



Conservation Status of Albatrosses and Petrels and Advice on Reducing their Bycatch in CCSBT Longline Fisheries

Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP)¹

SUMMARY

The incidental mortality of seabirds in longline and trawl fisheries continues to be a serious global concern, especially for threatened albatrosses and petrels. The need for international cooperation in addressing this concern was a major reason for establishing the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP). There are currently 31 species listed in Annex 1 of the Agreement. Of the 22 species of albatrosses, 18 breed or forage in the CCSBT Area, as do seven of the nine listed petrel species. This paper provides a summary of the status and current trends of these 25 species, as well as an update on the latest ACAP seabird bycatch mitigation advice for pelagic longline fisheries and other relevant ACAP resources.

INTRODUCTION

The Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP) provides a framework for coordinating and undertaking international activity to mitigate known threats to albatross and petrel populations. Most of the 31 species listed in Annex 1 of ACAP have extensive at-sea distributions (see **Table 1** for those found in the CCSBT area), and the greatest threat to these species is incidental mortality (bycatch) in pelagic and demersal longline and trawl fisheries. A global review estimated that at least 160,000 (and potentially in excess of 320,000) seabirds are killed annually in longline fisheries worldwide (Anderson *et al.* 2011). A 2017 risk assessment for Southern Hemisphere fisheries indicated significant levels of annual potential fatalities of ACAP species (Abraham *et al.* 2017). An initial global assessment of seabird bycatch in pelagic longline fishing in the Southern Hemisphere was carried out in February 2019 under the auspices of the FAO-GEF project *Sustainable Management of Tuna Fisheries and Biodiversity Conservation in the Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction* (also known as the “Common Oceans Tuna Project”). A report on this project was presented as CCSBT-ERS/1905/23 (BirdLife South Africa 2019).

ACAP cooperates with the CCSBT through our Memorandum of Understanding, which was renewed in December 2021. ACAP has participated regularly in CCSBT meetings and has been pleased to present updates to the ERSWG on ACAP best practice mitigation measures and guidelines, and to contribute updates on population status and trends. This paper provides information relevant to various CCSBT Multi Year Seabird Plan objectives, in particular Objective 3A regarding seabird bycatch mitigation technologies and techniques. We are

¹ Secretariat to the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels, Level 2, 119 Macquarie St, Hobart, Tasmania 7000, Australia.

pleased to provide this information to assist the ERSWG to develop updated best practice mitigation advice for CCSBT fisheries. We shall be happy to continue to work with the CCSBT to promote best practice mitigation measures in CCSBT fisheries.

CONSERVATION STATUS, POPULATION SIZE AND TRENDS OF ACAP SPECIES

Of the 25 species of albatrosses and large petrels that overlap in distribution with the CCSBT Area, the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) currently lists:

- one as *Critically Endangered* (CR)
- eight as *Endangered* (EN)
- eight as *Vulnerable* (VU)
- five as *Near Threatened* (NT)
- three as *Least Concern* (LC)

Comprehensive knowledge of population size, trend and demographic parameters is fundamental to many aspects of albatross and petrel conservation, and is vital to monitoring the effectiveness of management actions. ACAP collates breeding site, trend and other data for all albatrosses and petrels listed under the Agreement. Although the size of most populations has been determined at some point in time, the trend and current demographic statistics for many populations are less well known, due to the high level of resources required to access remote sites at appropriate intervals. Determination of global trends can also be difficult because populations of the same species at different sites may show different trajectories.

At its seventh meeting in May 2023, ACAP's Population and Conservation Status Working Group (PaCSWG7) discussed new information on the populations of five ACAP-listed species ([AC13 Doc 09](#)). This recent data will inform the update of the 20 year trend of each ACAP species at the eighth meeting of PaCSWG, in August 2024.

At present, information on the conservation status, population size, and trends of the 25 species of albatrosses and large petrels that overlap in their distribution with the CCSBT Area remains unchanged since the last update in **CCSBT-ERS/2203/16 (Table 1)**. Further information can also be found in the [species assessments](#) developed by ACAP which provide comprehensive information on the distribution, biology and threats facing all ACAP species. These are currently being updated and new species distribution maps have been provided to ERSWG15 in a separate paper co-authored with BirdLife International.

ACAP High Priority Populations

ACAP has also identified nine High Priority Populations, which represent more than 10% of a species' global population, and were declining at more than 3% per year over a 20 year period for which a major underlying cause was incidental mortality in fisheries. Seven of these populations breed and forage in the CCSBT area (see **Table 1**). These include Wandering Albatross *Diomedea exulans*, and Black-browed Albatross *Thalassarche melanophrys* breeding at South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)² (**Figure 1**).

² A dispute exists between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland concerning sovereignty over the Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas), South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands (Islas Georgias del Sur e Islas Sandwich del Sur) and the surrounding maritime areas.




Figure 1. Breeding population trends for Wandering Albatross (*Diomedea exulans*) (left) and Black-browed Albatross (*Thalassarche melanophris*) (right) at Bird Island, South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)² from when records began to 2023.

The Joint Meeting of ACAP’s Seabird Bycatch and Population and Conservation Status Working Groups (SBWG11 and PaCSWG7) held in May 2023 considered a paper (Phillips et al. 2023 [Joint SBWG11-PaCSWG7 Doc 04]) which described the overlap of eight of the nine ACAP High Priority Populations with EEZs, and areas of competence of RFMOs (Regional Fishery Management Organisations) and CCAMLR (Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources). The paper highlighted the responsibilities of these management bodies for addressing the conservation crisis for the ACAP High Priority Populations and encouraged coordinated advocacy at relevant management fora. The overlap with CCSBT was not calculated in this study as this convention has no geographic limits of competence.

ACAP ADVICE FOR REDUCING BYCATCH OF SEABIRDS IN FISHERIES

Much of ACAP’s Seabird Bycatch Working Group (SBWG) work focuses on routinely reviewing and updating best practice mitigation advice for industrial fishing gear types (principally pelagic and demersal longline, and trawl gear). The ACAP review process recognises that factors such as safety, practicality and the characteristics of the fishery should also be taken into account when considering the efficacy of seabird bycatch mitigation measures and consequently in the development of advice and guidelines on best practice.

The 11th Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group (SBWG11) was held in May 2023, prior to AC13. SBWG11 reviewed a range of studies that reiterated and further endorsed current ACAP Best Practice Advice for trawl, pelagic longline and demersal longline fisheries. A number of minor improvements to these best-practice documents were made to improve consistency and to reference the latest scientific evidence.

