


| | |
|---|---|
|  <p>Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels</p> | <p>Thirteenth Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group</p> <p><i>Swakopmund, Namibia, 27 - 29 May 2026</i></p> <p>Seabird bycatch-related indicators</p> <p>SBWG Convenors</p> |
|---|---|

SUMMARY

This paper summarises progress in refining and implementing ACAP's seabird bycatch *Response* indicators, following persistent challenges in obtaining adequate bycatch data from Parties. Despite long-standing efforts to develop state–pressure–response indicators, most Parties continue to report limited or no estimates of total annual seabird mortality or bycatch rates. A workshop held prior to SBWG12 identified two major constraints: insufficient capacity within government agencies to complete ACAP reporting, and restricted access to fishery-level data held by other agencies. In response, AC14 endorsed a strategic shift toward prioritising simpler Response indicators focused on mitigation implementation.

Refinements to the three Response indicators are presented. **R1** (implementation within EEZs) now uses straightforward, gear-specific questions on which mitigation measures are *mandated* and which are *used*, distinguishing between full ACAP Best Practice Advice (BPA) implementation, partial BPA uptake, use of alternative mitigation, and cases with no mitigation. For artisanal and purse-seine fisheries, metrics draw on ACAP's mitigation toolboxes. **R2** (engagement with RFMCOs) has been simplified to measure the proportion of Parties actively supporting actions in the ACAP RFMCO Strategy. **R3** (research and development) now tracks mitigation options that have been systematically trialled and shown to reduce bycatch of ACAP species.

Reporting forms have been streamlined accordingly, with a focus on mitigation implementation and monitoring. Although database delays compressed the AC15 reporting window, this paper presents preliminary results on the data submitted by Parties so far.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That SBWG

1. Review the refined indicators and identify any further adjustments to the reporting format to allow the collection of robust data for ACAP's Response bycatch indicators.
2. Recommend that AC endorse the refined Seabird Bycatch Response indicators developed by SBWG.

3. Recommend the AC highlight to Parties and Range States the value and need to report on implementation of seabird bycatch mitigation measures in fisheries under their jurisdiction prior to AC16.
4. Recommend the AC highlight to Parties and Range States the value and need to report on actions identified in the ACAP RFMCO Strategy prior to AC16.

1. BACKGROUND

The seabird bycatch state-pressure-response indicators, agreed at MoP4 ([MoP4 Doc 23](#)), were developed to contribute to the assessment of the success of the Agreement. The ACAP Performance Indicators provide a means to demonstrate the effectiveness of measures to address seabird bycatch. There has been considerable effort in developing ACAP seabird bycatch indicators and a reporting framework on which these indicators are based ([SBWG4 Doc 25 Rev 3](#), [SBWG5 Doc 16](#), [SBWG6 Doc 09](#), [SBWG7 Doc 05](#), [SBWG8 Doc 05](#), [SBWG9 Doc 05 Rev1](#)). Whilst an increase in data reporting has been noted ([SBWG10 Doc 05](#)), and despite renewed efforts to identify challenges faced by Parties in reporting data to inform the current indicators and identifying a number of potential actions to address some of the challenges ([SBWG11 Doc 05](#)), the low level of reporting of seabird bycatch as total estimated mortality or rates per unit effort has prevented full implementation of the indicators.

A workshop was held prior to SBWG12 ([SBWG12 Doc 04](#)), in part to continue to find solutions to the challenges experienced in the reporting of ACAP seabird bycatch indicators. The workshop discussed the low response rate and noted two issues in particular that are likely to contribute to this outcome:

1. A lack of capacity within Government agencies to complete the reporting to ACAP when there are often other competing and higher priority tasks.
2. Access to the information and data at the fishery level because it is held by another Government agency.

The workshop also acknowledged that Parties, generally, have been unable to report bycatch data across all fisheries in a manner that would allow estimation of total annual seabird bycatch and even bycatch rates by fishery are rarely reported.

The workshop agreed that reporting of detailed bycatch data, when available, remains valuable and ACAP should continue to seek data on total effort within each fishery and any bycatch rates. However, reporting on the Response indicators should be ACAP's highest priority because:

- Data and reporting questions related to implementation are less complex.
- Data collection and reporting would require less effort.
- Information on mandatory mitigation measures and implementation may be available from publicly available sources.

