

 <p>Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels</p>	<p><b>Ninth Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group</b> <i>Florianópolis, Brazil, 6 – 8 May 2019</i></p> <p><b>Review of ACAP RFMO Engagement Strategy</b> <i>Anton Wolfaardt, Marco Favero, Igor Debski</i></p>
---	---

### **SUMMARY**

At SBWG8 the Working Group reviewed progress against the framework for ACAP's engagement strategy with RFMOs and CCAMLR (SBWG8 Doc 13), and on the basis of the review agreed a list of prioritised areas of engagement for the 2017-2019 intersessional period. Progress achieved since SBWG8 is presented in Table 1, together with an updated list of proposed actions for the forthcoming triennium (2019-2021), for discussion and endorsement by the SBWG and subsequent adoption by the Advisory Committee. ACAP's engagement strategy with RFMOs and CCAMLR will be discussed at a workshop on 5 May 2019, immediately preceding SBWG9. In order to help frame discussions at the workshop and at the subsequent Working Group and Advisory Committee meetings, this document provides additional information on the background of the ACAP RFMO engagement strategy and considers the challenges and opportunities associated with achieving best practice standards in reducing seabird bycatch. It is intended that the outcomes of the RFMO workshop will be used to update, in tracked changes, this ACAP RFMO strategy, including to develop a more detailed list of priority actions that are needed to create a positive step-change in the status of seabird bycatch mitigation in RFMOs and more generally.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. The SBWG is requested to consider this review of the ACAP RFMO engagement strategy, and to contribute to the further development of this strategy, both at the workshop on 5 May 2019 and at the SBWG9 meeting, to revise the list of priority actions in Table 1 of this document to be progressed through the ACAP RFMO engagement strategy.
2. To request the Advisory Committee to support the implementation of these actions, including the provision of resources necessary to achieve this

## **Revisión de la estrategia de participación del ACAP con las OROP**

### **RESUMEN**

Durante la GdTCS8, el Grupo de Trabajo examinó los progresos obtenidos con respecto al marco para la estrategia de participación del ACAP con las OROP y la CCRVMA (GdTCS8 Doc 13) y, basándose en este examen, acordó una lista de áreas prioritarias de participación para el periodo intersesional comprendido entre 2017 y 2019. Los avances logrados desde la GdTCS8 se presentan en la Tabla 1, junto con una lista actualizada de acciones propuestas para el siguiente trienio (2019-2021), para su análisis y aprobación por parte del GdTCS y su posterior adopción por parte del Comité Asesor. La estrategia de participación del ACAP con las OROP y la CCRVMA se debatirá en un taller que se celebrará el 5 de mayo de 2019, inmediatamente antes de la GdTCS9. Para enmarcar los debates del taller y las consiguientes reuniones del Grupo de Trabajo y del Comité Asesor, en este documento se ofrece información adicional sobre los antecedentes de la estrategia de participación entre el ACAP y las OROP y se consideran los desafíos y las oportunidades relativos a lograr estándares de mejores prácticas para reducir la captura secundaria de aves marinas. La intención es utilizar los resultados del taller de las OROP para actualizar, con control de cambios, esta estrategia entre el ACAP y las OROP, incluida la preparación de una lista de acciones prioritarias más detallada que son necesarias para generar un cambio radical positivo en el estado de mitigación de la captura secundaria de aves marinas en las OROP y a nivel más general.

### **RECOMENDACIONES**

1. Se solicita al GdTCS considerar esta revisión de la estrategia de participación entre el ACAP y las OROP, y contribuir a seguir desarrollando esta estrategia, tanto en el taller del 5 de mayo de 2019 como en la reunión del GdTCS9, para revisar la lista de acciones prioritarias que figuran en la Tabla 1 de este documento que será desarrollada a través de la estrategia de participación entre el ACAP y las OROP.
2. Solicitar al Comité Asesor que respalde la implementación de estas acciones, incluida la provisión de los recursos necesarios para llegar a tal fin.

## **Examen de la stratégie d'engagement de l'ORGP de l'ACAP**

### **RÉSUMÉ**

Lors du GTCA8, le Groupe de travail a examiné les progrès réalisés par rapport à la stratégie d'engagement de l'ACAP avec les ORGP et la CCAMLR (GTCA8 Doc 13), et sur la base de l'examen a approuvé une liste de domaines d'engagement prioritaires pour la période intersessions 2017-2019. Les progrès réalisés depuis le GTCA8 sont présentés dans le tableau 1, ainsi qu'une liste actualisée des actions proposées pour la période à venir (2019-2021), pour examen et approbation par le GTCA et l'adoption ultérieure par le

Comité consultatif. La stratégie d'engagement de l'ACAP avec les ORGP et la CCAMLR sera discutée lors de l'atelier organisé le 5 mai 2019, juste avant le GTCA9. Le présent document fournit, pour encadrer ces discussions lors de l'atelier et lors des réunions du Groupe de travail et du Comité consultatif, des informations complémentaires sur l'historique de la stratégie d'engagement de l'ACAP avec les ORGP et passe en revue les difficultés et les opportunités associées à l'application des normes des bonnes pratiques pour réduire la capture accessoire des oiseaux de mer. Les résultats de l'atelier des ORGP devraient être l'occasion de mettre à jour, en utilisant le suivi des modifications, cette stratégie de l'ACAP avec les ORGP, notamment pour détailler les actions prioritaires nécessaires pour initier un changement progressif positif dans le statut de l'atténuation de la capture accessoire des oiseaux de mer dans les ORGP et de manière plus générale.

### **RECOMMANDATIONS**

1. Il est demandé au GTCA d'examiner cette révision de la stratégie d'engagement de l'ACAP avec les ORGP et de contribuer à l'approfondissement de cette stratégie, tant lors de l'atelier organisé le 5 mai 2019 que lors de la réunion du GTCA9, de réviser la liste des actions prioritaires reprises dans le tableau 1 du présent document à faire avancer par le biais de la stratégie d'engagement de l'ACAP avec le ORGP.
2. Demander au Comité consultatif de soutenir la mise en œuvre de ces actions, y compris la fourniture des ressources nécessaires pour y parvenir.

## **1. BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW OF THE PROCESS TO REVIEW AND UPDATE THE ACAP RFMO ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY**

### **1.1. Introduction**

Large numbers of ACAP-listed species are incidentally caught by fisheries managed by Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (RFMOs). Consequently, engagement with RFMOs has been an important component of ACAP's strategy to mitigate and reduce the bycatch of seabirds. At each of its meetings, the Seabird Bycatch Working Group routinely reviews and updates actions listed in ACAP's RFMO engagement strategy. This was done most recently in September 2017, at SBWG8, at which progress against the actions listed for the 2016-2017 period (SBWG8 Doc 13) were reviewed. The Working Group also considered a number of other RFMO-related papers at SBWG8, and on the basis of these documents and discussions thereof, agreed a list of prioritised areas of engagement and activities for the 2017-2019 intersessional period.

