

 <p data-bbox="213 546 456 584">Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels</p>	<p data-bbox="536 237 1382 327">Seventh Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group</p> <p data-bbox="868 342 1382 383"><i>La Serena, Chile, 2 - 4 May 2016</i></p> <p data-bbox="564 472 1305 517">Review of RFMO Engagement Strategy</p> <p data-bbox="523 607 1350 647"><i>Anton Wolfaardt, Warren Papworth, Marco Favero</i></p>
---	--

SUMMARY

At SBWG6 the Working Group reviewed progress against the 2013-2016 framework for ACAP's engagement strategy with the RFMOs and CCAMLR (SBWG6 Doc11 Rev1). Further progress has been achieved since SBWG6 against some important elements of this framework, as outlined in Table 1. A revised list of actions to implement the framework is provided for the next triennium for discussion and endorsement by the SBWG and subsequent adoption by the Advisory Committee.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The SBWG is requested to review and endorse the revised list of actions (including both Further Actions, and New Actions) to be taken in the RFMOs identified in Table 1 of this document; and
2. To request the Advisory Committee to support the implementation of these actions, providing the resources necessary to achieve this.

Revisión de la estrategia de acción con las OROPs

RESUMEN

En la reunión del GdTCS6 se revisó el progreso respecto del marco de acciones para OROPs y CCAMLR planeadas para 2013-2016 (GdTCS6 Doc11 Rev1). Se ha logrado un importante progreso desde GdTCS6 en algunos elementos importantes del esquema de trabajo planteado en la Tabla 1. Se provee una lista revisada de acciones para el próximo trienio para la discusión y aval del GdTCS y la subsecuente adopción del Comité Asesor.

RECOMENDACIONES

1. Se le solicita al GdTCS que revise y avale la lista revisada de acciones (incluyendo las continuadas y nuevas) que deben tomarse en las OROPs identificadas en la Tabla de este documento; y
2. Que solicite al Comité Asesor que apoye la implementación de estas acciones y proporcione los recursos necesarios para lograrlo.

Passage en revue de la stratégie d'engagement des ORGP

RÉSUMÉ

Lors du GTCA6, le Groupe de travail a examiné les progrès enregistrés sur le cadre 2013-2016 pour la stratégie d'engagement de l'ACAP avec les ORGP et la CCAMLR (GTCA6 Doc11 Rev1). De nouveaux progrès ont été enregistrés depuis le GTCA6 sur certains éléments importants de ce cadre, tel qu'indiqué dans le Tableau 1. Une liste révisée des mesures pour mettre en œuvre le cadre est fournie pour la prochaine période triennale afin que le GTCA en débattenne et l'approuve en vue de son adoption ultérieure par le Comité consultatif.

RECOMMANDATIONS

1. Il est demandé au GTCA d'examiner et d'approuver la liste révisée de mesures (notamment les Autres mesures et les Nouvelles mesures) à adopter dans les ORGP identifiés dans le Tableau 1 de ce document ; et
2. d'appeler le Comité consultatif à soutenir la mise en œuvre de ces mesures et à fournir les ressources nécessaires pour y parvenir.

1. REVIEW OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED IN RESPECT OF THE 2013-2016 PERIOD

1.1. Review of Progress to Date and Actions Proposed for Further Engagement

At SBWG6 the Working Group reviewed progress against the 2013-2016 framework for ACAP's engagement strategy with the tuna RFMOs and CCAMLR (SBWG6 Doc11 Rev1). Further progress has been achieved since SBWG6 against some important elements of this framework. Table 1 lists the actions previously proposed for the 2013-2016 period, and a review of progress achieved since SBWG6. In addition, further or ongoing actions required to meet the 2013-2016 objectives are provided, as well as new actions, which together form the proposed actions and engagement plan for the next triennium (2016-2018). Following discussion and endorsement by the Working Group, the revised strategy and action plan will be presented to the Advisory Committee for adoption.