Updates to pelagic mitigation measures

For pelagic longline fisheries SBWG11 reviewed a range of studies that reiterated and further endorsed current best practice advice. ACAP recommends that the most effective way to reduce seabird bycatch in pelagic longline fisheries is to use the following three best practice measures simultaneously: (1) branch line weighting, (2) night setting and (3) bird scaring lines.

SBWG11 updated the best practice advice document to more clearly outline the rationale for recommending the simultaneous use of methods. The simultaneous use of the three ACAP recommended mitigation measures optimises seabird bycatch reduction in longline fisheries. All three recommended measures are demonstrated to be effective; however, each has limitations when used alone:

- there is a period of time when hooks are accessible to birds even when branch lines are weighted.
- night setting used alone is less effective at reducing seabird bycatch for nocturnally active birds and during bright moon light conditions.
- bird scaring lines used alone can rarely protect baited hooks beyond the aerial extent of the line.

Consequently, the simultaneous use of the three ACAP recommended seabird bycatch mitigation measures compensates for these limitations. In addition, three hook-shielding devices (the 'Hookpod-LED', the 'Hookpod-mini' and the 'Smart Tuna Hook') and one underwater bait setting device (the 'Underwater Bait Setter, Skadia Technologies') have been assessed and incorporated into ACAP's Best Practice Advice as stand-alone mitigation measures.

SBWG11 also reviewed new research relevant to lasers as a mitigation measure in trawl and longline fisheries, specifically research to determine if lasers cause eye injury in birds. Available evidence shows that high-energy lasers are ineffective at deterring seabirds from danger areas around fishing vessels. The lasers in current use likely damage seabird visual systems, with negative effects on foraging behaviour. The use of high-energy laser technologies for seabird bycatch mitigation is strongly discouraged by ACAP, since there is currently no evidence of effectiveness, and serious concerns remain in terms of the potential impacts on the health of individual birds.

The updated [2023 Pelagic Longline mitigation review and best practice](#) advice document, endorsed by AC13, is available to download from the ACAP website, and is also attached in ANNEX 1. The document was recently translated into [Indonesian](#), courtesy of NOAA, and into [Korean](#) as part of an ACAP internship for Masters of Translation and Interpreting students.

ACAP has also produced [Advice on Improving Safety when Hauling Branch lines during Pelagic Longline Fishing Operations](#).

Other relevant resources

[Data collection guidelines for observer programmes](#) and [Guidelines on electronic monitoring systems](#) as highlighted in **CCSBT-ERS/2203/16** remain current. The data collection guidelines will be reviewed at the 12th meeting of SBWG in August 2024. The document is now also available in [Indonesian](#) and [Korean](#) and can be downloaded from <https://www.acap.aq/resources/bycatch-mitigation/bycatch-monitoring>.

Updates are currently in progress for other key resources, including the [ACAP-BirdLife Bycatch Mitigation Factsheets](#) (available in English, French, Japanese, Korean, Portuguese Spanish, and Traditional Chinese), and the [ACAP-FRA Seabird Bycatch Identification Guide](#) (available in English, French, Spanish, Portuguese, and Traditional Chinese; Korean, Indonesian and Japanese versions are also in progress).

New [Guidelines for working with albatrosses and petrels during H5N1 avian influenza outbreak](#) (available in English, French and Spanish) were added in July 2022 and updated in November 2023. The guidelines include recommendations for dealing with seabirds accidentally landed onboard vessels in areas within the reach of outbreaks. The guidelines will be supplemented by a poster in the coming weeks.

REFERENCES

- Abraham E, MJ Roux, Y Richard, N Walker. 2017. *Assessment of the risk of southern hemisphere surface longline fisheries to ACAP species. SBWG8 Doc 07. Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels. Eighth Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group. 4 – 6 September 2017, Wellington, New Zealand.*
- Anderson ORJ, CJ Small, JP Croxall, EK Dunn, BJ Sullivan, O Yates, A Black. 2011. Global seabird bycatch in longline fisheries. *Endangered Species Research* **14**: 91–106.
- BirdLife South Africa. 2019. *Report of the Final Global Seabird Bycatch Assessment Workshop. 25 February – 1 March 2019, Kruger National Park, South Africa. CCSBT-ERS/1905/23.*
- Clay TA, Small C, Tuck GN, Pardo D, Carneiro APB, Wood AG, Croxall JP, Crossin GT, Phillips RA. 2019. A comprehensive large-scale assessment of fisheries bycatch risk to threatened seabird populations. *Journal of Applied Ecology* **56**: 1882-1893 doi 10.1111/1365-2664.13407
- Dias MP, Martin R, Pearmain EJ, Burfield IJ, Small C, Phillips RA, Yates O, Lascelles B, Borboroglu PG, Croxall JP. 2019. Threats to seabirds: A global assessment. *Biological Conservation* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2019.06.033>
- Phillips RA, Gales R, Baker GB, Double MC, Favero M, Quintana F, Tasker ML, Weimerskirch H, Uhart M, Wolfaardt A. 2016. The conservation status and priorities for albatrosses and large petrels. *Biological Conservation* **201**: 169-183.
- Phillips RA, Catry P, Dias M, Opper S, Anderson DJ, Delord K, Elliott G, Nicholls D, Walker K, Wanless R, Weimerskirch H and Beal M. 2023. *Global political responsibility for the conservation of ACAP Priority Populations. Joint SBWG11/PaCSWG7 Doc 04. Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels. Joint Eleventh Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group and Seventh Meeting of the Population and Conservation Status Working Group. Edinburgh, United Kingdom, 18 May 2023.*

Table 1. Summary of global IUCN status and current trends of ACAP species with distribution in CCSBT waters. Breeding sites where populations have been identified as meeting the criteria for ACAP High Priority Populations (>10% of the global population, declining >3% per year, at risk from fisheries) are in red font.