The strategy revised and endorsed by SBWG8 and AC10 comprises three key areas, or themes, in which ACAP should aim to engage RFMOs to better understand the nature and extent of seabird bycatch and improve efforts to reduce bycatch to the lowest possible levels. These include: 1) engage in RFMO reviews of seabird bycatch levels and the effectiveness of conservation and management measures (including planned reviews by ICCAT, IOTC, WCPFC, and the joint tuna RFMO seabird bycatch assessments), 2) strengthen the seabird bycatch mitigation measures adopted by RFMOs, and 3) strengthen RFMO bycatch data collection and reporting requirements and the inclusion of appropriate seabird bycatch

mitigation elements within RFMO compliance monitoring. A number of actions were identified within each of these three areas of engagement. These prioritised areas of engagement and the list of activities within each, were included as Annex 6 of the SBWG8 report, and are presented in Table 1 to help facilitate the review process at SBWG9. Table 1 includes a review of progress achieved against the priority actions agreed at SBWG8 and AC10, and a list of proposed actions for the forthcoming (2019-2021) triennium. A fourth category titled 'Other Actions' has been included in Table 1 to capture additional recommendations for the forthcoming period. Following discussion and endorsement by the Working Group, the revised strategy and action plan will be presented to the Advisory Committee for endorsement.

There are a number of initiatives underway currently that aim to assess levels of seabird bycatch across multiple RFMOs. These processes are due to finalise their outputs and recommendations shortly, providing a valuable opportunity to progress seabird conservation objectives with RFMOs over the next triennium.

This document (the ACAP RFMO engagement strategy) was compiled prior to the completion of those processes, and so it has not been possible to incorporate their outputs and recommendations in the ACAP RFMO Engagement Strategy. Furthermore, it is intended that the ACAP RFMO engagement workshop planned for 5 May 2019 (immediately preceding SBWG9) will discuss the key elements of the RFMO engagement strategy with a view to prioritising the actions required to progress the ACAP objectives of reducing seabird bycatch. The purpose of this document is to provide a review of the ACAP RFMO strategy to date, as well as recommendations for future work to help inform discussions at the RFMO workshop and the SBWG9 meeting. The outcomes of the RFMO workshop will be used to update, in tracked changes, this ACAP RFMO strategy, including to develop a more detailed list of priority actions that are needed to create a positive step-change in the status of seabird bycatch mitigation in RFMOs and more generally.

## **2. A CONSIDERATION OF CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES**

The focus of ACAP's RFMO Engagement Strategy has been multi-pronged and includes the following components:

- To highlight the threat posed by fisheries activities, and particularly those associated with the particular RFMO, to ACAP species.
- To better understand the nature and extent of this threat, and to encourage and support the adoption and implementation of effective seabird bycatch mitigation measures to reduce the threat, and
- to promote the implementation of robust monitoring programmes to track the performance of fleets and RFMOs in reducing seabird bycatch and assessing the effectiveness of mitigation measures adopted by RFMOs.

Clearly, the first step is to convince the RFMOs, their member countries and the fishing industry that seabird bycatch is a serious problem that needs to be solved. Once this fundamental imperative is achieved, there will be greater support for the need to adopt and implement measures to reduce seabird bycatch and to monitor performance against that objective.

In order to evaluate progress to date, and to help inform discussions regarding the next steps, it is insightful to consider RFMO progress against the FAO (2009) guidelines on best practices to reduce incidental capture of seabirds in capture fisheries, which outline some generic steps and actions that constitute essential elements of a seabird bycatch reduction strategy.

## **2.1. Robust assessment of incidental seabird mortality in fisheries**

One of the first steps is to determine whether there is indeed a bycatch problem in the fishery and to ascertain the extent and nature of the problem. Such an assessment relies on the collection of reliable data on seabird-fishery interactions (to quantify bycatch rates – the number of seabirds killed as well as how, where and when they were killed), temporal and spatial distribution of fishing effort, details of the fishing operation and, ideally, the distribution of important seabird foraging areas. It is important that assessments are conducted regularly to ensure ongoing monitoring of bycatch rates, compliance with and effectiveness of prescribed mitigation measures (see below), thus enabling an informed and adaptive approach to seabird bycatch mitigation. Ongoing assessments of seabird bycatch rates depend critically on the implementation of a formal and well-designed onboard observer scheme (see below).

In most cases, it has not been possible to conduct a robust assessment of seabird bycatch within RFMOs and across multiple RFMOs due largely to the limited amount of data available for this purpose. There are currently a number of initiatives underway, and due to be completed shortly, that are investigating seabird bycatch levels associated with pelagic longline fisheries, both within RFMOs, and more widely. The outcomes of these processes will be important in guiding efforts to address shortcomings and data gaps.

A related issue is the extent to which levels of bycatch associated with fisheries affect seabird populations. In some cases, the lack of robust information on the population-level consequences of bycatch has led to suggestions for further investigations to be carried out in this area before proceeding with recommendations to update or bolster seabird conservation measures.

## **2.2. Prescription, adoption and implementation of minimum standard mitigation measures**

Over the last couple of decades there has been substantial progress in the development and testing of technical and operational mitigation measures that reduce bycatch of seabirds (and other taxa) in different fisheries operating in different parts of the world's oceans. Although research is still continuing on a number of emerging mitigation measures, there are already a range of proven methods available for minimising seabird bycatch that are cost-effective and practical to use. It is recognised that fisheries regulations should prescribe minimum standard mitigation measures that are mandatory and included in permit conditions. In addition, a recommendation to use other mitigation measures voluntarily is seen as a means of stimulating innovation of new and adapted measures. It is important that all methods, especially those prescribed in permit conditions are described unambiguously. Compliance and the proper use of mitigation measures is a critical issue affecting the success of these measures, and in many fisheries is the main downfall of seabird bycatch reduction strategies. The reasons for poor compliance are many. Dealing with poor compliance generally requires a two-pronged approach that includes education, outreach, training and awareness efforts on the one hand, and effective enforcement on the other.

Most of the tuna RFMOs have adopted seabird conservation and management measures (i.e. bycatch mitigation measures) that have been informed by ACAP best practice advice. Most of these RFMO policies reflect previous (pre-2016) advice from ACAP, which has subsequently been updated to incorporate more progressive line weighting specifications, in a few cases the addition of recommended hook-shielding devices as alternative measures. ACAP's engagement approach with RFMOs has been to routinely update the RFMOs of its latest advice, highlighting the specific updates, and areas where the RFMO policies are out of date in relation to ACAP advice. In some cases, the relevant RFMO Scientific Working Groups have supported the updated advice, or parts of the updated advice, but in most cases the Commissions of the relevant RFMOs have yet to use the updated advice to revise their seabird conservation measures. The one exception is the WCPFC, which has recently (2018) updated its seabird CMM to include the use of hook-shielding devices as an alternative/additional bycatch mitigation measure for vessels fishing south of 25°S latitude. Further details of the RFMO-specific situations are provided in Table 1 below. It is useful to note that the WCPFC revision did not include the more progressive line weighting specifications currently recommended by ACAP, and this is likely one of the main reasons that the proposal to update the seabird CMM was supported and adopted. This presents a challenge for ACAP, which recognises line-weighting (defined using the more progressive specifications) as an important, and key, component of reducing seabird bycatch in pelagic longline fisheries. Because it is integral to the fishing gear, line weighting has the advantage of being more consistently implemented, hence facilitating compliance and port monitoring. It is clear from discussions in the margins of RFMO meetings that many of the key countries within RFMOs are not yet ready to support a proposal to update seabird conservation measures to reflect the current line weighting specifications recommended by ACAP, highlighting this as an important area for further targeted engagement with these and other countries. This will likely be an important area of discussion under the Drivers and Barriers agenda item at the SBWG9 meeting, and it would be useful if any specific recommendations coming out of these discussions be reflected in a revised version of this RFMO engagement strategy.