Table 1. Outcomes Achieved Against 2013-16 Actions and Proposed Plan for 2016-2018

RFMO/ OTHER ORGANISATION	Actions Proposed for 2013-2016	Review of progress, and further actions required
WCPFC	1 Seek amendment of CMM 2012-07 so that the north Pacific fishery follows the two out of three approach; (2015 & 2016, sooner if possible)	<p>Substantially completed. WCPFC 11 adopted CMM 2015-03 which requires small vessels <24m in length to use at least one mitigation measure from Column A (weighted branchlines, tori line or night-setting).</p> <p><u>Further Actions:</u></p> <p>The specification of the tori lines used on vessels <24m must be reviewed within three years of the date of implementation of CMM 2015-03 (1 Jan 2017). As the design of the tori line specified in the CMM hasn't been evaluated and/or approved by the SBWG it is recommended that ACAP take an active role in evaluating and supporting the review this and other tori lines specifications proposed for use on small vessels.</p>
	2 Support the implementation of CMM 2012-07 through improved data collection and reporting (2013-2015);	<p>The first meeting of the E-Reporting and E-Monitoring Intersessional Working Group (ER and EM WG) was held in July 2015. It was noted that a number of WCPFC Members are conducting trials of electronic monitoring technologies and that they are at various stages in implementing such systems. The WG made a number of recommendations in relation to draft data field standards for observer and log-sheet data. A sub-working group was established to develop and maintain a master list of electronic data standards to support the collection of Commission agreed data fields. The WG encouraged the development of EM in areas where data gaps exist, such as longline observer coverage and high seas trans-shipment.</p> <p><u>Further Actions:</u></p> <p>It is recommended that ACAP continues to participate in meetings of the ER and EM WG to ensure that data relevant to seabird bycatch is collected and appropriately analysed.</p>

RFMO/ OTHER ORGANISATION	Actions Proposed for 2013-2016	Review of progress, and further actions required
3	Advocate for a methodology to be adopted to review the effectiveness of mitigation measures being used. Apply this to review the effectiveness of CMM 2012-07 (2014 & 2016);	<p>Being addressed through the work of the CCSBT Effectiveness of Seabird Mitigation Measures Technical Group (ESBM Technical Group), which has been established to develop this methodology, and also through the work of the ACAP Intersessional Group established to identify minimum data elements to review the effectiveness of seabird bycatch mitigation regulations in tuna RFMOs (see SBWG6 Doc 20).</p> <p><u>Further Actions:</u></p> <p>Refer to CCSBT item 3. It is recommended that the work of the ESBM Technical Group continue to be supported in order to address this task.</p>
4	Seek adoption of seabird data collection protocols (2013).	Completed. WCPFC-SC8 and WCPFC-TCC8 supported inclusion of ACAP recommended data. Subsequently approved by WCPFC8. Data to be collected from 1 Jan 2015.
5	Advocate for the Southern Boundary of CMM 2015-03 to be moved from 30S to 25S	<p>At WCPFC 12, FFA members presented WCPFC12-2015-DP11, seeking to amend CMM 2012-07 to shift the latitudinal line where the measure applies from 30°S to 25°S, excluding EEZs other than Australia and New Zealand that extend south of 25°S. A number of Members objected to the proposed exclusion of some EEZs, noting that there was no scientific evidence presented that support these exclusions. The proposal was not supported at WCPFC12.</p> <p><u>Further Actions:</u></p> <p>Continue to advocate for the southern boundary of CMM 2015-03 to be moved from 30S to 25S. Liaise with relevant Commission Members to seek inclusion of their EEZs within the scope of the revised CMM.</p>