Species	2021 IUCN Status ¹	Occurrence in CCSBT Area: Breeding (B) Foraging (F)	Number of sites (ACAP) ²	Breeding site responsibility	Annual breeding pairs (last census) ³	Current Population Trend 2001-2020 ⁴
<i>Diomedea dabbenena</i> Tristan Albatross	CR	B-F	1	UK (Gough Island)	1,439 (2021)	↓
<i>Diomedea amsterdamensis</i> Amsterdam Albatross	EN	B-F	1	France	51 (2020)	↑
<i>Diomedea antipodensis</i> Antipodean Albatross	EN	B-F	6	NZ (Antipodes Islands)	7,107 (1995-2020)	↓
<i>Diomedea sanfordi</i> Northern Royal Albatross	EN	B-F	5	NZ	4,080 (2018)	↓
<i>Thalassarche carteri</i> Indian Yellow-nosed Albatross	EN	B-F	6	France (Amsterdam Island), South Africa	33,974 (1984-2016)	↓
<i>Thalassarche chlororhynchos</i> Atlantic Yellow-nosed Albatross	EN	B-F	6	UK	33,650 (1974-2011)	↔
<i>Thalassarche chrysostoma</i> Grey-headed Albatross	EN	B-F	29	Australia, Chile, France, NZ, South Africa, South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)*	80,863 (1982-2020)	↓
<i>Phoebastria fusca</i> Sooty Albatross	EN	B-F	15	France (Crozet Island), South Africa, UK	12,074 (1974-2021)	↓
<i>Procellaria westlandica</i> Westland Petrel	EN	B-F	1	NZ	6,223 (2019)	↑
<i>Diomedea epomophora</i> Southern Royal Albatross	VU	B-F	4	NZ	7,921 (1989-2018)	↔
<i>Diomedea exulans</i> Wandering Albatross	VU	B-F	28	Australia, France, South Africa, South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)*	9,400 (1981-2021)	↓
<i>Procellaria aequinoctialis</i> White-chinned Petrel	VU	B-F	73	Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)*, France, New Zealand, South Africa, South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)*	1,118,033 (1984-2019)	↓
<i>Procellaria conspicillata</i> Spectacled Petrel	VU	B-F	1	UK	34,000–50,000 (2018)	↑
<i>Procellaria parkinsoni</i> Black Petrel	VU	B-F	2	NZ	6,970 (2016-2021)	↔
<i>Thalassarche eremita</i> Chatham Albatross	VU	B-F	1	NZ	5,296 (2017)	↔

Species	2021 IUCN Status ¹	Occurrence in CCSBT Area: Breeding (B) Foraging (F)	Number of sites (ACAP) ²	Breeding site responsibility	Annual breeding pairs (last census) ³	Current Population Trend 2001-2020 ⁴
<i>Thalassarche impavida</i> Campbell Albatross	VU	B-F	2	NZ	24,338 (2020)	↔
<i>Thalassarche salvini</i> Salvin's Albatross	VU	B-F	12	NZ	26,496 (1986-2019)	↓
<i>Phoebastria palpebrata</i> Light-mantled Albatross	NT	B-F	71	Australia, France, New Zealand, South Africa, South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)*	15,975 [^] (1954-2021)	?
<i>Procellaria cinerea</i> Grey Petrel	NT	B-F	17	Australia, France, New Zealand, South Africa, UK	86,959 [#] (1981-2018)	↓
<i>Thalassarche bulleri</i> Buller's Albatross	NT	B-F	10	NZ	33,268 (1984-2019)	↔
<i>Thalassarche cauta</i> Shy Albatross	NT	B-F	3	Australia	15,019 (2015-2021)	↓
<i>Thalassarche steadi</i> White-capped Albatross	NT	B-F	5	NZ	62,922 (2009-2017)	?
<i>Macronectes giganteus</i> Southern giant Petrel	LC	B-F	119	Antarctic Treaty, Argentina, Australia, Chile, Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)*, France, South Africa, South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)*, UK	46,127 (1958-2021)	↑
<i>Macronectes halli</i> Northern giant Petrel	LC	B-F	50	Australia, France, New Zealand, South Africa, South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)*	11,551 (1973-2021)	↑
<i>Thalassarche melanophris</i> Black-browed Albatross	LC	B-F	65	Australia, Chile, Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)*, France, New Zealand, South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)*	689,468 (1982-2020)	↑

*A dispute exists between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland concerning sovereignty over the Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas), South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands (Islas Georgias del Sur e Islas Sandwich del Sur) and the surrounding maritime areas.

[^] excluding Auckland estimates of 5,000 pairs – not reliable/supported

[#] incomplete global estimate - Prince Edward Islands numbers unknown


¹ CR = Critically Endangered, EN = Endangered, VU = Vulnerable, NT = Near Threatened, LC = Least Concern
The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2021-1. <www.iucnredlist.org>

² Site: usually an entire, distinct island or islet, or rarely, section of a large island (>3,000km²)

³ ACAP database. <data.acap.aq>. 31 August 2021

⁴ ACAP Trend: ↑ increasing, ↓ declining, ↔ stable, ? unknown. **n.b. the overall trend for the species may not reflect particular regional or site trends.**

ANNEX 1. ACAP Review of mitigation measures and Best Practice Advice for Reducing the Impact of Pelagic Longline Fisheries on Seabirds



INTRODUCTION

The incidental mortality of seabirds in pelagic longline fisheries continues to be a serious global concern, especially for threatened albatrosses and petrels. The need for international cooperation in addressing this concern was a major reason for establishing the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP). In pelagic longline fisheries seabirds are killed when they become hooked or entangled and drowned while foraging for baits on longline hooks as the gear is deployed. Seabirds can also be hooked or entangled as the gear is hauled; however, many of these seabirds can be released alive with careful handling.

There have been significant efforts internationally to develop mitigation measures to avoid or minimise the risk of incidental catch of seabirds in longline fisheries. Although most mitigation measures are broadly applicable, the application and specifications of some will vary with local methods and gear configurations. ACAP has comprehensively reviewed the scientific literature dealing with seabird bycatch mitigation in pelagic longline fisheries (see review section below) and this document is a summary of the advice informed by the review. Most of this scientific literature relates to large vessels, with lesser research attention given to small vessels and gear configurations and methods used in artisanal or semi-industrial fleets. Seabird bycatch mitigation advice for these fisheries is currently under development.

This document provides advice about best practices for reducing the impact of pelagic longline fishing on seabirds. ACAP's best practice advice is that the simultaneous use of weighted branch lines, bird scaring lines and night setting is the most effective approach to mitigate seabird bycatch in pelagic longline fisheries. Three hook-shielding devices, the 'Hookpod-LED', 'Hookpod-mini' and the 'Smart Tuna Hook', and one underwater bait setting device, the 'Underwater Bait Setter (Skadia Technologies)' have recently been assessed and on the basis of this assessment have been included in the list of best practice measures for mitigating seabird bycatch in pelagic longline fisheries. These best practice bycatch mitigation measures should be applied in areas where fishing effort overlaps with seabirds vulnerable to bycatch to

reduce the incidental mortality to the lowest possible levels. The ACAP review process recognises that factors such as safety, practicality and the characteristics of the fishery should also be considered when assessing the efficacy of seabird bycatch mitigation measures and consequently in the development of advice and guidelines on best practice.