### **2.3. Data collection and the implementation of an onboard observer scheme**

The implementation of an onboard observer scheme is a crucial element of any seabird bycatch reduction strategy. The purpose of observer schemes is to collect reliable data on seabird bycatch, assist fishers in the proper use of mitigation measures and monitor compliance with prescribed mitigation measures. It is important that observers are properly trained, and that data collection protocols are clearly defined, standardised and form part of a robust mechanism that allows for the efficient reporting and assessment of seabird bycatch. In many fisheries, the observer programmes and the quality and quantity of data collected have been inadequate to obtain reliable estimates of seabird mortality. One of the problems has been insufficient coverage of fishing activities by observers.

ACAP has provided advice, guidelines and tools (such as the Seabird Bycatch Identification guide, an updated version of which is currently under review) at RFMO meetings to encourage the improvement of observer programme protocols and efforts. However, in most cases the quantity and quality of data that are reported to RFMO Secretariats, and thus available for assessments, continues to be very limited, preventing the robust estimation of seabird bycatch in those fisheries. In some cases, this is due to concerns regarding the confidentiality of the data, in other cases it is likely due to the data having not been collected.

## **2.4. Education, training and publicity**

Low levels of compliance in respect of the use of required seabird bycatch mitigation measures are often due a lack of understanding of the severity of the seabird bycatch problem, and insufficient technical experience and knowledge of the proper use of mitigation measures. Education, training and general awareness programmes are therefore important elements of any seabird bycatch reduction strategy. Education and outreach programmes should be properly targeted (fishers, observers, compliance officers and policy makers), and tailored for the specific fishery. There are a number of relevant initiatives underway in different parts of the world (and a number of networks that work in the field of seabird bycatch mitigation), and there is great scope for the transfer and exchange of knowledge and expertise. However, there is no single correct approach, and any initiative dealing with education, training and awareness needs to be properly placed in, and informed by, the relevant cultural and socio-economic context. In general, initiatives where fishers are seen as partners in the process of finding solutions to bycatch problems result in more successful uptake of these measures.

This is an issue that will likely be discussed in detail during the Drivers and Barriers session of the SBWG9 meeting.

## **2.5. Research and development**

It is important that research efforts continue to assess the effectiveness of current mitigation measures (both experimentally and operationally) so that these methods and their implementation can be further improved, as well as developing and testing novel measures that are practicable and cost-effective. This is an area in which the ACAP Seabird Bycatch Working Group has been particularly focussed. There is also a need to integrate more effectively the human and institutional aspects of seabird-bycatch reduction into research programmes, and to continue studies (and initiate further studies where necessary and feasible) into the relevant aspects of the foraging ecology, demography and conservation management of the affected species. Opportunities to collaborate, and share expertise, knowledge and data, should be maximised.

To be effective a seabird bycatch reduction strategy needs to address all of these issues. Broadly it needs to influence the development and adoption of appropriate policy instruments (legal environment) and contribute towards effective compliance with and enforcement of the regulations and guidelines. The strategy also needs to strike the right balance of political/diplomatic (intergovernmental) encouragement and pressure and “grass roots” conservation action. Indeed, one of the major challenges is to translate international and national policy instruments into concerted action on the decks of fishing vessels. One of the areas in which ACAP has had limited direct involvement to date is compliance – the extent to which required seabird bycatch mitigation measures are being used and used effectively. This is clearly an important issue to address, and one which should be taken up more explicitly in the ACAP RFMO engagement strategy. It is necessary to consider how best to engage constructively on issues relating to compliance. This includes both compliance monitoring, and ways to help strengthen compliance. It is likely that at least some of the issues relating to compliance will form part of the discussions that will be held under the Drivers and Barriers agenda item of SBWG9, and it is hoped that the relevant outcomes of those discussions can feed into a revised version of this ACAP RFMO engagement strategy.

**Table 1:** Review of ACAP RFMO Engagement Strategy, and proposed actions for the forthcoming triennium 2019-2021

RFMO/Other organisation	No.	Actions agreed for 2017-2019	Review of progress, and further actions required
<b>Theme 1) Engage in RFMO reviews of seabird bycatch levels and the effectiveness of conservation and management measures</b>			
IOTC	a)	<p>Continue to work with IOTC, ACAP Party CPCs, other CPCs, BirdLife and other organisations, towards a revision of Res 12/06 that is informed by the current ACAP best practice advice. IOTC's WPEB and the SC have recommended that the latest ACAP advice be used to update Res 12/06 when it is next reviewed. Now that the IOTC scientific bodies have recommended Res 12/06 be updated in accordance with the latest best practice advice from ACAP, the next step would be for a CPC, or CPCs, to develop a revised resolution and submit it to the ICCAT Commission for their consideration and endorsement. A revised (track changed) version of Res 12/06, which is based on the current (2016) ACAP advice, has already been developed, and could form the basis of further engagement with key stakeholders.</p>	<p>In order to help facilitate the review of Res 12/06, ACAP presented its latest (2017) advice for mitigating seabird bycatch in pelagic longline fisheries at WPEB14. The presentation outlining the process ACAP follows to review relevant research and update our advice. The presentation then focussed on the most recent updates to our advice, particularly since 2016, highlighting where IOTC Res 12/06 differed from ACAP's current advice. The WPEB were reminded that it, and subsequently the Scientific Committee (SC), had previously (2016) considered and endorsed ACAP's updated advice regarding line-weighting specifications and hook-shielding devices, and that Res 12/06 has remained unchanged and based on the previous (pre-2016) ACAP advice.</p> <p>Several discussions were held in the margins of the meeting regarding the development and submission of a proposal to the IOTC Commission to update IOTC Res 12/06 to bring it in line with the current ACAP advice and is apparent that the key CPCs (ACAP Parties and others) are not yet ready to present and support a proposal that includes the updated ACAP advice in its entirety. It is evident that the updated line weighting specifications in the ACAP advice was (and is) the main stumbling block, rather than the addition of hook-shielding devices. This view was confirmed by the recent support at the WCPFC SC14 meeting (see 2a below) for hook-shielding devices to be added to the list of mitigation options in that RFMO.</p> <p><b><u>Proposed Actions:</u></b></p> <p>Assist the Commission in updating Resolution 12/06 to bring it in line with the</p>