RFMO/ OTHER ORGANISATION	Actions Proposed for 2013-2016	Review of progress, and further actions required
IOTC	1 Advocate for full implementation of IOTC Regional Observer Scheme (2013-2014).	Little progress. Most Members are not achieving the 5% minimum level of observer coverage. Also of concern is the limited fisheries effort data that are currently being submitted by CPCs to the IOTC Secretariat.
		<p><u>Further Actions:</u></p> <p>Continue to advocate for full implementation of the IOTC Regional Observer Scheme. In the first instance, ACAP Parties that are CPCs should ensure that these obligations are met. The review of IOTC’s seabird CMM, Resolution 12/06 (see point 2 below), which is due to take place at the WPEB12, in September 2016, will provide an opportunity to review the extent to which the requirements of the Regional Observer Scheme are being met, and to advocate for and help facilitate improvements.</p>
	2 Advocate for a methodology to be adopted to review the effectiveness of mitigation measures being used. Apply this to review the effectiveness of Resolution 12/06 (2016);	<p>This issue was considered broadly by the Effectiveness of Seabird Bycatch Mitigation Measures Group (SMMTG) of the CCSBT at a workshop held in November 2014 (see CCSBT section below). Some of the key outcomes of the SMMTG process have since been incorporated into the seabird bycatch component of the FAO’s GEF-funded Common Oceans Programme for tuna fisheries, which has recently been initiated, and is being implemented, by BirdLife South Africa and BirdLife International (see SBWG7 Inf 14). The key aims of this process are to build capacity and collaboration amongst national scientists in the collection, curation and analysis of seabird bycatch data, to support the development of common approaches in the assessment and monitoring of seabird bycatch, and the implementation of a joint-tuna RFMO seabird bycatch assessment (i.e. across all tuna RFMOs). At WPEB11, the WPEB agreed that the bycatch indicators proposed by ACAP ((i) bycatch rates, and (ii) estimates of total number of birds killed) would be useful candidate indicators for the review of Resolution12/06. The WPEB also agreed that the capacity building process and the development of common</p>

RFMO/ OTHER ORGANISATION	Actions Proposed for 2013-2016	Review of progress, and further actions required
		<p>approaches in the assessment and monitoring of seabird bycatch is important, and should be progressed in a step-wise manner.</p> <p><u>Further Actions:</u></p> <p>It is recommended that ACAP actively participate in and help facilitate the review of Resolution 12/06, which will formally take place at WPEB12, in September 2016. Following SBWG7, ACAP should present the updated best practice advice on mitigation measures to the IOTC, as well as the outcome of work and discussions on bycatch indicators and methodological guidelines for estimating bycatch. ACAP should also help facilitate the provision of the necessary data to this process by working with ACAP Parties that are members of IOTC and others in advance of the WPEB meeting.</p>
	<p>3 Review data currently being submitted through the IOTC Regional Observer Programme (2013-2016).</p>	<p>In order to improve the quality of data submissions by CPCs to the IOTC Secretariat, a revised (and significantly improved) version of the observer reporting templates was adopted on an interim basis by the IOTC Scientific Committee in 2015. It was intended that these interim reporting templates be reviewed and modified if necessary towards the end of 2015. However, this was not done, and the templates remain interim measures. At WPEB11, it was agreed that the IOTC Secretariat would collate the observer data available using the data exchange format already in place in CCSBT. The use of a bycatch data exchange protocol by tuna RFMOs was one of the recommendations that came out of the meeting of technical experts in Keelung, Taiwan in January 2015 (see section on Kobe Bycatch Technical Working Group below), and aims to understand and harmonise tuna RFMO bycatch data holdings, to review and improve bycatch data collection and reporting, and help support and plan for intra-and inter-RFMO analyses of bycatch rates and mitigation effectiveness. The IOTC Secretariat have agreed to collate the required observer data, using the data exchange template from CCSBT</p>

RFMO/ OTHER ORGANISATION	Actions Proposed for 2013-2016	Review of progress, and further actions required
		<p>as a trial format.</p> <p><u>Further Actions:</u></p> <p>Continue to engage in the process to review and formalise the Regional Observer Scheme templates. Seek to ensure that the revised (interim) templates are retained in their current form, with no loss of required data fields that would compromise the ability to assess the effectiveness of seabird bycatch mitigation measures. Support and work with CPCs and the IOTC Secretariat to help facilitate the use and revision of the draft template.</p>
	<p>4 Advocate for development of allocation criteria to ensure quotas can be used to deal with non-compliance with observer, data submission, seabird and other conservation measures</p>	<p>The opportunity has not arisen to advance this concept.</p>
CCSBT	<p>1 Seek adoption of seabird data collection protocols (2013).</p>	<p>ERSWG9 agreed that there was a need to develop a set of minimum requirements for observer data, taking into account the potential for harmonisation across RFMOs. To be progressed through the Kobe Bycatch Technical Working Group.</p> <p><u>Further Actions:</u></p> <p>Continue to support and participate in the work of the Kobe Bycatch Technical Working Group.</p>