This document also provides information regarding measures that are currently under active development, and which show promise as future best practices in pelagic longline fisheries. ACAP will continue to monitor the development of these improving practices and the results of scientific research about their effectiveness.

Additionally, this document provides information about mitigation measures that are not recommended. A wide range of potential seabird bycatch mitigation measures have been proposed over time; however, not all of these have proven effective. ACAP considers that certain mitigation measures are ineffective, based either on scientific studies, or a lack of evidence in substantiation of claims made about the mitigation measure.

The document comprises two components. The first component provides a summary of ACAP's advice regarding best practice measures for reducing seabird bycatch in pelagic longline fisheries, and the second component outlines the review of mitigation measures that have been assessed for pelagic longline fisheries.



Agreement on the Conservation
of Albatrosses and Petrels

ACAP Summary Advice for Reducing the Impact of Pelagic Longline Fisheries on Seabirds

*Reviewed at the Thirteenth Meeting of the Advisory Committee
Edinburgh, United Kingdom, 22-26 May 2023*

BEST PRACTICE MEASURES

ACAP recommends that the most effective way to reduce seabird bycatch in pelagic longline fisheries is to use the following three best practice measures **simultaneously: branch line weighting, night setting and bird scaring lines**. Alternatively, the use of an assessed hook-shielding device or underwater bait setting device is recommended. A hook-shielding device encases the point and barb of baited hooks until a prescribed depth or immersion time has been reached, and an underwater bait setting device deploys encapsulated baited hooks at the stern of the vessel releasing the baited hooks at a pre-determined depth. These devices are designed to release baited hooks at a depth beyond the diving range of most seabirds to avoid or minimise the risk of seabirds gaining access to the hook and becoming hooked during line setting.

The simultaneous use of the three ACAP recommended mitigation measures optimise seabird bycatch reduction in longline fisheries. All three recommended measures are demonstrated to be effective; however, each have limitations when used alone. There is a period of time when hooks are accessible to birds even when branch lines are weighted. Night setting used alone is less effective at reducing seabird bycatch for nocturnally active birds and during bright moon light conditions. Bird scaring lines used alone can rarely protect baited hooks beyond the aerial extent of the line. Consequently, the simultaneous use of the three ACAP recommended seabird bycatch mitigation measures compensate for these limitations.

1. Branch line weighting

Branch lines should be weighted to sink the baited hooks rapidly out of the diving range of feeding seabirds. Studies have demonstrated that branch line weighting where there is more mass closer to the hooks, sink most rapidly and consistently; thereby, dramatically reducing seabird attacks on baits and most likely reducing mortalities. Studies of a range of weighting regimes, including placing weights at the hook, have shown no negative effect on target catch rates. Continued refinement of line weighting configurations (mass, number and position of weights and materials) with regard to effectively reducing seabird bycatch and safety concerns through controlled research and application in fisheries, is encouraged.

Increased weighting will shorten but not eliminate the distance behind the vessel in which birds can be caught. Line weighting has been shown to improve the effectiveness of other mitigation methods such as night setting and bird scaring lines, in reducing seabird bycatch. Priority should be accorded to line weighting, providing certain pre-conditions can be met, among other things: (a) weighting regime adequately specified; (b) safety issues adequately addressed; and (c) issues concerning application to artisanal fisheries being considered.

Current recommended minimum standards for branch line weighting configurations include the following:

- (a) 40 g or greater attached within 0.5 m of the hook; or
- (b) 60 g or greater attached within 1 m of the hook; or
- (c) 80 g or greater attached within 2 m of the hook.

Line weighting is integral to the fishing gear and, compared to bird scaring lines and night setting, has the advantage of being more consistently implemented, hence facilitating compliance and port monitoring.

2. Night setting

Setting longlines at night (defined as the time between the end of nautical twilight and before nautical dawn as set out in the Nautical Almanac tables for relevant latitude, local time and date) is highly effective at reducing incidental mortality of seabirds because the majority of vulnerable seabirds are inactive at night. However, night setting is not as effective for crepuscular/ nocturnal foragers (e.g. White-chinned Petrels *Procellaria aequinoctialis*). The effectiveness of this measure may be reduced during bright moonlight and when using intense deck lights, and is less practical in high latitudes during summer, when the time between nautical dusk and dawn is limited.

Night setting is recognised as consistently defined, widely reflected in conservation and management measures and has benefit as a primary mitigation measure, as it has the potential for compliance monitoring through VMS and other tools.

3. Bird scaring lines

Properly designed and deployed bird scaring lines (BSLs) deter birds from sinking baits, dramatically reducing seabird attacks and related mortalities. A bird scaring line runs from a high point at the stern to a device or mechanism that creates drag at its terminus. Brightly coloured streamers hanging from the aerial extent of the line scare birds from flying to and under the line, preventing them from reaching the baited hooks.

BSLs should be the lightest practical strong fine line. Lines should be attached to the vessel with a barrel swivel to minimise rotation of the line from torque created as it is dragged behind the vessel. Long streamers should be attached with a swivel to prevent them from rolling up onto the BSL. Towed objects should be attached at the terminus of the BSL to increase drag. BSLs are at risk of tangling with float lines leading to lost bird scaring lines, interruptions in vessel operations and in some cases lost fishing gear. Alternatives, such as adding short streamers to the in-water portion of the line, can enhance drag while minimising tangles with float lines. Weak links (breakaways) should be incorporated into the in-water portion of the

line for safety reasons and to minimize operational problems associated with lines becoming tangled.

It is recommended to use a weak link to allow the BSL to break-away from the vessel in the event of a tangle with the main line, and, a secondary attachment between the bird scaring line and the vessel to allow the tangled BSL to be subsequently attached to mainline and recovered during the haul.

Sufficient drag must be created to maximise aerial extent and maintain the line directly behind the vessel during crosswinds. To avoid tangling, this is best achieved using a long in-water section of rope or monofilament.

Given operational differences in pelagic longline fisheries due to vessel size and gear type, bird scaring lines specifications have been divided into recommendations for vessels greater than 35 metres and those less than 35 metres in length.

