



Agreement on the Conservation
of Albatrosses and Petrels

Eighth Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group

Wellington, New Zealand, 4 – 6 September 2017

Opportunities in ports to improve data in order to review the effectiveness of seabird measures

Berry Mulligan and Cleo Small

*BirdLife International Marine Programme, RSPB, Sandy,
SG19 2DL, UK*

SUMMARY

This paper highlights the importance of expanding the sources of data on implementation of seabird bycatch mitigation measures via port inspection. The planned review of the effectiveness of Rec. 11-09 on seabird bycatch has been severely hampered by a lack of data, and the requirement to conduct an update assessment of the effectiveness of the mitigation measures by 2015 has not been met. Recognising that ICCAT has a scheme for minimum standards for inspection in port (Rec. 12-07), the addition of elements relevant to seabird bycatch to this scheme would provide a valuable supplementary data source on the nature and extent of the use of various measures mandated under Rec. 11-09, through limited additional effort. Such an approach would be complementary to existing data sources and would not replace them. We make suggestions of the data fields that could be used in ICCAT port inspection forms, and highlight the need for inspector training and materials to support such an approach.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The SBWG agree on the data fields that could be used in port inspection forms to collect relevant information on the use of mitigation measures;
2. The SBWG agree on the value of incorporating seabird elements in port inspection training programmes.

1. INTRODUCTION

The role of seabird bycatch from tuna longline operations in driving several seabird species towards extinction is well established (e.g. Robertson & Gales 1988; Tuck et al. 2001; Croxall et al. 2012). The ICCAT area is globally important for a suite of albatross species (BirdLife International 2004; ACAP 2010; Carneiro et al. 2016) and longline fisheries under ICCAT have been shown via risk assessments to pose an extinction threat to several species (ICCAT 2009). As a result, Conservation and Management Measures (CMMs) have been put in place by ICCAT to reduce the impact of bycatch on declining seabird populations (e.g. Rec. 07-07, Rec. 11-09). However, the low level of at-sea observer data collection and reported is widely acknowledged as a severe shortcoming for assessing seabird bycatch rates and the impacts of pelagic longline fishing on threatened seabird species, including the assessment of ICCAT seabird CMMs (Angel et al. 2015; ICCAT 2016a; ICCAT 2016b). At-sea observer data collection and reporting is also focused on data for scientific purposes, whereas there is also a need to incorporate monitoring of bycatch CMMs into overall RFMO Monitoring and Compliance Systems (MCS). The addition of bycatch monitoring elements to port inspection and transshipment monitoring is important if RFMOs are to increase the effectiveness of their bycatch CMMs.

Under the UN Fish Stocks Agreement and Agreement on Port State Measures to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing (PSMA), the tuna RFMOs have duties in relation to enhancing regional and international cooperation on port inspection and other forms of MCS. The importance of Port State Measures¹ (PSM) and Port State Control² (PSC) as tools for delivering sustainable fisheries management is well established. This is reflected in the entry in to force in June 2016 of the PSMA, which sets minimum international standards for PSM, and which 20 ICCAT Contracting Parties have ratified, accepted, approved or acceded to³.

While the approach to PSM remains fragmented across the five tuna RFMOs (Fabra et al. 2011) there is a growing emphasis on PSMs within RFMOs, and there are a number of provisions which are common to most (e.g. designation of ports).

2. OPPORTUNITY

Recommendation 12-07 on an ICCAT scheme for minimum standards for inspection in port was established with the view to promote implementation of and monitor compliance with ICCAT CMMs with respect to foreign fishing vessels carrying ICCAT-managed species, with inspection of at least 5% of all landing and transshipment operations of foreign fishing vessels. As such, Rec. 12-07 creates an opportunity, and duty, for inspectors to examine or determine

¹ Port State Measures are requirements established or interventions undertaken by port states which a foreign fishing vessel must comply with or is subjected to as a condition for use of ports within the port state (FAO, 2017).

² Port State Control is the inspection of foreign ships in national ports by PSC Officers (inspectors) to verify that the condition of the ship and its equipment complies with the requirements of international conventions and that the ship is manned and operated in compliance with these rules.

³ As of 19th May 2017: USA, Japan, South Africa, Ghana, France, Gabon, Cap Vert, Uruguay, São Tomé e Príncipe, Guinée Rep., European Union, Panama, Barbados, Vanuatu, Iceland, Norway, Senegal, St Vincent & the Grenadines, Albania, Mauritania. A further 6 ICCAT CPs that have not ratified, accepted, approved or acceded are Signatories (Canada, Russia, Brazil, Angola, Turkey, Sierra Leone). www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/legal/docs/037s-e.pdf

whether ICCAT seabird bycatch mitigation measures have been used (for those pelagic longline vessels fishing in areas to which Rec. 07-07, Rec. 11-09 apply). Under Rec. 12-07, inspections carried out by the authorities of the port CPC and can include fishing gears, equipment and records (including logbooks) that the port CPC inspectors deem necessary to ensure compliance with ICCAT CMMs.