RFMO/ OTHER ORGANISATION	Actions Proposed for 2013-2016	Review of progress, and further actions required
2	Work with New Zealand in development of a Level-2 Risk Assessment.(2016-17)	<p>New Zealand presented ERSWG10-Doc20 to the ERSWG. A number of practical responses were identified to improve future risk assessments.</p> <p><u>Further Actions:</u></p> <p>Continue to support development of a Level-2 risk assessment.</p>
3	Advocate for a methodology to be adopted to review the effectiveness of mitigation measures being used. Review data on the effectiveness of mitigation measures being used (2013 & 2014)	<p>Following a recommendation from ERSWG10 the CCSBT Commission agreed to establish an Effectiveness of Seabird Mitigation Measures Technical Group (ESBM Technical Group) to provide advice on feasible, practical, timely and effective technical approaches for measuring and monitoring the effectiveness of seabird mitigation measures in SBT longline fisheries. The TG met in November 2014 to discuss and further develop a scoping paper that had been drafted in advance of the November 2014 workshop. The report of the November workshop considers and provides recommendations on methods and approaches for monitoring the effectiveness of tuna RFMO seabird Conservation and Management Measures. The report also identifies opportunities and mechanisms to harmonise approaches between tuna RFMOs. Following the 2015 CCSBT Commission Meeting, the report is now publicly available and has been submitted to SBWG7 as an Information Paper (SBWG7 Inf 16). Some of the key recommendations of the SMMTG report have been taken up by the BirdLife led, GEF funded, FAO Common Oceans (ABNJ) Tuna project. Amongst other things, this project aims to strengthen national capacity to manage and assess bycatch within national fleets, and to facilitate a collaborative and harmonised approach to analysing and reporting seabird bycatch across RFMOs.</p> <p><u>Further Actions:</u></p> <p>It is recommended that ACAP supports and helps facilitate the seabird component of the FAO Common Oceans Tuna project. This should be done through the</p>

RFMO/ OTHER ORGANISATION	Actions Proposed for 2013-2016	Review of progress, and further actions required
		<p>development and provision of relevant ACAP advice and guidelines, and by helping facilitate the active engagement of ACAP Parties in the Common Oceans Tuna project. It is also important to help facilitate efficient linkages between the Common Oceans Tuna project and work planned by individual RFMOs to review the efficacy of seabird conservation measures.</p>
	<p>4 Seek the adoption of a binding seabird conservation measure</p>	<p>Australia presented a proposal to the 22nd meeting of the CCSBT Commission for a binding CMM, similar to those adopted by other tuna RFMOs. A consensus was not reached on the Australian proposal.</p> <p>Further Actions:</p> <p>Continue to advocate for the adoption of a binding seabird CMM by the CCSBT.</p>
<p>IATTC</p>	<p>1 Seek adoption of a revised conservation measure that reflects two out of three approach (2016);</p>	<p>Discussions held during the 6th IATTC Scientific Advisory Committee Meeting (2015) regarding the review of the seabird CM area of application, as well as the review of the measure currently in place that still using the two-column approach (with a number of measures not recognised as best practice. Although a paper was presented in 2014 (SAC-05 INF-E) providing information on seabird distribution and best practice, a Member expressed concerns regarding seabird distribution and the need of a review. Issues with the use of bird scaring lines were also expressed in relation to large vs. small vessels at SAC meeting, suggesting the use of only one BSL in large vessels.</p> <p>At the 89 Commission Meeting (2015) the US tabled a document proposing an amendment to Resolution C-11-02. This was supported by the report of the IATTC staff after SAC6 recommending the review such seabird measure. However, there was not possible to reach consensus since some Members indicated the need of harmonization with measure in the WCPFC.</p>