3. a) Recommendations for vessels ≥ 35 m total length

Simultaneous use of two BSLs, one on each side of the sinking longline, provides maximum protection from bird attacks under different wind conditions. The setup for BSLs should be as follows:

- BSLs should be deployed to maximise the aerial extent, which is a function of vessel speed, height of the attachment point to the vessel, drag, and weight of bird scaring line materials.
- To achieve a minimum recommended aerial extent of 100 m, BSLs should be attached to the vessel such that they are suspended from a point a minimum of 8 m above the water at the stern.
- BSLs should contain a mix of brightly coloured long and short streamers placed at intervals of no more than 5 m. Long streamers should be attached to the line with swivels to prevent streamers from wrapping around the line. All long streamers should reach the sea-surface in calm conditions.
- Baited hooks should be deployed within the area bounded by the two BSLs. If using bait-casting machines, they should be adjusted so as to land baited hooks within the area bounded by the BSLs.

If large vessels use only one BSL, it should be deployed windward of the sinking baits. If baited hooks are set outboard of the wake, the BSL attachment point to the vessel should be positioned several metres outboard of the side of the vessel that baits are deployed.

3. b) Recommendations for vessels < 35 m total length

Two designs have been shown to be effective:

1. a design with a mix of long and short streamers, that includes long streamers placed at 5 m intervals over at least the first 55 m of the BSL. Streamers may be modified over the first 15 m to avoid tangling, and
2. a design that does not include long streamers. Short streamers (no less than 1 m in length) should be placed at 1 m intervals along the length of the aerial extent.

In all cases, streamers should be brightly coloured. To achieve a minimum recommended aerial extent of 75 m, BSLs should be attached to the vessel such that they are suspended from a point a minimum of 6 m above the water at the stern.

4. Hook-shielding devices

Hook-shielding devices encase the point and barb of baited hooks to prevent seabird attacks during line setting until a prescribed depth is reached (a minimum of 10 metres), or until after a minimum period of immersion has occurred (a minimum of 10 minutes) that ensures that baited hooks are released beyond the foraging depth of most seabirds. The following performance requirements are used by ACAP to assess the efficacy of hook-shielding devices in reducing seabird bycatch:

- (a) the device shields the hook until a prescribed depth of 10 m or immersion time of 10 minutes is reached;
- (b) the device meets current recommended minimum standards for branch line weighting described in Section 1; and
- (c) experimental research has been undertaken to allow assessment of the effectiveness, efficiency and practicality of the technology against the ACAP best practice seabird bycatch mitigation criteria developed for assessing and recommending best practice advice on seabird bycatch mitigation measures.

Devices assessed as having met the performance requirements listed above will be considered best practice. At this time, the following devices have been assessed as meeting these performance requirements and are therefore considered to represent best practice:

1. **'Hookpod-LED'** – 68 g minimum weight that is positioned at the hook, encapsulating the barb and point of the hook during setting, and remains attached until it reaches 10 m in depth, when the hook is released (Barrington 2016a, Sullivan *et al.* 2018.).
2. **'Hookpod-mini'** – 48 g minimum weight that is positioned at the hook, encapsulating the barb and point of the hook during setting, and remains attached until it reaches 10 m in depth, when the hook is released (Goad *et al.* 2019, Gianuca *et al.* 2021, Sullivan & Barrington 2021).
3. **'Smart Tuna Hook'** – 40 g minimum weight that is positioned at the hook, encapsulating the barb and point of the hook during setting, and remains attached for a minimum period of 10 minutes after setting, when the hook is released (Baker *et al.* 2016, Barrington 2016b)

The assessment of these devices as best practice is conditional on continuing to meet the above performance requirements.

5. Underwater Bait Setting devices

Underwater Bait Setting devices deploy baited hooks at a pre-determined depth immediately at the stern of the vessel. Underwater Bait Setting devices deploy baited hooks individually underwater down a track fitted to the fishing vessel's transom enclosed in a capsule or similar device to eliminate any visual stimulus for seabirds following the vessel. The capsule is pulled quickly underwater to a predetermined target depth that can be adjusted in response to the

dive capabilities of seabirds attending the vessel during line setting to prevent interactions. The following performance requirements are used by ACAP to assess the efficacy of underwater bait setting devices in reducing seabird bycatch:

- (a) the device deploys encapsulated hooks in a vertical manner at the stern of the vessel until a minimum prescribed depth of 5 m is reached;
- (b) branch lines meet current recommended minimum standards for branch line weighting described in Section 1; and
- (c) experimental research has been undertaken to allow assessment of the effectiveness, efficiency and practicality of the technology against the ACAP best practice seabird bycatch mitigation criteria developed for assessing and recommending best practice advice on seabird bycatch mitigation measures.

Devices assessed as having met the performance requirements listed above will be considered best practice. At this time, the following device has been assessed as meeting these performance requirements and is therefore considered to represent best practice:

1. **'Underwater Bait Setter (Skadia Technologies)'** – a computer operated and hydraulically powered machine that deploys baited hooks individually underwater in a capsule, and where recommended minimum standards for branch line weighting are met. The capsule is pulled down a removable track fitted to the vessel's transom and then catapulted to a target depth. The capsule descends along the track at $6 \text{ m}\cdot\text{sec}^{-1}$ and thereafter at $\geq 3 \text{ m}\cdot\text{sec}^{-1}$ (Robertson *et al.* 2015, Robertson *et al.* 2018, Barrington 2021).

The assessment of an Underwater Bait Setting device as best practice is conditional on the device continuing to meet the above performance requirements.

6. Time-Area fishery closures

The temporary closure of important seabird foraging areas (e.g. areas adjacent to important seabird colonies during the breeding season or highly productive waters when large numbers of aggressively feeding seabirds are present) to fishing will eliminate incidental mortality of seabirds in that area.

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

Side-setting with line weighting and bird curtain (North Pacific): Research conducted in the North Pacific indicates that side-setting was more effective than other simultaneously trialled mitigation measures, including setting chutes and blue-dyed bait (Gilman *et al.*, 2003b). It should be noted that these tests were conducted in a single pilot scale trial of 14 days in the Hawaiian pelagic longline fishery for tuna and swordfish with an assemblage of surface-feeding seabirds. This method requires testing in the Southern Ocean with deeper-diving species and at a larger spatial scale, before it can be considered as a recommended approach beyond the pilot fishery.

Side-setting **must** be used in combination with ACAP best practice recommendations for line weighting in order to increase sink rates forward of the vessel's stern, and hooks should be cast well forward of the setting position, but close to the hull of the vessel, to allow hooks time to sink as far as possible before they reach the stern. Bird curtains, a horizontal pole with vertical streamers, positioned aft of the setting station, may deter birds from flying close to the side of the vessel. The combined use of side-setting, line weighting and a bird curtain should be considered as a single measure.

