

 <p>Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels</p>	<p><b>Eighth Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group</b></p> <p><i>Wellington, New Zealand, 4 – 6 September 2017</i></p> <p><b>Review of ACAP RFMO Engagement Strategy</b></p> <p><b><i>Anton Wolfaardt, Marco Favero, Igor Debski</i></b></p>
---	---

### **SUMMARY**

At SBWG7 the Working Group reviewed progress against the framework for ACAP's engagement strategy with RFMOs and CCAMLR (SBWG7 Doc15 Rev 1), and on the basis of the review agreed a list of prioritised areas of engagement for the 2016-2017 intersessional period. Progress achieved since SBWG7 is presented in Table 1, together with an updated list of actions for the forthcoming period (2017-2019), for discussion and endorsement by the SBWG and subsequent adoption by the Advisory Committee.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. The SBWG is requested to review and endorse the revised list of actions presented in Table 1 of this document to be progressed through the ACAP RFMO engagement strategy; and
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 GdTCS7, 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 (GdTCS7 Doc 15 Rev 1) y, basándose en este examen, acordó una lista de áreas prioritarias de participación para el periodo intersesional comprendido entre 2016 y 2017. Los avances logrados desde la GdTCS7 se presentan en la Tabla 1, junto con una lista actualizada de acciones por realizar en el siguiente periodo (2017-2019), para su análisis y aprobación por el GdTCS y su posterior adopción por parte del Comité Asesor.

### **RECOMENDACIONES**

1. Se solicita al GdTCS examinar y refrendar la lista revisada de acciones que se presenta en la Tabla 1 de este documento para su avance a través de la estrategia de participación del ACAP con las OROP; y
2. solicitar al Comité Asesor que apoye 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 GTCA7, 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 (GTCA7 Doc15 Rév1), et sur la base de l'examen a approuvé une liste de domaines d'engagement prioritaires pour la période intersessions 2016-2017. Les progrès réalisés depuis le GTCA7 sont présentés dans le tableau 1, ainsi qu'une liste actualisée des actions pour la période à venir (2017-2019), pour examen et approbation par le GTCA et l'adoption ultérieure par le Comité consultatif.

### **RECOMMANDATIONS**

1. Le GTCA est invité à examiner et approuver la liste révisée des actions présentées dans le tableau 1 du présent document à mettre en œuvre par le biais de la stratégie d'engagement de l'ORGP de l'ACAP; et
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. ACAP RFMO ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY – REVIEW OF PROGRESS TO DATE AND ACTIONS PROPOSED FOR FURTHER ENGAGEMENT**

Large numbers of ACAP-listed species are incidentally caught by fisheries managed by Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (RFMOs). Consequently, engagement with RFMOs is 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 May 2016, at SBWG7, at which progress against the actions listed for the 2013-2016 period ([SBWG7 Doc 15](#)) were reviewed. The Working Group also considered a number of other RFMO-related papers at SBWG7, and on the basis of these documents and discussions thereof, agreed a list of prioritised areas of engagement and activities for the 2016-2017 intersessional period.

The strategy revised and endorsed by SBWG7 and AC9 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 5 of the SBWG7 report, and are presented in **Table 1** to help facilitate the review process at SBWG8. Table 1 includes a review of progress achieved against the priority actions agreed at SBWG7 and AC9, and a list of proposed actions for the forthcoming (2017-2019) period. 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 adoption.

**Table 1:** Review of ACAP RFMO Engagement Strategy, and proposed actions for 2017-2019

RFMO/Other organisation	No.	Actions agreed for 2016-2017	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>			
<b>IOTC</b>	a)	Actively participate in and help facilitate the review of Resolution 12/06, which will formally take place at the Twelfth meeting of the Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch (WPEB12), in September 2016.	<p>In order to help facilitate the review of Res 12/06, ACAP presented its latest (2016) advice for mitigating seabird bycatch in pelagic longline fisheries at WPEB12). The presentation highlighted the specific updates to the advice, notably the changes to the line weighting specifications, and the addition of the two hook-shielding devices as best practice measures. This advice was endorsed, both by WPEB12 and the subsequent meeting of IOTC’s Scientific Committee (SC19), which recommended that the latest ACAP advice be used to update Res 12/06, when it is next updated. It’s useful to note that some IOTC WPEB and SC members expressed concern about the possible pollution consequences associated with the discarded shields of the Smart Tuna Hooks, and requested that further information be made available. Although there were some discussion amongst IOTC CPCs to prepare a proposal to update Res 12/06 at the 2017 Commission meeting, such a proposal was not forthcoming, as the key CPCs wanted more time to engage with their national departments before submitting a proposal.</p> <p><b><u>Proposed Actions:</u></b>                      Continue to work with IOTC, ACAP Party CPCs, and BirdLife 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>

