

 <p>Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels</p>	<p><b>Sixth Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group</b> <i>Punta del Este, Uruguay, 10 - 12 September 2014</i></p> <p><b>Definitions and descriptions of net fisheries</b></p> <p><b><i>Igor Debski, Anton Wolfaardt, Marco Favero</i></b></p>
---	---

### SUMMARY

At the Fifth Meeting of the SBWG in 2013 it was noted that there are a wide variety of net fisheries and there will likely be a wide variation in the risks posed by these fisheries to seabirds. This paper aims to describe and define net fishing methods other than trawl, to enable the SBWG to better target and classify mitigation needs amongst these fisheries, and thus allow the development of best practice mitigation advice where relevant. Due to the limited literature on seabird bycatch risk posed by some of these fisheries, we request information from Parties and other members and observers of the SBWG to inform further assessment of risks posed by these fisheries.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the SBWG recognise and adopt the nomenclature and classification of the International Standard Statistical Classification of Fishing Gear for net fishing types.
2. That the SBWG recognise that gillnets and entangling nets pose risks to ACAP-listed species, and consider developing best practice mitigation advice for these fisheries.
3. That the SBWG gather information and further review the risks posed to seabirds by net fisheries other than trawl and gillnet and entangling nets, in order to identify any other fisheries where it may be appropriate to develop best practice mitigation advice.

### Definiciones y descripciones de las pesquerías con redes

Durante la Quinta Reunión del GdTCS llevada a cabo en 2013, se señaló que existe una amplia variedad de pesquerías con redes y que probablemente haya también una extensa variación en los riesgos que presentan estas pesquerías para las aves marinas. El propósito de este documento consiste en describir y definir los métodos de pesca con redes que no sean de arrastre, con el objetivo de permitirle al GdTCS orientar y clasificar mejor las necesidades de mitigación en estas pesquerías y, así, facilitar la elaboración de recomendaciones sobre mejores prácticas de mitigación, donde corresponda. Dada la escasa bibliografía publicada sobre los riesgos de la captura secundaria de aves marinas

que presentan estas pesquerías, solicitamos información a las Partes y demás miembros y observadores del GdTCS para documentar las futuras evaluaciones de los riesgos de estas pesquerías.

### **RECOMENDACIONES**

1. Que el GdTCS reconozca y adopte la nomenclatura y clasificación de la Clasificación estadística internacional uniforme de los artes de pesca para los distintos tipos de pesca con redes.
2. Que el GdTCS reconozca que las redes de enmalle y enredo presentan riesgos para las especies incluidas en el ACAP y considere la posibilidad de elaborar recomendaciones sobre mejores prácticas de mitigación para estas pesquerías.
3. Que el GdTCS recopile información y siga estudiando los riesgos que representan para las aves marinas las pesquerías con redes que no sean de arrastre, enmalle ni enredo, a fin de identificar, en caso de corresponder, cualquier otro tipo de pesquería para la que se deba elaborar recomendaciones sobre mejores prácticas de mitigación.

### **Définitions et descriptions de la pêche au filet**

Lors de la Cinquième réunion du GTCA en 2013, il a été noté qu'il existe une grande variété de types de pêche au filet, ce qui fait probablement varier de façon importante les risques que ces pêches font courir aux oiseaux marins. Ce document vise à décrire et définir les méthodes de pêche au filet autres que le chalut, pour permettre au GTCA de mieux cibler et classer les besoins d'atténuation parmi ces types de pêches, et ainsi permettre le développement de bonnes pratiques d'atténuation le cas échéant. En raison de la documentation limitée sur le risque de captures accidentelles d'oiseaux marins posé par certaines de ces pêches, nous demandons aux Parties, aux autres membres et aux observateurs du GTCA de nous fournir des informations supplémentaires pour évaluer les risques posés par ces pêches.

### **RECOMMANDATIONS**

1. Que le GTCA reconnaisse et adopte la nomenclature et la classification de la Classification statistique standard internationale des engins de pêche (International Standard Statistical Classification of Fishing Gear) pour les types de pêche au filet.
2. Que le GTCA reconnaisse que les filets maillants et les folles (filets emmêlants) présentent des risques pour les espèces inscrites à l'ACAP, et qu'il envisage d'élaborer des bonnes pratiques d'atténuation pour ces pêches.
3. Que le GTCA recueille des informations et examine les risques posés aux oiseaux marins par les types de pêche au filet autres que le chalut, le filet maillant et la folle, afin d'identifier d'autres pêches qui pourraient bénéficier du développement de bonnes pratiques d'atténuation.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

A major achievement of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group (SBWG) has been the development of best practice mitigation advice. The focus to date has been on developing advice for pelagic longline, demersal longline and trawl fishing methods, which together cover the majority of large scale industrial fisheries which are known to pose bycatch risk to ACAP-listed species.

At the Fifth Meeting of the SBWG in 2013 it was noted that there are a wide variety of net fisheries and there will likely be a wide variation in the risks posed by these fisheries to seabirds. It was further discussed that if ACAP is to address assessment and mitigation in these fisheries, it would be worthwhile considering a broad definition of net-fishery types in the same way that line fisheries had been separated. As with line fisheries, there is also likely to be variance in appropriate mitigation responses depending on the scale of the fisheries. This paper aims to describe and define net fishing methods other than trawl, to enable the SBWG to better target and classify mitigation needs amongst these fisheries, and thus allow the development of best practice mitigation advice where relevant.