RFMO/Other organisation	No.	Actions agreed for 2017-2019	Review of progress, and further actions required
			<p>current ACAP advice. ACAP's current advice has been endorsed by both the WPEB and the SC of IOTC, so all that remains is for a CPC, or CPCs, to bring forward a proposal to the IOTC Commission. Given the recent experience at WCPFC (see 2a), it seems likely that IOTC CPCs would be more inclined to develop and support a proposal that excludes the current line weighting advice (i.e. retains the specifications from the previous – pre-2016 – advice), rather focusing only on the addition of approved hook-shielding devices. This represents a challenge for ACAP, as our advice highlights the importance (or advantages) of line weighting as a bycatch mitigation measure, and the need to update the specifications of the three weighting regimes.</p> <p>Help support IOTC work to advance innovation in seabird bycatch monitoring and mitigation, and associated capacity building, in relevant IOTC processes and implementation of current measures.</p>
<b>ICCAT</b>	b)	<p>Continue to work with ICCAT, ACAP Party CPCs, other CPCs, BirdLife and other organisations, towards a revision of Rec 11-09 that is informed by the current ACAP best practice advice.</p> <p>Facilitate the submission and presentation of the results of studies on hook pods and smart-tuna hooks to the ICCAT SC-ECO. The papers submitted to the ACAP SBWG7 meeting are currently under peer-review. It would be important to have</p>	<p>Following the presentation of the ACAP best practice advice for mitigating seabird bycatch in pelagic longline fisheries at its 2016 meeting, the SC-ECO were inclined to support the updated line-weighting specifications. Some concern was expressed regarding safety issues, entanglements and possible impacts on catch rates of target species. However, the SC-ECO were generally of the view that the ACAP advice was sound, and that it was based on good evidence, including that provided by the Brazilian study of Lumo Leads), which was presented at SBWG7, and again at the 2016 ICCAT SC-ECO meeting. Consequently, the SC-ECO recommended that when Rec [11-09] is updated, the line weighting specifications are revised to conform with the latest ACAP advice. A caveat was included in the meeting report regarding safety, along the lines that the SC-ECO encourages all CPCs to investigate safety concerns.</p> <p>At its 2016 meeting, the ICCAT SC-ECO acknowledged the updated advice from</p>

RFMO/Other organisation	No.	Actions agreed for 2017-2019	Review of progress, and further actions required
		<p>these papers presented to the SC-ECO once they are available.</p> <p>Help facilitate harmonisation between the Common Oceans Tuna project work on seabird bycatch assessment and the work being undertaken by ICCAT CPC scientists</p>	<p>ACAP on the addition of the two hook-shielding devices as stand-alone best practice measures. However, given the novel nature of these measures, and that the source papers used by ACAP to conduct its assessment were still in the process of being peer-reviewed for publication, the SC-ECO were of the view that it was premature to recommend their inclusion in the list of available seabird mitigation measures for ICCAT fisheries. It was recommended that further consideration of the two devices is required before the SC-ECO would be in a position to consider recommending them as mitigation measures for ICCAT fisheries and requested that the scientific papers on the hook-shielding devices be made available as soon as they are published. The recent publication of the core research used by ACAP to assess hook-pods as a best practice measure for pelagic longline fisheries (Sullivan et al. 2017) meant that this work could be presented to the ICCAT SC-ECO in more detail than had previously been possible. The paper (Document SCRS 2018/078) was presented by Tatiana Neves, in her capacity as one of the co-authors, and the Brazilian representative at the SC-ECO meeting, Dimas Gianuca, presented a paper providing interim results from research investigating the effectiveness and practical use of hook-pod minis in Brazilian longline vessels (SCRS/2018/086). Prior to these two papers on hook-pods, ACAP presented its current advice (Document SCRS/2018/074). Given ICCAT SC-ECO's previous endorsement of the ACAP recommended (and updated) line weighting specifications, the presentation focussed mostly on the review process, the updated recommendations pertaining to Bird Scaring Lines for small vessels, and also reminding the ICCAT SC-ECO of their position at the 2016 meeting that they wished to consider further the inclusion of hook-shielding devices once the research results were available. The two hook-pod papers were generally well received. The meeting acknowledged that from a scientific perspective, the hook-pod has been shown to be highly effective at reducing seabird bycatch and recognised that the re-usability of the pods is a positive</p>

RFMO/Other organisation	No.	Actions agreed for 2017-2019	Review of progress, and further actions required
			<p>attribute. However, they did not go as far as formally recommending that hook-pods be included in the list of mitigation measures permitted by ICCAT. The main reasons for this appear to be concerns regarding the cost, and uncertainty around the influence on the catch rates of other taxa, both target and non-target species (e.g. some sharks). It is useful to note that even though it was made very clear that in terms of the ACAP advice, the hook-pod is an additional or alternative measure, to the simultaneous use of the three standard measures, and didn't have to be used by fleets, but could be by those who choose to, ICCAT SC-ECO was not yet ready to recommend this advice. The feedback from the Brazilian study on hook-pod minis suggests that the Brazilian fishermen prefer the hook-pod minis to Bird Scaring lines, which they rarely use, even though they are legally required to. Overall, we have moved forward on the issue of support for hook-pods as one of ACAP's recommended best practice bycatch mitigation measures, but need to make further progress to get a formal endorsement from the ICCAT SC-ECO, which would provide the support ideally needed to present a proposal to the ICCAT Commission to update Rec 11-09.</p> <p><b><u>Proposed Actions:</u></b></p> <p>Continue to work with CPCs and ICCAT towards a revision of Rec 11-09 that is informed by the current ACAP best practice advice. The SC-ECO have recommended that the line-weighting specifications of Rec 11-09 be updated to conform with the latest ACAP advice but have not formally recommended the inclusion of hook-shielding devices. It would be useful for the ICCAT SCRS to support the recommendation of the SC-ECO in relation to line-weighting. Given the concerns regarding safety, and the current outstanding support from the ICCAT SC-ECO for hook-shielding devices, and specifically hook-pods, more work is required to build a stronger level of support amongst CPCs to update Rec 11-09 to bring it closer to the current ACAP best practice advice. The outcomes of</p>

RFMO/Other organisation	No.	Actions agreed for 2017-2019	Review of progress, and further actions required
			<p>the initiatives underway to assess seabird bycatch in ICCAT and other tuna fisheries will be important informants to this process.</p> <p>Facilitate the submission and presentation of results from ongoing and additional studies on hook pods and line weighting to the ICCAT SC-ECO. The Sullivan et al (2017) paper and the paper presenting the preliminary results from work on hook-pod minis in the Brazilian fleets have helped build support for the effectiveness of hook-pods, but further work is needed to address outstanding uncertainties amongst some CPCs, including additional results and advice pertaining to the updated ACAP advice regarding line weighting specifications.</p> <p>Participate in the ICCAT SC-ECO process to develop indicators (the ACAP focus would be on the seabird bycatch component) and an Ecosystem Report Card for ICCAT.</p> <p>Engage with members not reporting compliance data to understand the main reasons for this.</p> <p>Engage in intersessional work and discussions at the SC-Stats to review observer data collection forms (ST09).</p>
<b>WCPFC</b>	c)	Continue to participate in relevant meetings including Scientific Committee, Technical and Compliance Committee and Commission to ensure that data relevant to seabird bycatch is collected and appropriately analysed and effectiveness of the current CMM is assessed	<p>ACAP attended the WCPFC Scientific Committee (SC14) meeting in August 2018 and presented a range of papers providing updated advice on the conservation status of ACAP species, work underway to develop a reporting framework and a series of indicators pertaining to bycatch, and the latest best practice advice for mitigating seabird bycatch in pelagic longline fisheries.</p> <p>SPC provided an update on Project 68 (Estimation of seabird mortality across the WCPO Convention Area), which is co-funded by the ABNJ Tuna Project (EB-WP-03). It was reported that the contract had only recently been signed (April 2018), and so the work presented represented an initial exploratory step, and the results</p>