RFMO/Other organisation	No.	Actions agreed for 2016-2017	Review of progress, and further actions required
<b>ICCAT</b>	b)	Actively participate in and help facilitate the review of Recommendation 11-09, which will formally take place at the 2016 intersessional meeting of the Sub-committee on Ecosystems (SC-ECO) in September 2016. ACAP should also help facilitate the provision of the necessary data to this process by working with ACAP Parties that are members of ICCAT and others in advance of the SC-ECO meeting to prepare for the review. ACAP is also working to help support BirdLife International update the analysis of seabird distribution/tracking data within the ICCAT area and overlap with ICCAT fishing effort, which will serve as an important contribution to the review of Rec 11-09.	<p>The updated (2016) ACAP BPA for pelagic longline fisheries was presented to ICCAT's SC-ECO meeting in September 2016. The line-weighting specification updates were endorsed by the SC-ECO, but not the addition of the two hook-shielding devices. Due to the novel nature of the hook-shielding devices, and the fact that the source papers which ACAP used to undertake their assessment were not yet publicly available, the SC-ECO were inclined to hold off on supporting these measures until the peer-reviewed publications are publicly available. Due to the lack of data submissions by CPCs at both the 2016 and 2017 SC-ECO meetings, the review of Rec 11-09 is still outstanding. The seabird bycatch assessment component of the Common Oceans Tuna Project (see below), together with a process being undertaken by ICCAT CPC scientists to assess seabird bycatch, are intended to help support a review of Rec 11-09 (and in the case of the Common Oceans Tuna Project, other RFMO seabird conservation measures).</p> <p><b><u>Proposed Actions:</u></b></p> <p>Continue to work with ICCAT, ACAP Party CPCs, and BirdLife 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 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>
<b>WCPFC</b>	c)	Actively participate in the WCPFC Technical and Compliance Committee (TCC) seabird compliance review in 2016. Encourage the WCPFC SC to develop a methodology to review the effectiveness of CMM 2012-07, taking into account the	Limited implementation of the regulation for 5% longline observer coverage and low level of seabird interactions in reports raised at TCC12, which were linked to existence of data acquisition and reporting issues. Ongoing difficulties in reviewing measures to mitigate interactions between seabirds and fisheries were linked to challenges to obtain reliable and quantifiable information on low-frequency events. It was noted that e-monitoring may mitigate this requirement in future. It was noted that better observer data on seabird interactions will reduce the scientific uncertainty, a consequence of which is that management measures are precautionary

RFMO/Other organisation	No.	Actions agreed for 2016-2017	Review of progress, and further actions required
		similar initiatives already underway in ICCAT and IOTC	<p>The Twelve meeting of the Scientific Committee endorsed the addition of a new task in the SC 2017 Work Programme for the next triennium to estimate the seabird mortality across the WCPO Convention area (Project 68)</p> <p><b>Proposed Actions:</b>                      It is recommended that ACAP continues 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 current CMM is assessed.</p>
<b>Joint tuna RFMO review/Initiatives applicable to multiple RFMOs</b>	d)	Support the development of a seabird risk assessment being developed by New Zealand	<p>New Zealand presented a draft risk assessment at CCSBT ERSWG12. This group supported further development of the risk assessment which aimed to identify tuna RFMOs and fishing areas posing highest risk to ACAP species. New Zealand also presented an update paper to WCPFC SC13.</p> <p><b>Proposed Actions:</b>                      ACAP to continue to provide support to New Zealand to further the development of the risk assessment and its presentation to relevant RFMOs.</p>
<b>FAO Common Oceans Tuna Project</b>	e)	It is recommended that ACAP supports and helps facilitate the seabird component of the FAO Common Oceans Tuna project. This should be done through the development and provision of relevant ACAP advice and guidelines, and by helping facilitate the active engagement of ACAP Parties in the Common Oceans Tuna project. It is also important to help facilitate efficient linkages between the Common Oceans Tuna project and work planned by individual	<p>Two regional pre-assessment workshops were held in 2017 to initiate the collaborative process to work towards a global assessment of seabird bycatch in tuna RFMOs in the southern hemisphere. The workshops were attended by national scientists from the key CPCs, RFMO representatives, and other relevant organisations, including ACAP. A summary report of the workshops is presented in Annex 1 of SBWG8 Inf03. A workplan for the remainder of the project has been developed, which includes intersessional work by CPC scientists to compile data sets and conduct preliminary analyses, a collaborative data preparation workshop (scheduled for February 2018), the further development of analytical options for assessing seabird bycatch, culminating in an assessment workshop to finalise the assessment of seabird bycatch in tuna RFMOs.</p> <p>To facilitate a discussion regarding recommended data collection requirements or RFMOs the 2011 ACAP paper <i>Data collection requirements for RFMOs to improve knowledge of fishery impacts on ACAP-listed species</i> (SBWG4 Doc 26 Rev 1) was</p>