AC14 adopted the recommendations made by SBWG12 and agreed to prioritise the collection of simple Response data on the implementation of seabird bycatch mitigation measures in domestic and RFMO fisheries ([AC14 Report](#)). AC14 also encouraged Parties to report detailed information on seabird bycatch where possible and, in particular, on seabird

bycatch rates and total fishing effort. An intersessional group was established ([AC14 Report Annex 7](#)) which included the following Terms of Reference:

- Review, and if necessary, refine the Response Indicators on implementation of seabird bycatch mitigation measures within EEZs.
- Review, and if necessary, refine the questions in the ACAP reporting form to ensure that: a) the correct type of data is collected to populate the Response Indicator on implementation of seabird bycatch mitigation measures; and b) the reporting format is as simple and streamline as possible for the data custodians of Parties and Range States to complete.
- Prepare a costed scope-of-work for an ACAP Project to support Parties and Range States to report against the simplified Response Indicators.

Here we report on progress made against these actions and review relevant reporting provided by Parties prior to AC15.

2. RESPONSE INDICATORS

2.1. Background

Response indicators measure the activities put in place to address the bycatch of ACAP species in fisheries. The response indicators previously developed were:

- R1 Implementation of seabird bycatch mitigation within EEZs.
- R2 Engagement with RFMOs on seabird bycatch issues.
 - Note:
 - A mechanism has yet to be developed to assess the degree of implementation of seabird conservation measures by tuna and other RFMOs.
 - The development and implementation of methods to review the effectiveness of seabird bycatch mitigation measures across tuna and other RFMOs is currently underway.
 - The adoption of recommendations, including changes to bycatch mitigation measures, that arise from these reviews has not yet commenced.
- R3 Research and development for effective seabird mitigation measures.
 - Note, the relevance of mitigation research reported to SBWG meetings is to be assessed as a measure for this indicator.

It was envisaged that these indicators would measure progress in implementation of improved mitigation measures across all fisheries where ACAP species are caught.

2.2. Refined Indicators

Whilst the three response indicators remain relevant, refinements were made to improve the ease of reporting against the indicators.

2.2.1 R1 Implementation of seabird bycatch mitigation within EEZs

This indicator was refined to allow for data collection through simple questions based on each Party's fisheries, even where no monitoring or compliance data are available to the respondent. This was achieved through questions on what mitigation is mandated (can be answered for any fishery) and what mitigation is in use (for fisheries where some level of monitoring or compliance data is available). The specific indicator metrics developed are as follows.

For fisheries where ACAP provides Best Practice Advice (BPA):

- i. Proportion of **longline fisheries** where ACAP BPA measures are **mandated to BPA specifications and in BPA combinations of mitigation options**
- ii. Proportion of **trawl and longline** fisheries where at least one ACAP BPA recommended mitigation option is **mandated to BPA specification**
- iii. Proportion of **trawl and longline** fisheries where at least one ACAP BPA recommended mitigation option is **mandated, but not to BPA specification**
- iv. Proportion of **trawl and longline** fisheries where at least one ACAP BPA recommended mitigation option is **used**
- v. Proportion of **trawl and longline** fisheries where at least one mitigation option is **used but it is not an ACAP BPA recommended measure**
- vi. Proportion of **trawl and longline** fisheries where no mitigation is mandated or used, **or use is unknown**

For artisanal and purse seine fisheries (where ACAP provides mitigation toolboxes):

- i. Proportion of fisheries where at least one ACAP Toolbox mitigation, classed as systematically trialled and demonstrated to reduce bycatch of ACAP species, is **mandated**
- ii. Proportion of fisheries where at least one ACAP Toolbox mitigation, classed as systematically trialled and demonstrated to reduce bycatch of ACAP species, is **used**
- iii. Proportion of fisheries where at least one ACAP Toolbox mitigation, classed as systematically trialled and demonstrated to reduce seabird bycatch or in need of systematic evaluation, is **mandated**
- iv. Proportion of fisheries where at least one ACAP Toolbox mitigation, classed as systematically trialled and demonstrated to reduce seabird bycatch or in need of systematic evaluation, is **used**
- v. Proportion of fisheries where at least one mitigation option described in the ACAP Toolbox other than systematically trialled and demonstrated to reduce seabird bycatch or in need of systematic evaluation is **mandated**
- vi. Proportion of fisheries where at least one mitigation option described in the ACAP Toolbox other than systematically trialled and demonstrated to reduce seabird bycatch or in need of systematic evaluation is **used**