As a minimum, we suggest that the PSC officers should view and collect data on the following when inspecting a pelagic longline vessel:

1. Identify whether the vessel has fished in an area to which the ICCAT Seabird CMMs apply (Rec. 11-09; Rec. 07-07).
2. Verify evidence that the vessel has been using two bycatch mitigation measures when fishing in the areas to which Rec 11-09 applies.
 - a. Verify if the vessel has the equipment necessary for deploying one or more bird scaring ('tori') lines, and whether this complies with the recommended specifications in Rec 11-09. Priorities for verification are (i) presence of the bird scaring (tori) pole(s), (ii) overall length of bird scaring line, and (iii) spacing and length of streamers.
 - b. Examine the logbook to establish the vessel's setting start and end times, to ascertain if the vessel is undertaking night setting (as defined by Rec. 11-09 as being between completed between nautical dusk and nautical dawn).
 - c. Verify if weights are attached to the branch lines and if they comply with the weight and distance from the hook as required under Rec 11-09 (greater than a total of 45 g attached within 1 m of the hook or; greater than a total of 60 g attached within 3.5 m of the hook or greater than a total of 98 g weight attached within 4 m of the hook).
3. For those vessels fishing between 20-25°S, verify presence of equipment for deployment of a bird scaring line.

The Secretariat is responsible for developing forms and provides an ICCAT Port inspection form online. Rec. 12-07 requires the submission of copies of inspection reports to the ICCAT Secretariat. The port inspection form broadly mirrors the reporting format of the PSMA (i.e. PSMA Annex C), and would allow information on presence or use of all seabird mitigation measures in the sections related to logbooks, gear, inspector finding and apparent infringements (see Annex 1).

Such an approach would compliment and supplement scientific data gathered via the observer programme, and would be subject to existing confidentiality rules. Improved data on bycatch CMMs via port inspection could also benefit assessments related to other non-target taxa, for example inspection of line cutters, de-hookers and dip-nets necessary for the implementation of Rec. 10-09 on bycatch of sea turtles in ICCAT fisheries.

This approach is being promoted for bycatch CMMs within IOTC with training materials and through port inspection procedures (e.g. IOTC 2013), and IOTC has developed an secondary inspection report form to record compliance with technical management measures including bycatch measures (see Annex 2). The 12th meeting of CCSBT's Ecologically Related Species Working Group (ERSWG) has asked the CCSBT Compliance

Committee to consider ways to effectively monitor seabird mitigation measures in relation to port inspection and transshipment inspection.

As far as we are aware ICCAT does not currently provide detailed inspection procedure (similar to PSMA Annex B) nor specific guidance on training relating to PSMA, but CPCs have been carrying out capacity building activities and ICCAT Recommendation 14-08 builds on Rec. 12-07 by establishing a Monitoring, Control and Surveillance Fund (MCSF) to support and strengthen the development and implementation of effective systems of port inspection to exceed the minimum standards in Rec. 12-07. Given that the approach outlined above requires inspectors with specific training to support the collection of consistent data related to mitigation measures, it would be beneficial that future development of ICCAT guidelines for port inspector training to include relevant information on bycatch CMMs be integrated to both training programmes and related materials.

3. CONCLUSIONS

The tuna RFMOs play an important role in ensuring that port inspection measures are effective and harmonised. Port inspection provides a valuable mechanism to provide supplementary data to evaluate mitigation efforts for bycaught species. We believe such data would provide a useful complement to existing data collecting processes within ICCAT, which are primarily via scientific observers.

4. REFERENCES

- ACAP. 2010. Albatross and petrel distribution in the Atlantic Ocean and overlap with ICCAT longline fishing effort. Author BirdLife International. Paper submitted to the June 2010 meeting of the ICCAT Sub-Committee on Ecosystems, Madrid, Spain, 31 May – 4 June 2010. SCRS/2010/050.
- Angel, A., Wanless, R. & Small, C. 2015. ICCAT process for national reporting on bycatch: an assessment of need from a seabird bycatch perspective. Paper submitted to the 2015 Intersessional meeting of the ICCAT Sub-Committee on Ecosystems, Madrid, Spain, 8-12th June 2015. SCRS/2015/119.
- BirdLife International. 2004. Tracking ocean wanderers: the global distribution of albatrosses and petrels. Results from the Global Procellariiform Tracking Workshop, 1–5 September 2003, Gordon's Bay, South Africa. Cambridge, UK: BirdLife International.
- Carneiro, A., Mulligan, B., Beare, D. & Small, C. 2016. Albatross and petrel distribution in the Atlantic Ocean and overlap with ICCAT longline effort. Paper submitted to the 2016 Intersessional meeting of the ICCAT Sub-Committee on Ecosystems, Madrid, 5-9th September 2016. SCRS/2016/174.
- Croxall, J. P., Butchart, S. H. M., Lascelles, B., Stattersfield, A. J., Sullivan, B. J., Symes, A., & Taylor, P. 2012. Seabird conservation status, threats and priority actions: a global assessment. *Bird Conservation International*:1-34.
- Fabra, A., Gascón, V., Marrero, M., Lieberman, S. & Sack, K. 2011. Closing the Gap: Comparing tuna RFMO port State measures with the FAO Agreement on Port State Measures. The Pew Environment Group, 24 pp.