RFMO/Other organisation	No.	Actions agreed for 2016-2017	Review of progress, and further actions required
		RFMOs to review the efficacy of seabird conservation measures	<p>presented and discussed. At both the South African and Vietnam workshops, the list of the minimum data fields in the ACAP guideline document was considered. It was agreed that most of these should be retained as minimum requirements, but that a couple were perhaps redundant or unnecessary. In addition, there were a couple of data fields added that were considered useful as proxy information (such as vessel length/size), which could be used to estimate bycatch for unobserved fleets/strata. See Annex 1 for details of the changes.</p> <p><b>Proposed Actions:</b></p> <p>It is recommended that ACAP continue to engage in the FAO Common Oceans Tuna project work, to help support and facilitate the objectives of the initiative. 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 project. ACAP should also help encourage and facilitate efficient linkages between the project work and similar or related work being undertaken simultaneously to review the efficacy of seabird conservation measures in tuna RFMOs.</p> <p>It is recommended that ACAP review the minimum data fields defined in <a href="#">SBWG4 Doc 26 Rev 1</a> (<i>Data collection requirements for RFMOs to improve knowledge of fishery impacts on ACAP-listed species</i>) in relation to the proposed changes recommended at the Common Oceans Tuna Project workshops (see Annex 1), and revise the document as a whole, with the intention of converting it into a formal conservation guideline document.</p>

RFMO/Other organisation	No.	Actions agreed for 2016-2017	Review of progress, and further actions required
<b>Theme 2) Strengthen the seabird bycatch mitigation measures adopted by RFMOs</b>			
<b>WCPFC</b>	<p>a)</p> <p>b)</p>	<p>Seek amendment of CMM 2012-07 so that the north Pacific fishery follows the two out of three approach or alternative measures within the revised ACAP best practice advice for pelagic longline fisheries. Engage in the process to review the design and performance specifications of the bird-scaring lines on vessels &lt;24m, which must be reviewed within three years of the date of implementation of CMM2015-03</p> <p>Continue to advocate for the southern boundary of CMM 2015-03 to be moved from 30S to 25S. Liaise with relevant Commission Members to seek inclusion of their EEZs within the scope of the revised CMM</p>	<p>Latest ACAP BPA adopted at AC9 presented to SC12. However, there wasn't any proposal for the actual update of mitigation measures in current CMM 2012-07 (and CMM 2015-03 coming into effect on 1 January 2017). New Zealand presented information on seabird distribution in the West Pacific indicating that seabird bycatch may be occurring north to the current southern boundary of the CMM, and seeking movement of the boundary of the CMM north of 30°S. The review of this boundary still under discussion. Further work and in the margin discussions with Delegates were held regarding the package of mitigation measures considered for the North Pacific. Also discussions took place regarding the effectiveness of different designs of bird scaring lines (BSL). The importance of line weighting to shrink the area to be defended by BSL was highlighted.</p> <p><b><u>Proposed Actions:</u></b> Continue to advocate for the southern boundary of CMM 2015-03 to be moved north of 30°S. 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. Engage in the process to review investigate different BSL designs and further highlight the relevance of using line weighting as combined measure.</p>
<b>CCSBT</b>	c)	Continue to advocate for the adoption of a binding seabird CMM by the CCSBT	<p>Seabird bycatch discussion at CCSBT ERSWG12 focussed on mitigation developments, bycatch estimation and risk assessment. It was agreed Australia would lead the development of a multi-year seabird strategy.</p> <p><b><u>Proposed Actions:</u></b> Encourage consistent and detailed reporting of bycatch based on representative observer coverage. Encourage and support further efforts to implement and improve mitigations measures used in SBT fisheries to reflect ACAP BP advice, and continue to advocate for the adoption of a binding seabird CMM by the CCSBT.</p>