- vii. Proportion of fisheries where, in the absence of any mitigation options described in the ACAP Toolbox, **other mitigation is mandated or used**
- viii. Proportion of fisheries where **no mitigation** is mandated or used, **or use unknown**

For fisheries where ACAP does not provide mitigation advice:

- i. Proportion of fisheries where at least one mitigation measure is **mandated**
- ii. Proportion of fisheries where at least one mitigation measure is **used**

2.2.2 R2 Engagement with RFMCOs on seabird bycatch issues

To simplify this indicator, focus on ACAP Party engagement, and align with priority actions, the following reporting metric was developed for each RFMCO identified in the prioritisation process:

- i. Proportion of Parties actively supporting actions identified in the ACAP RFMCO Strategy.

2.2.3 R3 Research and development for effective seabird mitigation measures

This indicator was simplified to align with the process already used by the SBWG to assess BPA mitigation options and toolkit mitigation options classed as systematically trialled and reduced bycatch of ACAP species. A reporting metric that reflects ongoing innovation and testing of effective mitigation was developed as:

- i. Number of mitigation options classed as a component of BPA (for longline and trawl) or systematically trialled and reduced bycatch of ACAP species.

3. DATA REPORTING

Following SBWG12, to facilitate the collection of data to populate the Response Indicator on Implementation of Seabird Bycatch Mitigation Measures, the fishery reporting forms in the ACAP database were simplified to focus data entry on mitigation measures specific to each gear type. ANNEX 1 illustrates the forms provided for each gear type. For gears not covered by ACAP BPA or a toolbox approach, a text box was provided to capture mitigation measures in place and their mandated status with a view to translate the information provided into a structured options form in future iterations of the form. Information on how mitigation effectiveness and compliance is monitored continued to be sought, together with data on the level of bycatch in the fishery as per previous years' reporting.

For new strata (defined by year, season, area, vessel), the option to report the taxonomic makeup of the bycatch was removed given the very limited uptake of this option in past reporting.

4. RESULTS AND NEXT STEPS

The database currently contains a total of 124 active fisheries, identified by 12 Parties and two Range States. Technical issues delayed the launch of the reporting period for AC15, resulting in a considerably compressed reporting window. Consequently, results relating to Indicator R1 and R2 were not yet available at the time of writing. [To be updated]

Table 1. R1 Implementation of seabird bycatch mitigation within EEZs

| | Metric | Proportion of Fisheries |
|---------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| ACAP BPA | <i>Longline fisheries where ACAP BPA measures are mandated to BPA specifications and in BPA combinations of mitigation options</i> | TBC |
| | <i>Trawl and longline fisheries where at least one ACAP BPA mitigation option is mandated to BPA specification</i> | TBC |
| | <i>Trawl and longline fisheries where at least one ACAP BPA recommended mitigation option is mandated, but not to BPA specification</i> | TBC |
| | <i>Trawl and longline fisheries where at least one ACAP BPA recommended mitigation option is used</i> | TBC |
| | <i>Trawl and longline fisheries where at least one mitigation option is used but it is not an ACAP BPA recommended measure</i> | TBC |
| | <i>Trawl and longline fisheries where no mitigation is mandated or used, or use is unknown.</i> | TBC |
| ACAP mitigation toolboxes | <i>fisheries where at least one ACAP Toolbox mitigation, classed as systematically trialled and demonstrated to reduce bycatch of ACAP species, is mandated</i> | TBC |
| | <i>fisheries where at least one ACAP Toolbox mitigation, classed as systematically trialled and demonstrated to reduce bycatch of ACAP species, is used</i> | TBC |
| | <i>fisheries where at least one ACAP Toolbox mitigation, classed as systematically trialled and demonstrated to reduce seabird bycatch or in need of systematic evaluation, is mandated</i> | TBC |
| | <i>fisheries where at least one ACAP Toolbox mitigation, classed as systematically trialled and demonstrated to reduce seabird bycatch or in need of systematic evaluation, is used</i> | TBC |
| | <i>fisheries where at least one mitigation option described in the ACAP Toolbox other than systematically trialled and demonstrated to reduce seabird bycatch or in need of systematic evaluation is mandated</i> | TBC |
| | <i>fisheries where at least one mitigation option described in the ACAP Toolbox other than systematically trialled and demonstrated to reduce seabird bycatch or in need of systematic evaluation is used</i> | TBC |
| | <i>fisheries where, in the absence of any mitigation options described in the ACAP Toolbox, other mitigation is mandated or used</i> | TBC |
| | <i>fisheries where no mitigation is mandated or used or use is unknown</i> | TBC |
| No advice | <i>fisheries where at least one mitigation measure is mandated.</i> | TBC |
| | <i>fisheries where at least one mitigation measure is used</i> | TBC |