RFMO/Other organisation	No.	Actions agreed for 2017-2019	Review of progress, and further actions required
			<p>should be viewed as preliminary. It is already obvious that the low levels of observer coverage, especially in areas of high seabird abundance will be a constraint. The objective of the study is to provide reliable estimates of seabird mortality in the WCPO, but also to identify the critical data gaps and provide recommendations to address these. It is also clear from the initial analysis that it will be necessary to develop separate models for the northern and southern areas of the WCPO rather than applying a single model to both areas. The work will be progressed intersessionally, and it seems SPC may organize a workshop with seabird specialists to ensure that they incorporate appropriate variables into the catch models. It is not clear when this might take place, but SPC are intending to complete the study in time to present the final results to the SC in 2019.</p> <p>New Zealand presented paper EB-WP-11 providing an update on bycatch risks to seabirds in the Western Pacific. The main thrust of the paper was that updated information on the distribution and deteriorating conservation status of Antipodean Albatrosses highlight that considerable risk posed by substantial fishing effort between 30°S and 25°S, beyond the area in which seabird bycatch mitigation measures are required. On the basis of these results, New Zealand proposed that SC recommend the northern boundary of the southern area of application of CMM 2017-06 be extended from 30°S to 25°S.</p> <p>ACAP presented EB-WP-14 on the conservation status and priorities for albatrosses and large petrels distributed in the WCPFC area, and EB-WP-15 on the development of ACAP seabird bycatch indicators, data needs, methodological approaches and reporting requirements. The purpose of the former paper was to provide an update on the conservation status of ACAP species that occur in the WCPO, highlighting the recent deterioration in the conservation status of Antipodean Albatross, and its inclusion in the list of ACAP high priority populations. In so doing, the paper sought to lend support for the proposal to</p>

RFMO/Other organisation	No.	Actions agreed for 2017-2019	Review of progress, and further actions required
			<p>extend the area of application of CMM 2017-06 from 30°S to 25°S (see 2a). The purpose of the second paper on ACAP bycatch indicators was to inform the WCPFC SC of the work underway by to develop bycatch indicators and a reporting framework, and so establish the opportunity to present subsequent outcomes of this work and advice to help encourage improved data collection and analysis in respect of seabird bycatch.</p> <p>Following discussions at the 2017 WCPFC SC meeting, and an indication by France at MoP6 to consider supporting a seabird bycatch mitigation project in French Polynesia, aninformal concept note was developed for a potential project to undertake bycatch mitigation trials and training in French Polynesia fisheries. This was discussed informally in the margins of the meeting by representatives of New Zealand Direction des Ressources Marines et Minières, French Polynesia (DRMM), BirdLife International and ACAP. Some initial bycatch mitigation trials have already been conducted by New Zealand (DOC), and the report from that work should be available shortly. It was agreed that as a first step, it would be useful to determine what sort of data are already collected and available that could help characterize the risk to seabirds associated with French Polynesian fleets. This would be coarse scale, using broad scale distribution information and effort data to conduct a very preliminary risk assessment. This first step could potentially be achieved by requesting SPC to provide some outputs of the analysis they have conducted for Project 68 (see 1c), focusing specifically on the French Polynesian fleet. If these outputs are not sufficient, further work will need to be undertaken to collect the necessary information. If this is the case, a work plan could be developed and funds sought to collate information on fisheries (including the spatial and temporal distribution of the fishing effort) and their potential risk to seabirds. Once this information is available, either through feedback from the Project 68 process, or a dedicated data collation exercise, the proposed project</p>

RFMO/Other organisation	No.	Actions agreed for 2017-2019	Review of progress, and further actions required
			<p>would include actions aimed at providing guidelines for data collection, and importantly assistance to develop capacity within DRMM on seabird observations and bycatch implementation and monitoring. SPC is presently updating their seabird identification guide, and this could form part of the resources used for capacity building.</p> <p>The ACAP Secretariat submitted a proposal to the SPC to compile seabird identification guide materials for its fisheries observers, based on the ACAP/FRA seabird byatch ID guide, focussed on the SPC area of interest. The existing material will be supplemented with new species distribution maps provided by BLI, identification keys to species level for albatrosses and petrels in collaboration with a New Zealand expert, and more images showing the anatomical features used for identification. This is expected to be completed by June 2019.</p> <p><b><u>Proposed Actions:</u></b></p> <p>Continue to engage with WCPFC, SPC, CPCs, and other organisations to improve data collection, reporting and assessment efforts regarding seabird bycatch and the effectiveness of mitigation methods. It is likely that Project 68 will develop a range of recommendations to address data gaps and data quality issues. It will be useful for ACAP to engage in this process to encourage linkages between the outcomes of the SPC process (Project 68), and the other seabird bycatch assessments currently underway, which would also be developing recommendations to improve data collection and monitoring efforts.</p> <p>Help develop and support the proposed work to advance seabird bycatch monitoring and mitigation, and associated capacity building, in relevant French Polynesian fisheries, and help facilitate French funding via the ACAP National Contact Point for this work</p>

RFMO/Other organisation	No.	Actions agreed for 2017-2019	Review of progress, and further actions required
<p><b>Joint tuna RFMO review/Initiatives applicable to multiple RFMOs</b></p>	<p>d)</p>	<p>Help support and facilitate collaboration between the various initiatives underway investigating the impacts of tuna fisheries on seabirds. These include the FAO Common Oceans Tuna project seabird bycatch assessment work, initiatives being undertaken by RFMO CPC scientists, and the New Zealand seabird-fisheries risk assessment currently underway. This should be done through the development and provision of relevant ACAP advice and guidelines, and by helping facilitate the active engagement of ACAP Parties in the projects. ACAP should also help encourage and facilitate efficient linkages between the initiatives being undertaken simultaneously to review the efficacy of seabird conservation measures in tuna RFMOs.</p>	<p>ACAP has continued to participate in the various initiatives currently underway to investigate the impacts of tuna fisheries on seabirds, either through a specific ACAP representative, or through representatives of ACAP Parties participating in the relevant projects. At the time of writing this report, the latest outputs of these processes, such as the FAO Common Oceans Tuna project seabird bycatch assessment, were not available.</p> <p><b><u>Proposed Actions:</u></b></p> <p>The RFMO workshop preceding SBWG9, and the SBWG9 and AC11 meetings, should be used to discuss how best to advance the results and recommendations coming out of the various seabird bycatch assessment processes that are underway and close to completion. These discussions should aim to agree specific actions required to address the priority needs identified in these assessment processes that should then form an integral part of this ACAP RFMO Engagement Strategy. These will likely include a range of interconnected actions such as strengthening the proper use of effective bycatch mitigation measures, improving data collection, reporting and monitoring efforts, including in relation to compliance, and education and outreach to help support these objectives.</p>