FAO. 2009. Agreement on Port State Measures to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing. Rome.

FAO. 2017. Port State Measures - Web site. Port State Measures. FI Institutional Websites. Text by Skonhøft, A. In: FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Department [online]. Rome. Updated 13 May 2016. [Cited 3 July 2017]. <http://www.fao.org/fishery/psm/en>

ICCAT 2009. Report of the 2009 inter-sessional meeting of the Sub-committee on Ecosystems. International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tuna, Recife, Brazil, 8-12 June, 2009. 27pp.

ICCAT. 2016a. Report of the 2016 inter-sessional meeting of the Sub-committee on Ecosystems. International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tuna, Madrid, Spain, 5-9 September 2016. SCRS/2016/012. 33pp.

ICCAT. 2016b. Report of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics (SCRS). International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tuna. Madrid, Spain, 3-7 October 2016. 425pp.

IOTC. 2013. Procedures for the implementation of the Indian ocean Tuna Commission Port State Measures. IOTC, Seychelles. 167 pp.

Robertson, G.; Gales, G. (ed.), 1988. Albatross biology and conservation, pp. 113-136. Surrey Beatty & Sons, Chipping Norton, Australia.

Tuck, G.S., Polacheck, T., Croxall, J. P. & Weimerskirch, H. 2001. Modelling the impact of fishery by-catches on albatross populations. *J Appl Ecol* 38:1182–1196.

ANNEX 1

Extract from ICCAT Port inspection form, with red arrows highlighting fields where use or presence of seabird or sea turtle mitigation measures could feasibly be recorded:

31. Catch retained onboard (quantity)						
Species	Product form	Catch area(s)	Quantity declared	Quantity retained	Difference between quantity declared and quantity determined, if any	
32. Examination of logbook(s) and other documentation				Yes	No	Comments
33. Compliance with applicable catch documentation scheme(s)				Yes	No	Comments
34. Compliance with applicable statistical document scheme(s)				Yes	No	Comments
35. Type of gear used						
36. Gear examined			Yes	No	Comments	
37. Findings by inspector(s)						
38. Apparent infringement(s) noted including reference to relevant legal instrument(s)						
39. Comments by the master						
40. Action taken						
41. Master's signature*						
42. Inspector's signature						

ANNEX 2

Extract from IOTC (2013) Procedures for the implementation of the Indian ocean Tuna Commission Port State Measures, Appendix X: Port inspection report form (B):

Sea birds (Longliners)		Resolution 10/06 On Reducing the Incidental Bycatch of Seabirds in Longline Fisheries			
For vessels fishing south of 25°S the longline vessel use at least two mitigation measures		<input type="checkbox"/> Night setting with minimum deck lighting		<input type="checkbox"/> Bird-scaring lines (Tori Lines)	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Weighted branch lines			
Conformity of mitigation measures to the minimum technical standards (Annex 1 of Resolution 10/06)					
The vessel has not set line between nautical dawn & before nautical dusk.		Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>		Bird-scaring line was deployed during longline setting to deter birds from approaching branch line	
The deck was lighted at a minimum				Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	
Area and period of closure (All vessels)		Resolution 12/13 For the Conservation and Management of Tropical Tunas Stocks in the IOTC			
The longline vessel has been fishing in the area 0° - 10° North - 40° and 60° East from 0000 hours on 1 February to 2400 hours on 1 March		Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>		Date(s) and position(s) of the vessel:	
The purse seine vessel has been fishing in the area 0° - 10° North - 40° and 60° East from 0000 hours on 1 November to 2400 hours on 1 December		Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>		Date(s) and position(s) of the vessel:	
Marine Turtles (all vessels)		Resolution 12/04 On marine turtles			
The logbook contains information on incidental catches of marine turtles (details on species, location of capture, conditions, actions taken on board and location of release)				Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	
The vessel carries line cutters	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	The vessel carries de-hookers	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	The vessel is using whole finfish bait	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
				The vessel carries dip-nets	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
Sharks fins (all vessels)		Resolution 05/05 - Concerning the conservation of sharks caught in association with fisheries managed by IOTC			
Shark on board are fully utilised (carcass and fins present on board)	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	Fins onboard total not more than 5% of the weight of sharks onboard	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	Weight of shark (kg):	Weight of fins (kg):
					%