Table 2. R2 Engagement with RFMCOs on seabird bycatch issues

| Metric | Proportion of Parties |
|--|-----------------------|
| <i>Parties actively supporting actions identified in the ACAP RFMCO Strategy</i> | TBC |

Table 3. R3 Research and development for effective seabird mitigation measures

| Metric | Number of mitigation options |
|---|------------------------------|
| <i>Number of mitigation options classed as a component of BPA (for longline and trawl) or systematically trialled and demonstrated to reduce bycatch of ACAP species.</i> | 23 |

Pending any adjustments to the reporting forms based on feedback from SBWG13, Parties are encouraged to schedule the collation of their data on implementation of seabird bycatch mitigation measures within their EEZs and on actions identified in the ACAP RFMCO Strategy well in advance of AC16 (August 2027).

ANNEX 1. MITIGATION OPTIONS FORMS

Pelagic Longline form

Fisheries: SE nemo longline - back to [edit fishery](#) or [Add records for new Stratum table](#)

Fishery Strata - Adding new strata

Please provide information on this stratum below by season, area and vessel as appropriate. Default is "All seasons", "All areas" and "All vessels". You can chose several mitigation measures that are mandated (click in the empty part of box, click on the measure and repeat). If your measure is not on the list, please email secretariat@acap.aq and ask for it to be added to the list of mitigation measures.

Please remember to save your data regularly and before navigating away from the form/ page.

Year: Season: Area: Vessel:

Mitigation measures (select all that apply, including those in use but not mandated). For **squid jig, pots/traps, purse seines, boat seines, gillnet and entangling nets, and bait boats fishing for tuna** - if measure is not listed here, please list in "Any other comments" text box below and note if mandated or not. -

Measure type

| Weighting | Measure mandated? | Mandated as per ACAP Best Practice? | Measure in use? | Other measures | Measure mandated? | Mandated as per ACAP Best Practice? | Measure in use? |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Branchline weighting | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Area and seasonal closures | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Night Setting | | Measure mandated? | Mandated as per ACAP Best Practice? | Hook-shielding devices | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Night setting | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Underwater Bait Setting devices | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Bird scaring lines | Measure mandated? | Mandated as per ACAP Best Practice? | Measure in use? | Line-setter/shooter | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Bird scaring lines | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Underwater setting funnel/chute | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | | Side-setting with line weighting and bird curtain | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | | Strategic management of offal discharge - Longlines | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | | Bait caster | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | | Blue-dyed bait | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | | Thawing bait | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | | Lasers | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Is it **mandated** that line weighting, night setting and Bird Scaring Lines have to be **used simultaneously, in combination**?