RFMO/Other organisation	No.	Actions agreed for 2017-2019	Review of progress, and further actions required
<b>Theme 2) Strengthen the seabird bycatch mitigation measures adopted by RFMOs</b>			
<b>WCPFC</b>	a)	<p>Continue to advocate for the southern boundary of CMM 2015-03 to be moved north of 30°S.</p> <p>Seek amendment of CMM 2015-03 to have North Pacific fisheries following ACAP BPA within the revised ACAP best practice advice for pelagic longline fisheries.</p> <p>Engage in the process to consider BSL designs, providing information relating to ACAP updated best practice advice for bird scaring lines for small vessels, and further highlight the relevance of using line weighting in combination with bird scaring lines.</p>	<p>Latest ACAP BPA adopted at AC10 presented to SC14 (EB-WP-13). The presentation then focussed on the most recent updates to ACAP advice, particularly since 2016, highlighting where WCPFC CMM 2017-06 differed from ACAP's current advice. The ACAP presentation was followed by a paper presented by New Zealand (EB-WP-10) providing a review of the effectiveness of hook-pods at reducing seabird bycatch. The paper collated results from the key studies on hook-pods, covering both the original hook-pod design and the hook-pod mini, and including studies that have been conducted recently and are still underway. The critical recommendation from this paper and presentation was for the WCPFC SC to support the scientific basis for the effectiveness of hook-pods, and hook-shielding devices more broadly, at reducing seabird bycatch, and to recommend that the WCPFC Technical Compliance Committee (TCC) consider and the WCPFC revise CMM 2017-06 to include hook-shielding devices as a stand-alone bycatch mitigation option. It was highlighted that this would not replace the existing measures but provide more options to vessels fishing in the areas in which seabird bycatch mitigation options are required. It was pointed out by New Zealand that this would potentially be an attractive option for many of the New Zealand vessels fishing in areas with high seabird abundance, but it was acknowledged that it would not be the optimal option for all fleets. The scientific evidence was generally accepted by the meeting, and the concerns raised in plenary and in the process of developing and revising a recommendation from the meeting, related to the specificity of the measures (i.e. does one prescribe the exact specification of the hook-shielding device that should be included in CMM 2017-06), and a fear that although not proposed currently as a mandatory measure, this might change in the future. The latter concern was allayed by including some text in the Recommendation that while there was no proposal that</p>

RFMO/Other organisation	No.	Actions agreed for 2017-2019	Review of progress, and further actions required
			<p>hook-shielding devices be made mandatory, if this was proposed in the future, it would need to be supported by a thorough review by WCPFC SC and TCC.</p> <p>There was no detailed discussion by the meeting of the updated line-weighting specifications recommended by ACAP. However, discussions in the margins of the meeting highlight that there are a number of key countries that are not yet ready to support a proposal to bring the WCPFC seabird CMM in line with the current ACAP advice on line-weighting.</p> <p>WCPFC SC14 adopted two key recommendations regarding seabirds. The first was to add hook-pods to the list of mitigation measures as an alternative to the existing requirement (combined use of 2 of the 3 measures in the list: line weighting, bird scaring lines and night setting), and the second was to modify the area of application of the seabird conservation and management measure, to include the area between 30°S and 25°S. These proposals were subsequently considered by the WCPFC TCC and Commission, which ultimately adopted a revised CMM for seabirds, CMM 2018-03. CMM 2018-03 incorporates hook shielding devices as an additional/alternative (stand-alone) mitigation measure for vessels fishing south of 25°S. With the adoption of this CMM, WCPFC is the first RFMO to include hook-shielding devices in their list of permitted mitigation measures. CMM 2018-03 also expanded its area of application, including the area between 30°S and 25°S. This area is treated slightly different to the area south of 30°S in that vessels are only required to use one of the following measures: weighted branchlines, tori lines or hook-shielding devices. The less stringent requirement in this area was a compromise to get agreement by some CPCs that fish in this area, but predominantly north of it. The requirements for vessels fishing north of 25°S remain unchanged.</p> <p>Although not formally presented, EB-IP-13 provided some preliminary results from</p>

RFMO/Other organisation	No.	Actions agreed for 2017-2019	Review of progress, and further actions required
			<p>research conducted by the Japanese to trial ways to increase the aerial extent of tori lines on small vessels fishing in the North Pacific. This research is ongoing, and although the results presented were based on bald/streamerless tori lines, Japan indicated that they will be attaching streamers in a future phase of this research and are aware of the research conducted by New Zealand on tori line designs for small vessels.</p> <p>A question was asked in the margins of the SC14 meeting about potential conflicts of interest in respect of ACAP advice. In order to avoid any uncertainty in this regard, it is recommended that in future versions of our BPA documents and papers presented to RFMO and other meetings, we include mention of our Conflict of Interest policy.</p> <p><b>Proposed Actions:</b></p> <p>Given the adoption in 2018 of the updated seabird CMM (CMM 2018-03), ACAP should help support efforts to facilitate the effective implementation of this measure, i.e. the proper use of the mitigation measures as well as efforts to measure the efficacy of these measures by CPCs and WCPFC/SPC.</p>
CCSBT	b)	Encourage and support further efforts to implement and improve mitigation measures used in SBT fisheries to reflect ACAP best practice advice, and continue to advocate for the adoption of a binding seabird CMM by the CCSBT	There have been no meetings of CCSBT's Ecologically Related Species Working Group (ERSWG) since SBWG8. The thirteenth meeting of the ERSWG is due to take place from 28-31 May 2019. ACAP will be represented at the meeting by its Executive Secretary, Christine Bogle. The deadline for the submission of documents for ERSWG13 is prior to SBWG9/AC11, and so it will not be possible to formally submit outputs of these latter meetings to the ERSWG13. However, ACAP will be submitting its current Best Practice Advice (agreed at SBWG9/AC10) for reducing seabird bycatch in pelagic longline fisheries and will hopefully have the opportunity to provide any further updates verbally at the meeting. The outcomes of the FAO Common Oceans Tuna project seabird

RFMO/Other organisation	No.	Actions agreed for 2017-2019	Review of progress, and further actions required
			<p>bycatch assessment project will be of critical importance for the ERSWG meeting. It is assumed that BirdLife International will lead on providing a document of the workshop outcomes for consideration by the ERSWG.</p> <p><b><u>Proposed Actions:</u></b></p> <p>Advocate the application of additional seabird bycatch mitigation measures for SBT fisheries in high risk areas.</p> <p>Investigate why the binding resolution adopted by CCSBT in 2018 states that a summary of information on mitigation use will be submitted to the Compliance Committee on an annual basis, but for information only.</p> <p>Encourage and support further efforts to implement and improve mitigation measures used in SBT fisheries to reflect ACAP best practice advice. In this respect, ACAP should present its current best practice advice on reducing seabird bycatch in pelagic longline fisheries, and work with its Parties that are members of CCSBT to address the outcomes and recommendations coming out of the relevant seabird bycatch and risk assessment initiatives currently underway. The multi-year seabird strategy mooted at ERSWG12 is a potential mechanism to reflect the priority actions that need to be progressed.</p>
<b>IATTC</b>	d)	Further work with ACAP Parties (Chile, Ecuador, France, Peru), other Members, specifically the US and the EU, and BirdLife International, on a new proposal to strengthen IATTC's seabird bycatch mitigation requirements for the next Commission meeting in 2019. Encourage the IATTC Commission to improve data	In 2018, ACAP attended the 8 <sup>th</sup> meeting of the Bycatch Working Group (BWG) and the 9 <sup>th</sup> meeting of the Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC). ACAP was the main speaker on seabirds, covering three elements: i) Presentation of the ACAP-Birdlife paper Update on the Conservation Status, Distribution and Priorities for Albatrosses and Petrels (SAC-09 INF XX); ii) Presentation of ACAP Best Practice mitigation advice (SAC-09-INF XX); and iii) A reminder of key data collection elements covered in previous advice from ACAP (SAC-08 INF D(d)). The presentation assessed the extent to which the IATTC seabird Resolution C-11-02 conforms with ACAP Best Practice advice. The BWG and SAC agreed to detailed