RFMO/ OTHER ORGANISATION	Actions Proposed for 2013-2016	Review of progress, and further actions required
		<p><u>Further Action:</u></p> <p>Intersessional work with IATTC Members expressing concerns raised during the 2015 meetings is recommended. This should include the provision of technical information about seabird distribution and overlap with fisheries for albatrosses (already provided) and diving species (in progress). Further work with ACAP Parties, BirdLife and the US for the submission of a new proposal for the next Commission meeting scheduled for late June 2016.</p>
	2 Improve communication between ACAP Parties to ensure consistent positions are put forward to IATTC meetings;	Good progress made with relevant ACAP Parties and EU, Japan and USA coordinating work on a revised seabird conservation measure to be presented in 2016.
	3 Follow up on the adoption of seabird data collection protocols and further work to improve data provision in relation to Resolution C-11-08 on observer programs in longline fishing vessels;	Completed. 87 th IATTC Regular Meeting adopted seabird data collection form, following on from work in 85 th Regular Meeting.
	4 Address the needs of artisanal fisheries in relation to mitigation.	Work in progress.

RFMO/ OTHER ORGANISATION	Actions Proposed for 2013-2016	Review of progress, and further actions required
ICCAT	1 Advocate for a methodology to be adopted to review the effectiveness of mitigation measures being used. Review data on the effectiveness of mitigation measures being used (formal review planned for 2015)	<p>This issue was broadly considered by the Effectiveness of Seabird Bycatch Mitigation Measures Group (SMMTG) of the CCSBT at a workshop held in November 2014 (see CCSBT and IOTC sections above), which built on the earlier work of the ACAP Intersessional Group. Some of the key outcomes of the SMMTG process have since been incorporated into the seabird bycatch component of the FAO's GEF-funded Common Oceans Programme for tuna fisheries, which is being implemented, by BirdLife South Africa and BirdLife International. At ICCAT's 2015 Sub-Committee on Ecosystems (SC-ECO) meeting the SC-ECO agreed that the bycatch indicators proposed by ACAP ((i) bycatch rates, and (ii) estimates of total number of birds killed) would be useful candidate indicators for the review of Recommendation 11-09. The formal review of Rec 11-09 was previously scheduled for 2015, but was postponed until the 2016 meeting of the SC-ECO in September 2016.</p> <p><u>Further Actions:</u></p> <p>It is recommended that ACAP actively participate in and help facilitate the review of Recommendation 11-09, which will formally take place at the ICCAT SC-ECO meeting in September 2016. Following SBWG7, ACAP should present the updated best practice advice on mitigation measures to the IOTC, as well as the outcome of work and discussions on bycatch indicators and methodological guidelines for estimating bycatch. ACAP should also help facilitate the provision of the necessary data to this process by working with ACAP Parties that are members of ICCAT and others in advance of the SC-ECO meeting to prepare for the review. ACAP is also working to help support BirdLife International update the analysis of seabird distribution/tracking data within the ICCAT area and overlap with ICCAT fishing effort, which will serve as an important contribution to the review of Rec 11-09.</p>

RFMO/ OTHER ORGANISATION	Actions Proposed for 2013-2016	Review of progress, and further actions required
2	Assist with the development of data collection and reporting protocols (2013 & 2014)	<p>A shortened version of the ACAP document on data collection requirements for RFMOs to improve knowledge of fishery impacts on seabirds (SBWG-4 Doc 26 Rev 1) was presented at the 2015 ICCAT SC-ECO meeting. The minimum data fields identified in the document are mostly included in the revised ICCAT observer spreadsheet template. However, some minor modifications are needed to the ICCAT observer templates to bring the properly in line with the minimum standards identified in the ACAP paper. ICCAT's bycatch co-ordinator will endeavour to make the necessary changes and incorporate in the next revision.</p> <p>At the 2015 meeting of ICCAT's SC-ECO, the ICCAT Secretariat presented a summary of information it has received to date from CPCs on how they are implementing Rec 11-09, highlighting the paucity of information received to date, and the challenge that lies ahead for its formal review.</p> <p><u>Further Actions:</u></p> <p>Continue to engage with ICCAT and its CPCs to help improve the collection and reporting of bycatch and associated data. It would be helpful for ACAP to help facilitate progress by working with its Parties that are also CPCs of ICCAT to meet the required standards and set an example for others to follow. The outputs of the CCSBT SMMTG should be promoted.</p>
3	Seek the adoption of an MoU between ACAP and ICCAT	<p>A proposal for a memorandum of understanding (MoU) between ACAP and ICCAT was submitted to ICCAT's 24th Regular Meeting of its Commission in 2015 (Doc PLE-109C/2015). A number of substantive changes were sought by ICCAT Members, including changing the title of the document to 'Guidelines', rather than 'MoU', in line with past practice in ICCAT. The Commission subsequently approved the 'MoU/Guidelines' with the inclusion of the amendments suggested by ICCAT Members.</p> <p>As the revised MoU/Guidelines included substantive changes to the template</p>