RFMO/Other organisation	No.	Actions agreed for 2016-2017	Review of progress, and further actions required
<b>IATTC</b>	d)	Continue to work with ACAP Parties and the US for the submission of a new proposal for the next Commission meeting in June 2016	<p>Further discussions were held with a range of Parties, and in particular the US, prior and during the 2016 Commission meeting regarding the review of the seabird CM (IATTC Resolution C-11-02). However, there was no measure tabled during the meeting.</p> <p>In 2017, ACAP attended the 7<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Bycatch Working Group and the 8<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Scientific Advisory Committee. A range of matters were raised during those meetings including data collection and reporting issues, conservation status of ACAP species and the need for revising the current seabird resolution following the ACAP BPA. Good synergy and outcomes were achieved by addressing data collection and reporting issues in a coordinated fashion with the Secretariat of the Inter-American Turtle Convention.</p> <p><b><u>Proposed Actions:</u></b>            Further work with ACAP Parties, BirdLife and the US for the submission of a new proposal for the next Commission meeting in 2018.            Encourage the IATTC Commission to improve data collection and reporting following the advice endorsed in the latest Scientific Advisory Committee Meeting (SAC7)</p>
<b>All RFMOs</b>	e)	Following SBWG7, ACAP should present its updated best-practice advice on mitigation measures for pelagic longline fisheries, as well as the outcome of work and discussions on bycatch indicators and methodological guidelines for estimating bycatch.	<p>The updated (2016) ACAP best practice advice for mitigating seabird bycatch in pelagic longline fisheries was presented to all tuna RFMOs in 2016 (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 (1e), and continues to be of relevance to these processes.</p> <p><b><u>Proposed Actions:</u></b>            Continue to work through the RFMO 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)</p>

RFMO/Other organisation	No.	Actions agreed for 2016-2017	Review of progress, and further actions required
			<p>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 mechanisms to encourage better implementation of the seabird conservation measures currently in place.</p> <p>Although there are elements that will be similar, engagement approaches should be RFMO-specific, and should be strategic (by, for example, making use of opportunities such as formal RFMO 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 at the CCAMLR Scientific Committee and Commission meetings is recommended to monitor the application of its seabird conservation measure and to strengthen it where necessary</p>	<p>Isolated bycatch event reported to the SC meeting. ACAP Secretariat offered technical advice and CCAMLR Secretariat agreed in providing information on the recent records of bycatch events that could be of relevance for ACAP SBWG.</p> <p>The Commission endorsed the recommendation of the SC to grant an exemption (one-season trial) for the use of net-sonde cable on any krill trawl vessel. The requirements included (i) 100% observer coverage, (ii) use of a camera monitoring system, (iii) mandatory use of two BSL, (iv) IMAF standard observations on the net monitoring cable twice daily, (v) 'snatch block' should be set so the net monitoring cable enters the water is less than 2 m, (vi) a cap limit of three heavy strikes. Commission recommended that outcomes of the trials be provided to ACAP to be discussed in the refinement of best practice advice.</p> <p><b><u>Proposed Actions:</u></b>                      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>

RFMO/Other organisation	No.	Actions agreed for 2016-2017	Review of progress, and further actions required
<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>			
<b>All RFMOs</b>	a)		<p>ACAP is still in the process of finalising these various 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>            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.</p> <p>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> <li>• Guidelines for seabird bycatch estimation</li> <li>• ACAP seabird bycatch ID guide (ensuring updated versions are made available).</li> <li>• ACAP-BirdLife bycatch mitigation fact sheets</li> <li>• ACAP best practice guidelines on data collection requirements for RFMOs (an update of <a href="#">SBWG4 Doc 26 Rev 1</a>, and converting the document into a formal ACAP conservation guideline document). See actions 1e and 4d.</li> <li>• Guidelines for counting seabirds around vessels (still to be fully developed – see action 4d)</li> </ul>