RFMO/Other organisation	No.	Actions agreed for 2017-2019	Review of progress, and further actions required
		<p>collection and reporting following the advice endorsed in the latest Scientific Advisory Committee Meeting (SAC7). Present PaCSWG4 Doc 03 highlighting the distribution of Antipodean Albatrosses and potential overlap with fisheries in the central and eastern Pacific (New Zealand will be presenting similar papers to WCPFC and SPRFMO).</p>	<p>recommendations to review each element of Resolution C-11-02 that does not comply with ACAP Best Practice Advice. One of the key hurdles in this respect is the quality and quantity of available data, due to low levels of observer coverage and the inconsistent manner in which the observer data has been reported and compiled, all of which hampers the ability to understand the true extent of seabird bycatch.</p> <p>The meetings were attended by a delegation from the Sustainable Fisheries Partnership. Discussions in the margins revealed a strong interest in their willingness to ensure Fisheries Improvement Plans for the fisheries they assess are addressing ACAP bycatch priorities (for example one plan is being developed for fisheries in Peru where a number of ACAP species are at risk of bycatch). ACAP's interest in better understanding the drivers and barriers of mitigation uptake and the identification of new interventions to achieve this was discussed.</p> <p><b><u>Proposed Actions:</u></b></p> <p>Unfortunately, the next meetings of IATTC's BWG and SAC take place at the same time as AC11. The current ACAP best practice advice for reducing seabird bycatch in pelagic longline fisheries was presented in 2018, and so there are no further updates to provide at this point. One of the items on the agenda for the 2019 meeting is safe release and handling, a subject which ACAP can contribute to by submitting its de-hooking guide.</p> <p>ACAP should continue to work intersessionally to engage with IATTC Members ahead of potential consideration of changes to Resolution C-11-02 in 2019 to identify any areas to help build consensus. High priority because it is the only tRFMO that still has the two column approach.</p> <p>ACAP should continue to engage with New Zealand on their global seabird bycatch risk assessment, with a view to supporting the presentation of a paper to</p>

RFMO/Other organisation	No.	Actions agreed for 2017-2019	Review of progress, and further actions required
			<p>the 2019 BWG and SAC to clearly outline the underlying need for improved seabird mitigation and improved data collection and reporting. This would provide underlying rationale for improvements to IATTC's current CMM.</p> <p>Subject to the outcomes of the IATTC BWG and SAC meetings in 2019, and the SBWG9/AC11 meetings, ACAP should prepare papers and presentations for the 2020 meetings of BWG and SAC to help CPCs understand the scientific basis for possible changes to mitigation options in Resolution C-11-02, as this has been raised by some IATTC CPCs as a requirement to justify any changes.</p> <p>ACAP, and in particular the SBWG, should consider how engagement with the Sustainable Fisheries Partnership may be used to facilitate mitigation uptake in fisheries posing bycatch risk to ACAP species.</p>
<p><b>All RFMOs &amp; CCAMLR</b></p>	<p>e)</p>	<p>Continue to work through the RFMO and CCAMLR mechanisms to strengthen the bycatch mitigation measures in place for each of them. In most cases, the current RFMO seabird conservation measures reflect (have been informed by) the previous (2011-2016). ACAP best practice advice. Ongoing efforts are required to encourage the RFMOs to update these measures to account for the recent (updates) in ACAP's advice. It is also important that ACAP continues to work through RFMO and CCAMLR mechanisms to encourage better</p>	<p>The updated (2017) ACAP best practice advice for mitigating seabird bycatch in pelagic longline fisheries was presented to all tuna RFMOs in 2018 (see detailed actions in themes 1 and 2 above). Although this advice has been formally supported by the scientific working groups of some of the other RFMOs (such as IOTC and ICCAT – see 1a and 1b above), none of the RFMOs have yet updated their seabird conservation and management measures to reflect this latest advice.</p> <p>The ongoing work to develop an ACAP reporting framework for bycatch indicators and guidelines for seabird bycatch estimation has been presented to most of the tuna RFMOs, and to the Common Oceans Tuna project workshop and continues to be of relevance to these processes.</p> <p><b><u>Proposed Actions:</u></b></p> <p>Continue to work through the RFMO and CCAMLR mechanisms to strengthen the bycatch mitigation measures in place for each of them. Ongoing efforts are required to encourage the RFMOs to update these measures to account for the</p>

RFMO/Other organisation	No.	Actions agreed for 2017-2019	Review of progress, and further actions required
		<p>implementation of the seabird conservation measures currently in place. Although there are elements that will be similar, engagement approaches should be RFMO- and CCAMLR-specific, and should be strategic (by, for example, making use of opportunities such as formal reviews of seabird conservation measures, and avoiding a 'tinkering' approach in which proposals to make small changes are frequently presented).</p>	<p>recent (updates) in ACAP's advice. It is also important that ACAP continues to work through RFMO and CCAMLR mechanisms to encourage better implementation of the seabird conservation measures currently in place. Although there are elements that will be similar, engagement approaches should be RFMO- and CCAMLR-specific, and should be strategic (by, for example, making use of opportunities such as formal reviews of seabird conservation measures, and avoiding a 'tinkering' approach in which proposals to make small changes are frequently presented).</p>
<p><b>CCAMLR</b></p>	<p>f)</p>	<p>Attendance of the CCAMLR Scientific Committee and Commission meetings to monitor the application of the seabird conservation measure and to strengthen it where necessary. Further work with CCAMLR Secretariat in monitoring the seabird bycatch events occurred during the last years, and the results of the one-season trial for the use of net-monitoring cable in the krill trawl fishery</p>	<p>In previous fishing seasons there were reports of bycatch events (few tens of White-chinned petrels) linked to issues experienced by few vessels during setting operations. Although it may be premature to confirm the reasons, such events could be linked to earlier starts/late finish of fishing seasons in recent years. This matter may require particular attention given the possibility of further fishing season extensions to be granted in areas of importance for ACAP species.</p> <p><b><u>Proposed Actions:</u></b></p> <p>Work with CCAMLR Secretariat to periodically monitor the occurrence and magnitude of seabird bycatch events reported in previous seasons largely dominated by White-chinned petrels although with isolated records of albatrosses caught.</p>