RFMO/ OTHER ORGANISATION	Actions Proposed for 2013-2016	Review of progress, and further actions required
Kobe Bycatch Technical Working Group	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Coordinate the development of a seabird identification guide for use by the tRFMOs; 2 Provide input into the discussions of the Technical Working Group to assist with the harmonisation of best-practice seabird conservation measures, including data collection and reporting, between the tRFMOs. 	<p>approved by MoP, an intersessional decision was sought from ACAP Parties to seek their approval of these changes (ACAP Circular 2015-11). ACAP Parties subsequently approved the changes and as a result ACAP now has MoU/Guidelines with all five tuna RFMOs, as well as with CCAMLR and the SPRFMO.</p> <p>The seabird identification guide has been completed, and is in the process of being disseminated through relevant RFMO observer programmes.</p> <p>A meeting of technical experts, including representatives from all five tuna RFMOs, was held in Keelung, Taiwan, in January 2015 to discuss how best to progress towards the harmonisation of data collection systems between tuna RFMOs. The report of the meeting (available as SBWG7 Inf 15) provides guidelines on a range of issues pertinent for the interoperability of observer data collected in the longline fisheries of tuna RFMOs. The report has been submitted to each tuna RFMO, and it is hoped that they will use the guidelines to modify their protocols and requirements where necessary, and work towards a more harmonised approach to data collection and indeed engage in data exchanges between RFMOs in support of wider scale analyses. Funds have since been provided through the ABNJ/GEF project for a short-term contract to prioritise the many data fields identified (i.e. identify the data fields that are crucial for bycatch monitoring) across all bycatch taxa. The ACAP paper on minimum data fields for seabird bycatch has been made available for this purpose. Eric Gilman is carrying out the short-term contract, with support from Shelley Clarke and Martine Hall. The draft outputs of the prioritisation process were presented in the first instance at the Scientific Committee meeting of the WCPFC in August 2015, with wider circulation planned.</p>

RFMO/ OTHER ORGANISATION	Actions Proposed for 2013-2016	Review of progress, and further actions required
		<p><u>Further Actions:</u></p> <p>Continue to engage in the process to refine the outputs of the Keelung workshop (ensuring that they are consistent with ACAP best practice guidelines), and advocate that these are formalised and progressed through the tuna RFMOs.</p> <p>Seek to encourage more frequent and active engagement of the Kobe Bycatch Technical Working Group.</p>
<p>CCAMLR</p>	<p>1 Low priority – Seabird bycatch reduced substantially in most fisheries. Incidental Mortality Arising from Fishing Working Group (WG-IMAF) does not have a fixed meeting schedule (last met in 2011). Currently, bycatch and other seabird related issues are addressed by the Working Group on Fish Stock Assessment (WG-FSA) and the Scientific Committee.</p>	<p>The 2015 CCAMLR Commission meeting approved the continuation of the MoU with ACAP for a further three years. A proposal was also considered to amend the seabird conservation measure. Following concerns being raised that this would potentially weaken the application of the measure, agreement was reached on a revised text that addressed these concerns.</p> <p><u>Further Actions:</u></p> <p>Attendance at the CCAMLR Scientific Committee and Commission meetings is recommended to monitor the application of the seabird conservation measure and to strengthen it where necessary.</p>
<p>SEAFO</p>	<p>Although no actions were previously proposed, ACAP was formally invited to attend the 11th meeting of the South East Atlantic Fisheries Organisation (SEAFO) Scientific Committee</p>	<p>This was the first SEAFO meeting that ACAP has attended, and was helpful in building a closer working relationship with SEAFO and Namibia in respect of seabird conservation matters. The SEAFO Convention Area is certainly of importance for ACAP, as it encompasses an area known to be important for a number of ACAP species. However, the fishing effort within the Convention Area has been declining significantly over the last few years to the extent that in the</p>