- All 3 must be used simultaneously
 Not applicable (none of the 3 are mandated)
 Not applicable (only 1 of the 3 is mandated)

2 of the 3 measures must be used simultaneously (choose one)

- Night setting and BSLs
 Night setting and line weighting
 BSLs and line weighting
 Can choose any 2 of the 3 measures

% of effort using mitigation in accordance with ACAP Best Practice

% of effort using mitigation not in accordance with ACAP Best Practice

% of effort not using mitigation

% of effort with no information on mitigation use (e.g. if no monitoring)

Any other comments

Is the **effectiveness** of the mitigation measures monitored? If YES, how is it monitored?

- Yes No Not answered

Is **compliance** with mitigation measures monitored? If YES, how is it monitored?

- Yes No Not answered

Demersal Longline form

Fisheries: Southern Nemo Fishery - back to [edit fishery](#) or [Add records for new Stratum table](#)

Fishery Strata - Adding new strata

Please provide information on this stratum below by season, area and vessel as appropriate. Default is "All seasons", "All areas" and "All vessels". You can chose several mitigation measures that are mandated (click in the empty part of box, click on the measure and repeat). If your measure is not on the list, please email secretariat@acap.aq and ask for it to be added to the list of mitigation measures.

Please remember to save your data regularly and before navigating away from the form/ page.

Year: Season: Area: Vessel:

Mitigation measures (select all that apply, including those in use but not mandated). For **squid jig, pots/traps, purse seines, boat seines, gillnet and entangling nets, and bait boats fishing for tuna** - if measure is not listed here, please list in "Any other comments" text box below and note if mandated or not. -

Measure type

| Weighting | Measure mandated? | Mandated as per ACAP Best Practice? | Measure in use? | Other measures | Measure mandated? | Mandated as per ACAP Best Practice? | Measure in use? |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Externally weighted lines: a) Spanish system | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Area and seasonal closures | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Externally weighted lines: b) Chilean method (trot line with nets) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Haul bird exclusion devices | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Externally weighted lines: c) Autoline | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Line-setter/shooter | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Integrated weighting of lines | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Underwater setting funnel/chute | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | | Side-setting | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | | Strategic management of offal discharge - Longlines | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Night Setting | | | | Hook size and shape | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Night setting | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Mitigation measures to improve sink rates of baited hooks on floated longlines | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | | Blue-dyed bait | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Bird scaring lines | | | | Thawing bait | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Paired or multiple bird scaring lines | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Acoustic deterrents | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Single bird scaring line | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Olfactory deterrents | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | | Lasers | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Is it **mandated** that line weighting, night setting and Bird Scaring Lines have to be **used simultaneously, in combination**?

- All 3 must be used simultaneously
 Not applicable (none of the 3 are mandated)
 Not applicable (only 1 of the 3 is mandated)

2 of the 3 measures must be used simultaneously (choose one)

- Night setting and BSLs
 Night setting and line weighting
 BSLs and line weighting
 Can choose any 2 of the 3 measures

% of effort using mitigation in accordance with ACAP Best Practice

% of effort using mitigation not in accordance with ACAP Best Practice

% of effort not using mitigation

% of effort with no information on mitigation use (e.g. if no monitoring)

Any other comments

Is the **effectiveness** of the mitigation measures monitored? If YES, how is it monitored?

- Yes No Not answered

Is **compliance** with mitigation measures monitored? If YES, how is it monitored?

- Yes No Not answered

Trawl form

Mitigation measures (select all that apply, including those in use but not mandated). For **squid jig, pots/traps, purse seines, boat seines, gillnet and entangling nets, and bait boats fishing for tuna** - if measure is not listed here, please list in "Any other comments" text box below and note if mandated or not. -

Measure type

| Weighting | Measure mandated? | Mandated as per ACAP Best Practice? | Measure in use? | Other measures | Measure mandated? | Mandated as per ACAP Best Practice? | Measure in use? |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Net weighting | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Area and seasonal closures | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Night Setting | Measure mandated? | Mandated as per ACAP Best Practice? | Measure in use? | Offal discharge and fish discard management - Full retention | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Bird scaring lines | Measure mandated? | Mandated as per ACAP Best Practice? | Measure in use? | Offal discharge and fish discard management - Mealing | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Bird Scaring Lines (BSL) to reduce interaction with warp cables | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Offal discharge and fish discard management - Batching | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | | Offal discharge and fish discard management - Mincing | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | | Net binding | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | | Net cleaning | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | | Snatch block | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | | Bird bafflers | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | | Cones on warp cables | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | | Net jackets | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | | Net restrictor | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | | Reduced net mesh size | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | | Warp boom | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | | Warp deflectors | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | | Warp scarers | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | | Minimise pooling area | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | | Acoustic deterrents | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | | Lasers | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> |