Mainline tension: Setting longlines into propeller turbulence (wake) should be avoided because it slows the sink rates of baited hooks.

Live vs. dead bait: Use of live bait should be avoided. Individual live baits can remain near the water surface for extended periods, thus increasing the likelihood of seabird captures.

Hook mass and design: Changes to hook mass and design may reduce the chance of seabird mortality in longline fisheries but have not been adequately studied.

Bait hooking position: Baits hooked in either the head (fish), or tail (fish and squid) are recommended because they sink significantly faster than baits hooked in the mid-back (fish) or upper mantle (squid).

Offal and discard discharge management: Offal and discards should not be discharged during line setting. During line hauling, offal and used baits should preferably be retained or discharged on the opposite side of the vessel from that on which the line is hauled. All hooks should be removed and retained on board before discards are discharged from the vessel.

MITIGATION MEASURES THAT ARE NOT RECOMMENDED

ACAP considers that the following measures lack scientific substantiation as technologies or procedures for reducing the impact of pelagic longlines on seabirds.

Line shooters: No experimental evidence of effectiveness in pelagic longline fisheries.

Olfactory deterrents: No evidence of effectiveness in pelagic longline fisheries.

Blue dyed bait: No experimental evidence of effectiveness in pelagic longline fisheries. Insufficiently researched.

Bait thaw status: No evidence that the thaw status of baits has any effect on the sink rate of baited hooks set on weighted lines.

Laser technology: There is currently no evidence of effectiveness, and serious concerns remain regarding the potential impacts on the health of individual birds.

The ACAP review of seabird bycatch mitigation measures for pelagic longline fisheries is presented in the following section.



Agreement on the Conservation
of Albatrosses and Petrels

ACAP Review of Seabird Bycatch Mitigation Measures for Pelagic Longline Fisheries

*Reviewed at the Thirteenth Meeting of the Advisory Committee
Edinburgh, United Kingdom, 22-26 May 2023*

INTRODUCTION

A range of technical and operational mitigation methods have been designed or adapted for use in pelagic longline fisheries to reduce incidental mortality of seabirds. Operationally, peak areas and periods of seabird foraging activity should be avoided. Effective technical methods include actively deterring birds from, and minimising the visibility of, baited hooks. Vessels need to be made less attractive to birds, and the distance astern and time baited hooks are available to birds should be reduced. Mitigation methods need to be easy and safe to implement, cost effective, enforceable and should not reduce catch rates of target species or increase the bycatch rates of other protected species.

The feasibility, effectiveness and specifications of mitigation measures may vary by area, seabird assemblage, fishery, vessel size, and gear configuration. Some of the mitigation methods are well established and explicitly prescribed in pelagic longline fisheries; however, additional measures are undergoing further testing and refinements.

The Seabird Bycatch Working Group (SBWG) of ACAP has comprehensively reviewed the scientific literature dealing with seabird bycatch mitigation in pelagic fisheries and this document is a distillation of that review. Currently, simultaneous use of weighted branch lines, bird scaring lines and night setting, or use of one of the assessed hook-shielding and underwater bait setting devices, is considered best practice mitigation for reducing seabird bycatch in pelagic longline fisheries. Three hook-shielding devices (the 'Hookpod-LED', the 'Hookpod-mini' and the 'Smart Tuna Hook') and one underwater bait setting device (the 'Underwater Bait Setter (Skadia Technologies)') have been assessed.

THE ACAP REVIEW PROCESS

At each of its meetings, the ACAP SBWG considers any new research or information pertaining to seabird bycatch mitigation in pelagic longline fisheries. The following criteria are used by ACAP to guide the assessment process, and to determine whether a particular fishing technology or measure can be considered best practice to reduce the incidental mortality of albatrosses and petrels in fishing operations.

Best Practice Seabird Bycatch Mitigation Criteria and Definition

- i. Individual fishing technologies and techniques should be selected from those shown by experimental research to significantly³ reduce the rate of seabird incidental mortality⁴ to the lowest achievable levels. Experimental research yields definitive results when performance of candidate mitigation technologies is compared to a control (no deterrent), or to status quo in the fishery. When testing relative performance of mitigation approaches, analysis of fishery observer data can be plagued with a myriad of confounding factors. Where a significant relationship is demonstrated between seabird behaviour and seabird mortality in a particular system or seabird assemblage, significant reductions in seabird behaviours, such as the rate of seabirds attacking baited hooks, can serve as a proxy for reduced seabird mortality. Ideally, where simultaneous use of fishing technologies and practices is recommended as best practice, research should demonstrate significantly improved performance of the combined measures.
- ii. Fishing technologies and techniques, or a combination thereof, should have clear and proven specifications and minimum performance standards for their deployment and use. Examples would include: specific bird scaring line designs (lengths, streamer length and materials; etc.), number (one vs. two) and deployment specifications (such as aerial extent and timing of deployment); night fishing defined by the time between the end of nautical dusk and start of nautical dawn; and, line weighting configurations specifying mass and placement of weights or weighted sections.
- iii. Fishing technologies and techniques should be demonstrated to be practical, cost effective and widely available. Commercial fishing operators are likely to select for seabird bycatch reduction measures and devices that meet these criteria including practical aspects concerning safe fishing practices at sea.
- iv. Fishing technologies and techniques should, to the extent practicable, maintain catch rates of target species. This approach should increase the likelihood of acceptance and compliance by fishers.
- v. Fishing technologies and techniques should, to the extent practicable not increase the bycatch of other taxa. For example, measures that increase the likelihood of catching other protected species such as sea turtles, sharks and marine mammals, should not be considered best practice (or only so in exceptional circumstances).
- vi. Minimum performance standards and methods of ensuring compliance should be provided for fishing technologies and techniques, and clearly specified in fishery regulations. Relatively simple methods to check compliance should include, but not be limited to, port inspections of branch lines to determine compliance with branch line weighting, determination of the presence of davits (tori poles) to support bird scaring lines, and inspections of bird scaring lines for conformance with design requirements. Compliance monitoring and reporting should be a high priority for enforcement authorities.