**RFMO/ OTHER
ORGANISATION**

Actions Proposed for 2013-2016

Review of progress, and further actions required

2014-15 fishing season, there were only two active fishing vessels. Although the effort is currently very low, it could potentially increase in the future so it is important to ensure that the appropriate bycatch mitigation and conservation measures are in place, being used and reported on. The current SEAFO conservation measures in relation to seabird bycatch mitigation (CM 25/12) are generally consistent with ACAP best practice advice. One of the outcomes of the meeting was the recommendation by the SEAFO Scientific Committee that SEAFO and ACAP develop a closer working relationship on seabird bycatch and associated conservation and management measures, along the lines of the MoUs ACAP has in place with other RFMOs.

New Actions:

Consider the development of an MoU with SEAFO to provide a framework for interaction and support on matters relating to seabird bycatch.

Maintain a watching brief, and rather than routinely attending SEAFO Scientific Committee meetings, determine the value of attending future meetings on a case-by-case basis.

RFMO/ OTHER ORGANISATION	Actions Proposed for 2013-2016	Review of progress, and further actions required
SPRFMO	<p>Although no actions were proposed for the SPRFMO in the 2013-2015 plan, it was agreed that attention should be given to it, if resources allowed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Secure support for the adoption of a Conservation and Management Measure (CMM) by SPRFMO to mitigate seabird bycatch that is in line with ACAP's best practice advice.	<p>ACAP attended the 2nd Meeting of the SPRFMO Commission in 2014. A seabird conservation measure for demersal longline and trawl fisheries was adopted at the meeting (CMM 2.04 attached at Annex A). This was subsequently amended at the 4th Meeting of the Commission (Annex B) to tighten the requirement for observer coverage.</p> <p><u>Further Actions:</u></p> <p>In order to gain consensus support for seabird conservation measure CMM 2.04 an exemption from the requirement to use seabird mitigation measures was granted to trawl vessels that discharge no biological material. This provision is subject to periodic review, or review when new information is available.</p> <p>A Member indicated that they would seek funding to undertake research on this issue (approx. Euro 100k). It is recommended that ACAP offer to contribute to the development of the research plan for this study and support it in other areas where possible.</p>

RFMO/ OTHER ORGANISATION	Actions Proposed for 2013-2016	Review of progress, and further actions required
	<p>2. Secure support from SPRFMO for an effective observer programme and (bycatch) data collection and reporting protocols that have clear requirements relating to minimum standards. In particular, support the recommendations made by SC-01 on this issue, as per agenda item 11 of the SPRFMO-SC-01-2013 Report.</p>	<p>SPRFMO has adopted CMM 01-03 and CMM 2.02 on Standards for the Collection, Reporting, Verification and Exchange of Data. Annex N of the CMM concerns data to be collected on seabirds. Annex 8 (G) details the specific information to be collected on seabirds. Additionally, CMM 2.04 para's 7-9 details reporting requirements in relation to seabird interactions and use of bycatch mitigation measures.</p> <p><u>Further Actions:</u></p> <p>Continue to engage with SPRFMO and its CMs to help improve the collection and reporting of bycatch and associated data. It would be helpful for ACAP to help facilitate progress by working with its Parties that are also CMs of SPRFMO to meet the required standards and set an example for others to follow.</p>
	<p>3. Seek the adoption of an MoU between ACAP and SPRFMO</p>	<p>The second meeting of the SPRFMO Commission authorised its Secretariat to explore the possibility of a MoU with ACAP. An intersessional decision was subsequently sought from ACAP Parties for the ACAP Secretariat to enter into a MoU with the SPRFMO (ACAP ANCP Circular 2014-06). Following ACAP Parties approval of this request the MoU between ACAP and SPRFMO was signed on 28 Oct 2014.</p>

Table 2. Actions Proposed for 2016-2018

TO BE COMPLETED AT SBWG7