RFMO/Other organisation	No.	Actions agreed for 2016-2017	Review of progress, and further actions required
<b>Theme 4) Other actions</b>			
<b>SPRFMO</b>	a)		<p>In 2017, ACAP provided inputs to an intersessional SPRFMO process to develop guidelines for annual reporting CPCs to the SPRFMO Scientific Committee.</p> <p><b>Proposed Actions:</b> Continue engagement to help strengthen bycatch data collection and reporting requirements, and the inclusion of seabird bycatch mitigation elements within RFMO compliance monitoring. Focus ACAP inputs through the development and dissemination of specific ACAP products, which could include the ACAP seabird bycatch identification guide, advice on data collection and reporting requirements, seabird bycatch estimation and how best to include seabird components in electronic monitoring initiatives.</p>
<b>SIOFA (Southern Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement)</b>	b)		<p>A paper was presented to the Third Meeting of Parties (June 2016) introducing ACAP, its objectives, work with RFMOs, and proposing possible mechanisms for formal engagement between ACAP and SIOFA on the issue of seabird conservation and management measures.</p> <p>SIOFA is in the process of developing mechanisms for a number of issues that pertain to 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. The level of fishing activity in the SIOFA Agreement Area is relatively low compared with other RFMOs and areas. However, given the developing state of these mechanisms, it might be appropriate for ACAP to provide some formal inputs to SIOFA regarding seabird conservation and management measures.</p> <p><b>Proposed Actions:</b> Given the information provided above, it is proposed that SBWG8 discuss and agree the optimal approach for engaging with SIOFA. It might be appropriate, for example, for ACAP to work towards and help support harmonising the conservation and management measures concerning seabirds across SEAFO, SPRFMO and SIOFA, and communicating to these RFMOs the latest ACAP advice for mitigating seabird</p>

RFMO/Other organisation	No.	Actions agreed for 2016-2017	Review of progress, and further actions required
			<p>bycatch for trawl and demersal longline fisheries. Such an approach may also include an action for ACAP to develop a draft SIOFA conservation and management measures on reducing the impact of fishing activities within the Agreement Area on seabirds, paying particular attention to trawl and demersal longline fishing. This draft text could then be provided to Parties to SIOFA to encourage its advocacy. ACAP should also decide whether there is value in developing a MoU with SIOFA, along the lines of the MoUs that are in place for other RFMOs.</p>
<p><b>All RFMOs</b></p>	<p>c)</p>	<p>Availability of source papers that inform ACAP's best practice advice</p>	<p>At a couple of RFMO meetings in 2016 and 2017, discussions of ACAP's latest best practice advice was slightly hindered by the unavailability of the key papers that informed the 2016 changes to our advice, specifically on the efficacy of the two new hook-shielding devices. The use of a password protected mechanism for documents submitted to ACAP meetings has been valuable in encouraging the submission of relevant documents that have been published (and subject to copyright requirements), in preparation, or in press, and may otherwise not have been made available to ACAP meeting participants, and should clearly be maintained. Although the scientific working groups of RFMOs do not always wish to consider the research papers on which ACAP advice is based, the novel nature of the hook-shielding devices meant that in some cases, RFMO scientists were reluctant to support the ACAP advice until they have had an opportunity to review the research papers presenting the evidence, which were and still are undergoing the peer review process.</p> <p><b><u>Proposed Actions:</u></b>                      Consider possible mechanisms for making password protected papers used by ACAP in developing/updating its advice available for the confidential consideration by relevant RFMO scientific working groups.</p>
<p><b>All RFMOs</b></p>	<p>d)</p>	<p>Review and update ACAP's document providing recommendations on Data collection requirements for RFMOs to improve knowledge of fishery impacts on ACAP-listed species (<a href="#">SBWG4 Doc 26 Rev 1</a>),</p>	<p>This document was presented to SBWG4 in 2011, and was subsequently presented to some of the RFMOs. It has most recently been presented to the Common Oceans Tuna Project seabird bycatch pre-assessment workshops (see 1e), following which some suggestions were made to modify slightly the list of minimum data fields (see Annex 1).</p> <p><b><u>Proposed Actions:</u></b></p>