³ Any use of the word 'significant' in this document is meant in the statistical context

⁴ This may be determined by either a direct reduction in seabird mortality or by reduction in seabird attack rates, as a proxy

On the basis of these criteria, the scientific evidence for the effectiveness of mitigation measures or fishing technologies/techniques in reducing seabird bycatch is assessed, and explicit information is provided on whether the measure is recommended as being effective, and thus considered best practice, or not. The ACAP review also indicates whether the measure needs to be combined with additional measures, and provides notes and caveats for each measure, together with information on performance standards and further research needs. Following each meeting of ACAP's SBWG and Advisory Committee, this review document and ACAP's best practice advice, is updated (if required). A summary of ACAP's current best practice advice is provided in the preceding section of this document.

SEABIRD BYCATCH MITIGATION FACT SHEETS

A series of seabird bycatch mitigation fact sheets have been developed by ACAP and BirdLife International to provide practical information, including illustrations, on seabird bycatch mitigation measures (<https://www.acap.aq/resources/bycatch-mitigation/mitigation-fact-sheets>). The sheets, which include information on the effectiveness of the specific measure, their limitations and strengths and best practice recommendations for their effective adoption, are linked to the ACAP review process, and are updated following ACAP reviews. Links to the available fact sheets are provided in the relevant sections below. The mitigation fact sheets are currently available in [English](#), [French](#), [Spanish](#), [Portuguese](#), [Japanese](#), [Korean](#), [Simplified Chinese](#), [Traditional Chinese](#), and [Indonesian](#).

BEST PRACTICE MEASURES

1. Branch line weighting

Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries

Proven and recommended mitigation method. Should be used in combination with night setting and bird scaring lines (Brothers 1991; Boggs 2001; Sakai *et al.* 2001; Brothers *et al.* 2001; Anderson & McArdle 2002; Hu *et al.* 2005; Melvin *et al.* 2013; 2014, Jiménez *et al.* 2017; 2019).

Notes and Caveats

Branch lines should be weighted to sink the baited hooks rapidly out of the diving range of feeding seabirds. Studies have demonstrated that branch line weighting where there is more mass closer to the hooks, results in hooks sinking most rapidly and consistently (Gianuca *et al.* 2011; Robertson *et al.* 2010a; 2013; Barrington *et al.* 2016), and reduces seabird attacks on baits (Gianuca *et al.* 2011; Ochi *et al.* 2013, Jiménez *et al.* 2019) as well as seabird mortalities (Jiménez *et al.* 2017; 2019; Santos *et al.* 2019). Studies of a range of weighting regimes have shown no negative effect on target catch rates (Jiménez *et al.* 2013; 2017; 2019; Robertson *et al.* 2013; Gianuca *et al.* 2013; Santos *et al.* 2019). However, an experimental weighted fishing hook, with a mass of 32 g added to the shank of the hook, showed a decrease in the catch rates of pooled retained species (Gilman *et al.* 2022).

Increased weighting will shorten but not eliminate the distance behind the vessel in which birds can be caught. Line weighting has been shown to improve the effectiveness of other mitigation methods such as night setting and bird scaring lines, in reducing seabird bycatch (Brothers 1991; Boggs 2001; Sakai *et al.* 2001; Anderson & McArdle 2002; Gilman *et al.* 2003a, Hu *et al.* 2005; Melvin *et al.* 2013; 2014). Line weighting is integral to the fishing gear and, compared to bird scaring lines and night setting, has the advantage of being more consistently implemented, hence facilitating compliance and port monitoring. On this basis it is important to enhance the priority accorded to line weighting, providing certain pre-conditions can be met, among other things: (a) that the weighting regime is adequately specified; (b) safety issues are adequately addressed; and (c) issues concerning application to artisanal fisheries are being considered.

Minimum standards

On the basis of sink-rate data (Barrington *et al.* 2016) and seabird attack and bycatch rates (Gianuca *et al.* 2011; Jiménez *et al.* 2019; Santos *et al.* 2019), current recommended minimum standards for branch line weighting are as follows:

- (a) 40 g or greater attached within 0.5 m of the hook; or
- (b) 60 g or greater attached within 1 m of the hook; or
- (c) 80 g or greater attached within 2 m of the hook.

Need for combination

Should be combined with bird scaring lines and night setting. There is a period of time when hooks are accessible to birds even when branch lines are weighted.

Implementation monitoring

Vessels <35 m total length: Line weights crimped into branch lines are very difficult to remove at sea. Inspection before departure from port of all gear bins on vessels is therefore considered an acceptable form of implementation monitoring.

Vessels ≥35 m total length: It is possible to remove and/or re-configure gear at sea. Consequently, implementation monitoring requires using appropriate methods (e.g., observer inspection of line setting operations; video surveillance; at-sea compliance checks). Video surveillance may be possible, subject to the mainline setter being fitted with motion sensors to trigger cameras.

Research needs

Continued refinement of line weighting configurations (mass, number and position of weights and materials) with regard to effectively reducing seabird bycatch and safety concerns, through controlled research and application in fisheries, is encouraged. Studies should also include evaluations of the effects of branch line weighting on the catch rate of pelagic fish and provide data that allow evaluation of the relative safety and practicality attributes of various weighting configurations.

Mitigation Fact Sheet

<https://www.acap.aq/bycatch-mitigation/bycatch-mitigation-fact-sheets>

2. Night setting

Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries

Proven and recommended mitigation method. Should be used in combination with weighted branch lines and bird scaring lines (Duckworth 1995; Gales *et al.* 1998; Klaer & Polacheck 1998; Brothers *et al.* 1999; McNamara *et al.* 1999; Gilman *et al.* 2005; 2023; Baker & Wise 2005; Jiménez *et al.* 2009; 2014; 2020; Melvin *et al.* 2013; 2014; Rollinson *et al.* 2016; Rollinson 2017; Melvin *et al.* 2023, Meyer & MacKenzie 2022).

Notes and Caveats

Setting longlines at night (defined as the time between the end of nautical twilight and before nautical dawn as set out in the Nautical Almanac tables for relevant latitude, local time and date) is highly effective at reducing incidental mortality of seabirds because the majority of vulnerable seabirds are inactive at night. For example, a Pacific Ocean albacore tuna longline fishery had dramatically lower albatross bycatch rates when making sets completely at night compared to sets made partially in the daytime, with no reduction in the target species catch rate (Gilman *et al.* 2023). Night setting is not as effective for crepuscular/ nocturnal foragers (e.g. White-chinned Petrels *Procellaria aequinoctialis*). Consequently, night setting should be used in combination with weighted branch lines and bird scaring lines (Klaer & Polacheck 1998; Brothers *et al.* 1999; McNamara *et al.* 1999; Gilman *et al.* 2005; Baker & Wise 2005; Jiménez *et al.* 2009; 2014; 2020; Melvin *et al.* 2013; 2014). The effectiveness of this measure may be reduced during bright moonlight and when using intense deck lights, and is less practical in high latitudes during summer, when the time between nautical dusk and dawn is limited.