% of effort using mitigation in accordance with ACAP Best Practice

% of effort using mitigation not in accordance with ACAP Best Practice

% of effort not using mitigation

% of effort with no information on mitigation use (e.g. if no monitoring)

Any other comments

Is the **effectiveness** of the mitigation measures monitored? If YES, how is it monitored?

Yes No Not answered

Is **compliance** with mitigation measures monitored? If YES, how is it monitored?

Yes No Not answered

Purse seine form

Fisheries: Nemo purse seine - back to [edit fishery](#) or [Add records for new Stratum table](#)

Fishery Strata

Please provide information on this stratum below by season, area and vessel as appropriate. Default is "All seasons", "All areas" and "All vessels". You can chose several mitigation measures that are mandated (click in the empty part of box, click on the measure and repeat). If your measure is not on the list, please email secretariat@acap.aq and ask for it to be added to the list of mitigation measures. **Please remember to save your data regularly and before navigating away from the form/ page.**

Year: Season: Area: Vessel:

Mitigation measures (select all that apply, including those in use but not mandated). For **squid jig, pots/traps, purse seines, boat seines, gillnet and entangling nets, and bait boats fishing for tuna** - if measure is not listed here, please list in "Any other comments" text box below and note if mandated or not. -

Measure type

| Weighting | Measure mandated? | Mandated as per ACAP Best Practice? | Measure in use? | Other measures | Measure mandated? | Mandated as per ACAP Best Practice? | Measure in use? |
|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Night Setting | Measure mandated? | Mandated as per ACAP Best Practice? | Measure in use? | Modified purse seine (MPS) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | | Water spraying | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Bird scaring lines | Measure mandated? | Mandated as per ACAP Best Practice? | Measure in use? | Bird scaring device (Scaring kite) | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

% of effort using mitigation in accordance with ACAP Best Practice

% of effort using mitigation not in accordance with ACAP Best Practice

% of effort not using mitigation

% of effort with no information on mitigation use (e.g. if no monitoring)

Any other comments

Is the **effectiveness** of the mitigation measures monitored? If YES, how is it monitored?

Yes No Not answered

Is **compliance** with mitigation measures monitored? If YES, how is it monitored?

Yes No Not answered

Other gears

Please provide information on this stratum below by season, area and vessel as appropriate. Default is "All seasons", "All areas" and "All vessels". You can chose several mitigation measures that are mandated (click in the empty part of box, click on the measure and repeat). If your measure is not on the list, please email secretariat@acap.aq and ask for it to be added to the list of mitigation measures.

Please remember to save your data regularly and before navigating away from the form/ page.

Year: Season: Area: Vessel:

Mitigation measures (select all that apply, including those in use but not mandated). For **squid jig, pots/traps, purse seines, boat seines, gillnet and entangling nets, and bait boats fishing for tuna** - if measure is not listed here, please list in "Any other comments" text box below and note if mandated or not. -

Measure type

| Weighting | Measure mandated? | Mandated as per ACAP Best Practice? | Measure in use? | Other measures | Measure mandated? | Mandated as per ACAP Best Practice? | Measure in use? |
|---------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Night Setting | Measure mandated? | Mandated as per ACAP Best Practice? | Measure in use? | | | | |
| Bird scaring lines | Measure mandated? | Mandated as per ACAP Best Practice? | Measure in use? | | | | |

% of effort using mitigation in accordance with ACAP Best Practice

% of effort using mitigation not in accordance with ACAP Best Practice

% of effort not using mitigation

% of effort with no information on mitigation use (e.g. if no monitoring)

Any other comments

Is the **effectiveness** of the mitigation measures monitored? If YES, how is it monitored?

Yes No Not answered

Is **compliance** with mitigation measures monitored? If YES, how is it monitored?

Yes No Not answered