RFMO/Other organisation	No.	Actions agreed for 2016-2017	Review of progress, and further actions required
		<p>and develop into a formal ACAP conservation guideline document.</p>	<p>It is recommended that ACAP review the minimum data fields defined in <a href="#">SBWG4 Doc 26 Rev 1</a> (<i>Data collection requirements for RFMOs to improve knowledge of fishery impacts on ACAP-listed species</i>) in relation to the proposed changes recommended at the Common Oceans Tuna Project workshops (see Annex 1), and revise the document as a whole, with the intention of converting it into a formal conservation guideline document.</p> <p>Either as part of the RFMO data collection guideline document envisaged above, or as a separate, but linked, document, it is recommended that ACAP develop guidelines and standard protocols for counting seabirds around vessels.</p>

**ANNEX 1: MINIMUM/CRITICAL DATA TO BE COLLECTED BY SET FOR  
 LONGLINE FISHING OPERATIONS – A COMPARISON OF RECOMMENDATIONS  
 IN SBWG4 DOC 26, AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE COMMON  
 OCEANS TUNA PROJECT SEABIRD ASSESSMENT WORKSHOPS**

**Table (i)** presents the recommended data fields identified in the ACAP document [SBWG4 Doc 26](#) (2011), which was discussed at the Common Oceans Tuna Project seabird bycatch pre-assessment workshops in 2017. Based on discussions at the workshops, a slightly modified list of priority data requirements was developed, which is presented in **Table (ii)**. It was agreed that most of the data collection priorities identified by ACAP in [SBWG4 Doc 26](#) (and Table i) should be retained as minimum requirements, but that a couple were perhaps redundant, unnecessary or difficult to collect. In addition, there were a couple of data fields added that were considered useful as proxy information (such as vessel length/size and target species/species composition), which could be used to estimate bycatch for unobserved fleets/strata.

**Table (i)** Recommended minimum data collection requirements in ACAP [SBWG4 Doc 26 Rev1](#). These data should be recorded for each set and haul observed.

Category	Variables
Temporal	Date gear deployed Start time of gear deployment End time of gear deployment
Spatial	Latitude at beginning of gear deployment Longitude at beginning of gear deployment Latitude at beginning of gear retrieval Longitude at beginning of gear retrieval
Fishing operation	Total number of hooks deployed Total number of hooks observed (crucial for calculating seabird bycatch levels) <sup>1</sup>
Mitigation measure	Tori line used (yes/no) Number of tori lines used Aerial coverage achieved (m)
Bycatch	Species identification Number of each species captured Disposition (dead/alive/injured) Description of condition/viability of animal upon release (if released alive)

<sup>1</sup> – Important to record the numbers of hooks observed specifically for seabirds. If the observer is in the factory or collecting information elsewhere they may miss seabirds being hauled aboard. Therefore it is important to be able to relate the number of birds caught to the number of hooks observed.

**Table (ii)** Draft list of priority data fields to be collected by set for seabird bycatch per unit effort standardisation and estimation, as recommended by Common Oceans Tuna Project seabird bycatch pre-assessment workshops

<b>Variable classification</b>	<b>Variable description</b>
Dependent variable	Number of seabirds caught (by spp.) Condition (Dead/Alive/Injured) End time of gear deployment
Spatial	Latitude at beginning of set Longitude at beginning of set
Physical	Moon phase (this can also be calculated by date)
Fishing operation	Vessel Identification Observer Identification [Vessel Characteristics e.g. length, tonnage & target species, for extrapolation to unobserved fleets] No. Hooks Between Floats Number of hooks deployed Number of hooks observed at haul Catch composition or target species
Relevant Conservation and Management Measures	Bird-scaring line used (Yes/No) Number of bird-scaring lines Text field for description of bird-scaring line Mass of added weight (grams) and distance from hook (metres)

Although the differences in these two lists are relatively slight, it is important to ensure that advice provided to RFMOs is unambiguous. Consequently, it is recommended that the ACAP document [SBWG4 Doc 26 Rev 1](#) be reviewed and updated, not only in respect of the suggested changes to the priority data collection requirements presented in Table (ii), but more broadly to develop it into a formal ACAP conservation guideline document.