## 2. FISHING GEAR CATEGORIES

### 2.1. FAO Classification

The FAO classification of fishing gear, based on the International Standard Statistical Classification of Fishing Gear (ISSCFG) is described in detail in [FAO Technical Report 222/Rev.1](#) (FAO 1990). At the Twenty-fourth Session of the FAO Coordinating Working Party on Fishery Statistics in 2013, revisions were proposed for the ISSCFG ([paper CWP-24/5](#)). The following classification (and standard abbreviation) of gear that may use nets (excluding trawl) is based on these proposed revisions:

#### SURROUNDING NETS

Purse seines	(PS)
Surrounding nets without purse lines	(LA)
Surrounding nets (nei)	(SUX)

#### SEINE NETS

Beach seines	(SB)
Boat seines	(SV)
Seine nets nei	(SX)

#### DREDGES

Towed dredges	(DRB)
Hand dredges	(DRH)
Mechanized dredges	(DRM)

Dredges (nei) (DRX)

#### LIFT NETS

Portable lift nets (LNP)

Boat-operated lift nets (LNB)

Shore-operated stationary lift nets (LNS)

Lift nets (nei) (LN)

#### FALLING GEAR

Cast nets (FCN)

Cover pots/Lantern nets (FCO)

Falling gear (nei) (FG)

#### GILLNETS AND ENTANGLING NETS

Set gillnets (anchored) (GNS)

Drift gillnets (GND)

Encircling gillnets (GNC)

Fixed gillnets (on stakes) (GNF)

Trammel nets (GTR)

Combined gillnets-trammel nets (GTN)

Gillnets and entangling nets (nei) (GEN)

#### TRAPS (partial listing, of types involving nets only)

Stationary uncovered pound nets (FPN)

Fyke nets (FYK)

Stow nets (FSN)

#### MISCELLANEOUS Gears (partial listing, of types involving nets only)

Pushnets (MPN)

Scoopnets (MSP)

Drive-in nets (MDR)

### 3. BYCATCH RISK

It is apparent that there are a wide variety of fishing methods that use nets. Undoubtedly, the risk posed by these fisheries to seabird will vary greatly.

There have been a number of reviews that have assessed the risk to seabirds from gillnet fisheries (i.e. fisheries within the gillnets and entangling nets FAO category), including the recent global reviews by Waugh et al (2014) and Zydalis et al (2013). These reviews have found risks posed to ACAP-listed species, clearly illustrating the relevance of these fisheries to the SBWG.

Literature assessing the risk posed by other net fisheries is sparse.

Rowe (2013) reports the findings of a qualitative risk assessment to examine the potential impact of fisheries on seabirds in New Zealand. As part of this process, workshop participants scored the likelihood of each New Zealand seabird species being exposed to, and interacting with, each of the major fishing methods in New Zealand. Exposure scores varied from 0 (remote – the species will not interact directly with the fishery) to 5 (likely – interactions are expected to occur). Table 1 lists the highest scores for any seabird species and any ACAP-listed species for non-trawl net methods. Whilst this study is only on a regional basis, it clearly shows that some fishing methods may be unlikely to pose a bycatch risk (e.g. dredge fisheries), whilst others are likely to (e.g. drift nets or purse seine lighting).

**Table 1.** Seabird exposure scores to New Zealand net fisheries (Rowe 2013).

New Zealand fishery	FAO fishery	Highest exposure score	
		Any seabird	ACAP species
Beach seine	SB	2	0
Danish seine	SV	2	2
Dredge	Dredges	0	0
Inshore drift net	GND	4	0
Purse seine	PS	2	1
Purse seine lighting	PS (lighting)	5	4
Ring net	GNC?	2	0
Setnet	GNS	5	2

### 3. CONCLUSIONS

Risks to ACAP-listed seabird species from gillnet and entangling net fisheries have been identified, and it is therefore appropriate that the SBWG consider developing best practice mitigation advice for these fisheries. Within the category of gillnets and entangling nets there are a range of fishing gears, and development of best practice mitigation advice will need to be tailored carefully to specific gear types.

A wide variety of other net fishing gear exists, but information on the risks posed to seabirds by these methods is limited, and it is likely that any risk will vary greatly between gear types. Further work is required to determine which of these gear types pose any appreciable risk to ACAP-listed species, and therefore identify which gear types may require the development

and use of mitigation strategies. We request that Parties and other members or observers of the SBWG provide information from local experts, by SBWG7, in order to allow an assessment of risk posed by these fisheries. Progressing such an assessment would ensure that the SBWG takes a holistic view to addressing fisheries impacts on seabirds.

### 3. REFERENCES

FAO. 1990. Definition and Classification of Fishing gear categories. FAO Fisheries Technical Paper 222 Rev I. Rome.

Rowe, S. 2013: Level 1 risk assessment for incidental seabird mortality associated with fisheries in New Zealand's Exclusive Economic Zone. *DOC Marine Conservation Services Series 10*. Department of Conservation, Wellington. 58 p.

Waugh, S.M., Filippi, D.P., Blyth, R., Filippi, P.F. 2014. Assessment bycatch in gill net fisheries. UNEP/CMS/ScC18/Inf.10.15.1.

Zydelis, R., Small, C., French, G. 2013. The incidental catch of seabirds in gillnet fisheries: A global review. *Biological Conservation* 162: 76–88.