RFMO/Other organisation	No.	Actions agreed for 2017-2019	Review of progress, and further actions required
<p><b>Theme 3) Strengthen RFMO bycatch data collection and reporting requirements, and the inclusion of appropriate seabird bycatch mitigation elements within RFMO compliance monitoring. Focus ACAP inputs through the development of specific ACAP products (for example advice on seabird bycatch indicators, and seabird elements of electronic monitoring)</b></p>			
<p>All RFMOs &amp; CCAMLR</p>	<p>a)</p>	<p>Continue to develop and update specific ACAP products that serve to focus ACAP inputs and efforts to strengthen bycatch data collection requirements, and the inclusion of appropriate seabird bycatch mitigation elements within RFMO compliance monitoring. These products should include:</p> <p>ACAP review and best practice advice documents on seabird bycatch mitigation (ensuring updated versions are made available)</p> <p>Guidelines for seabird bycatch estimation.</p> <p>ACAP seabird bycatch ID guide (ensuring updated versions are made available).</p> <p>ACAP-BirdLife bycatch mitigation fact sheets</p>	<p>ACAP is still in the process of finalising some of these guidelines. However, in addition to the best practice bycatch mitigation advice presented at RFMO meetings, documents reporting on the ongoing work to develop an ACAP bycatch indicator and reporting framework and guidelines for seabird bycatch estimation have been presented, together with other tools, such as the ACAP seabird bycatch Identification Guide.</p> <p><b><u>Proposed Actions:</u></b></p> <p>Continue to develop and update specific ACAP products that serve to focus ACAP inputs and efforts to strengthen bycatch data collection requirements, and the inclusion of appropriate seabird bycatch mitigation elements within RFMO compliance monitoring. These products should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ACAP review and best practice advice documents on seabird bycatch mitigation (ensuring updated versions are made available).</li> </ul> <p>Consider including a short section in future ACAP seabird bycatch mitigation 'Best Practice Advice' documents outlining ACAP's Conflict of Interest policy (see 2a).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Best practice guidelines on data collection requirements for observer programmes - an update of SBWG4 Doc 26 Rev 1, and converting the document into a formal ACAP conservation guideline document, which should include guidelines for counting seabirds around vessels (see SBWG9 Doc 06).</li> <li>• ACAP-BirdLife Mitigation Fact Sheets.</li> </ul>

RFMO/Other organisation	No.	Actions agreed for 2017-2019	Review of progress, and further actions required
		ACAP best practice guidelines on data collection requirements for observer programmes (an update of SBWG4 Doc 26 Rev 1, and converting the document into a formal ACAP conservation guideline document, which should include guidelines for counting seabirds around vessels).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ACAP seabird bycatch identification guide (ensuring updated versions are made available).</li> <li>• ACAP de-hooking and safe release guidelines.</li> <li>• Guidelines for seabird bycatch estimation (informed by the outcomes of the seabird bycatch assessment initiatives that are currently underway).</li> <li>• Net entanglement safe release guidelines.</li> </ul>
All RFMOs & CCAMLR	b)	Investigate and encourage the use of additional data collection opportunities to understand the extent of use of mitigation measures, such as through port and transshipment inspection procedures.	<p>BirdLife International and BirdLife South Africa have piloted this approach within the IOTC. They undertook an assessment of two readily-available sources of data to indicate use of bird scaring lines (BSL) and night setting by vessels that transhipped tuna in the IOTC area. Images from transshipment observers were evaluated for presence and likely suitability of 'tori poles' to indicate whether a Best Practice BSL, or a line that could meet the performance specifications for aerial extent in IOTC Res 12/06, could be deployed. The pilot also evaluated likely use of night setting requirements based on logbook entries for setting times. Only vessels actively fishing in waters south of 25°S, the area in which IOTC Res 12/06 applies, were evaluated. The results of this investigation revealed very low levels of compliance overall, although with some differences amongst fleets – a few showing much higher levels of compliance. The pilot estimated that of 119 high seas vessels assessed, about a third had tori poles that could support an effective BSL. Of 117 vessels assessed for night setting, the data indicated that only 11% of vessels had consistent use of night setting. Despite the fact that it was not possible to determine use of line weighting in the study, the authors' most optimistic evaluation is that at best one third of high seas vessels fishing south of 25°S consistently use two seabird bycatch mitigation measures (the IOTC Seabird CMM requirement). The paper concluded that the pilot was successful and identified clear opportunities for RFMOs to use transshipment observers, including</p>

RFMO/Other organisation	No.	Actions agreed for 2017-2019	Review of progress, and further actions required
			<p>through photographs, to check compliance with conservation measures for seabird bycatch mitigation. There was some discussion at the IOTC WPEB meeting as to whether it was appropriate to consider a compliance related paper at the WPEB. However, it was pointed out that the degree of use (and non-use) of bycatch mitigation measures in high risk areas will influence the estimates of bycatch rates. If these rates remain unchanged, or even increase, following the formal adoption of these mitigation measures in an RFMO, the degree of use of these measures will clearly influence these results, and should be accounted for, or at least acknowledged (i.e. no or little change in the estimated bycatch rates following the formal adoption of seabird bycatch mitigation measures does not mean that those measures are not effective if the level of implementation of those measures remains low).</p> <p><b>Proposed Actions:</b></p> <p>Continue to investigate and encourage the use of additional data collection opportunities and innovations to understand the extent of use of mitigation measures, such as through port and transshipment inspection procedures.</p> <p>Consider how best to engage constructively on issues relating to compliance in respect of the use of seabird bycatch mitigation measures. This includes both compliance monitoring, and ways to help strengthen compliance. This is an issue in which ACAP has had limited involvement to date, but is clearly an area that requires urgent attention.</p>
<b>4.) Other actions</b>			
SIOFA	a)	Establish an MoU between ACAP and the Southern Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement (SIOFA) based on the standard template – from MoP6	<p>In 2018, An MoU was been signed between ACAP and SIOFA.</p> <p><b>Proposed Actions:</b></p> <p>The level of fishing activity in the SIOFA Agreement Area is relatively low compared</p>

RFMO/Other organisation	No.	Actions agreed for 2017-2019	Review of progress, and further actions required
			<p>with other RFMOs and areas, and so is not considered a high priority RFMO. However, given the recent signing of the MoU between SIOFA and ACAP, and that SIOFA is in the process of developing mechanisms for issues that concern seabird monitoring and seabird bycatch including requirements for scientific observer programmes, and the collection of information on seabird abundance, bycatch and the use of bycatch mitigation measures, it might be appropriate for ACAP to provide some formal inputs to SIOFA regarding seabird conservation and management measures. Following SBWG9/AC11, ACAP should consider submitting a series of updated ACAP advice and guideline documents that could be presented by one of the ACAP Parties present at the meeting or the SIOFA Secretariat.</p> <p>Work towards a binding seabird conservation measure that is informed by ACAP best practice and is aligned with measures in SPRFMO and other comparable bodies.</p>
SEAFO	b)	Establish an MoU between ACAP and the South East Atlantic Fisheries Organisation (SEAFO) based on the standard template – from MoP6	<p>In 2018, an MoU was signed between ACAP and SEAFO.</p> <p><b><u>Proposed Actions:</u></b></p> <p>Although the fishing effort within the SEAFO area of jurisdiction is currently very low (and so shouldn't be regarded as a high priority RFMO with which to engage), it could potentially increase in the future, and so it is important to ensure that the appropriate bycatch mitigation conservation measures are in place, being used, and reported on. Given the recent (2018) formalisation of the MoU between the two organisations, it will be useful to remain formally engaged. It is proposed that this takes the form of 'keeping a watching brief' and determining the value of attending specific meetings on a case by case basis. Generally, the Scientific Committee meetings are the ones that will be of interest to ACAP. Given the recent (2018) signing of the MoU, it would probably be worth attending the next (2019) Scientific Committee meeting, which will likely take place in November 2019, or alternatively submitting a series of updated ACAP advice and guideline documents that could be presented by one of the ACAP Parties present at the meeting or the SEAFO Secretariat.</p>