery - Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)*
United Kingdom	Finfish pelagic trawl fishery - Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)*
United Kingdom	<i>Illex argentinus</i> jig fishery - Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)*
United Kingdom	<i>Loligo gahi</i> demersal trawl fishery - Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)*
United Kingdom	Trawl fishery for Antarctic krill: South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)*
United Kingdom	Trawl fishery targeting Icefish (<i>Champsocephalus gunnari</i>) in CCAMLR 48.3 (South Georgia / Islas Georgias del Sur)*
Uruguay	Arrastre de fondo (Merluza comun <i>M. hubbsi</i>)
Uruguay	Palangre de fondo (Merluza Negra)
Uruguay	Palangre pelagico
USA	Alaska demeresal longline
USA	Alaska Demersal Groundfish Trawl
USA	At-Sea Hake Trawl (Motherships & Catcher Processors)
USA	California Halibut Trawl
USA	Limited Entry Groundfish Trawl
USA	Limited Entry Non-Sablefish-endorsed Fixed Gear
USA	Limited Entry Sablefish-endorsed Fixed Gear
USA	Nearshore Fixed Gear
USA	Open Access Fixed Gear
USA	Pacific halibut (Alaska)
USA	Pacific Longline, Deep Set
USA	Pacific Longline, Shallow Set
USA	Pink Shrimp Trawl

* "A dispute exists between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland concerning sovereignty over the Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas), South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands (Islas Georgias del Sur e Islas Sandwich del Sur) and the surrounding maritime areas".