Minimum standards

No setting should take place between nautical dawn and nautical dusk. Nautical dawn and nautical dusk are defined as set out in the Nautical Almanac tables for relevant latitude, local time and date. Setting longlines across night and day does not represent night setting: either when setting commences at night and finishes after the nautical dawn, or when setting commences prior to the nautical dusk and continues into the night.

Need for combination

Should be used in combination with bird scaring lines and weighted branch lines. Night setting used alone is less effective at reducing seabird bycatch for nocturnally active birds and during bright moon light conditions.

Implementation monitoring

Requires Vessel Monitoring Systems (VMS) or fishery observers. Vessel speed and direction vary between transiting, line setting, line hauling and when vessels are stationary on fishing grounds. VMS-derived assessment of vessel activity in relation to time of nautical dawn and dusk are considered acceptable for implementation monitoring. Alternatively, VMS-linked sensors fitted to mainline setting and hauling drum could be used to indicate compliance, as could sensors to trigger video surveillance cameras. This facility is currently unavailable and requires development.

Research needs

Assessing the effectiveness of bird scaring lines and branch line weighting at night needs to be determined, possibly by way of using thermal or night vision technologies.

Mitigation Fact Sheet

<https://www.acap.aq/en/bycatch-mitigation/bycatch-mitigation-fact-sheets/1824-fs-05-demersal-pelagic-longline-night-setting/file>

3.a Bird scaring lines for vessels ≥ 35 m in total length

Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries

Proven and recommended mitigation method. Should be used in combination with weighted branch lines and night setting. (Imber 1994; Uozumi & Takeuchi 1998; Brothers *et al.* 1999; Klaer & Polacheck 1998; McNamara *et al.* 1999; Boggs 2001; CCAMLR 2002; Minami & Kiyota 2004; Melvin 2003; Rollinson *et al.* 2016; Rollinson 2017). For vessels ≥ 35 m in length, the use of two bird scaring lines (BSLs) is considered best practice. BSLs with the appropriate aerial extent can be more easily rigged on large vessels. Two BSLs are considered to provide better protection of baited hooks in crosswinds than single BSLs (Melvin *et al.* 2004; 2013; 2014; Sato *et al.* 2013). Hybrid BSLs (with long and short streamers) are more effective than BSLs with short streamers only in deterring diving seabirds (e.g. White-chinned Petrels *Procellaria aequinoctialis*, Melvin *et al.* 2010; 2013; 2014).

Notes and Caveats

Properly designed and deployed BSLs deter birds from sinking baits, dramatically reducing seabird attacks and related mortalities. A bird scaring line runs from a high point at the stern to a device or mechanism that creates drag at its terminus. Brightly coloured streamers hanging from the aerial extent of the line scare birds from flying to and under the line, preventing them from reaching the baited hooks. It is important to note that the BSLs only provide protection to the baited hooks within the area protected by its aerial extent. This is why it is particularly important to use BSLs in combination with weighted branch lines (and night setting), which ensure that the baited hooks have sunk beneath the diving depth of most seabirds beyond the aerial extent of the BSLs. The presence of diving species increases the vulnerability of surface foragers (e.g., albatrosses) due to secondary interactions (i.e. albatrosses attacking baited hooks that are brought back to the surface by diving birds).

BSLs should be the lightest practical strong fine line. Lines should be attached to the vessel with a barrel swivel to minimise rotation of the line from torque created as it is dragged behind the vessel. Long streamers should be attached with a swivel to prevent them from rolling up onto the BSL. BSLs are at risk of tangling with float lines leading to lost BSLs, interruptions in vessel operations and in some cases lost fishing gear.

BSLs potentially increase the likelihood of entanglements, particularly if the attachment points on davits (tori poles) are insufficiently outboard of vessels. To achieve a minimum aerial extent BSLs should be attached to the vessel such that it is suspended from a point a minimum of 8 m above the water at the stern. Attaching towed objects to the terminus of the in-water extent of bird scaring lines to increase drag has proven problematic in pelagic longline fisheries, as float lines tend to tangle with bird scaring lines. For this reason, the addition of short streamers woven into the in-water extent of the bird scaring line or lengthening or increasing the diameter

of the in-water extent, are encouraged to increased drag while minimizing tangles. Weak links (breakaways) should be incorporated into the in-water portion of the line for safety reasons and to minimize operational problems associated with lines becoming tangled.

Minimum standards

Simultaneous use of two BSLs, one on each side of the sinking longline, provides maximum protection from bird attacks under different wind conditions (Melvin *et al.* 2004; 2013; 2014; Sato *et al.* 2013). The setup for BSLs should be as follows:

- BSLs should be deployed to maximise the aerial extent, which is a function of vessel speed, height of the attachment point to the vessel, drag, and weight of bird scaring line materials.
- To achieve a minimum recommended aerial extent of 100 m, BSLs should be attached to the vessel such that they are suspended from a point a minimum of 8 m above the water at the stern.
- BSLs should contain a mix of brightly coloured long and short streamers placed at intervals of no more than 5 m. Long streamers should be attached to the line with swivels to prevent streamers from wrapping around the line. All long streamers should reach the sea-surface in calm conditions.
- Baited hooks should be deployed within the area bounded by the two BSLs. If using bait-casting machines, they should be adjusted so as to land baited hooks within the area bounded by the BSLs.

If large vessels use only one BSL, it should be deployed windward of the sinking baits. If baited hooks are set outboard of the wake, the BSL attachment point to the vessel should be positioned several meters outboard of the side of the vessel that baits are deployed.

Need for combination

Should be used in combination with appropriate line weighting and night setting. BSLs used alone can rarely protect baited hooks beyond the aerial extent of the line.

Implementation monitoring

Requires fisheries observers, video surveillance or at-sea surveillance (e.g. patrol boats or aerial over-flights).

Research needs

Developing methods that minimise entanglements of the in-water portion of BSLs with longline floats remains the highest priority for research on bird-scaring lines. Other research priorities include: (1) evaluating the effectiveness of one vs. two BSLs; and, (2) BSLs design features including streamer lengths, configurations and materials.

Mitigation Fact Sheet

<https://www.acap.aq/en/bycatch-mitigation/bycatch-mitigation-fact-sheets/1497-fs-07a-pelagic-longline-streamer-lines-vessels-35-m/file>

3.b Bird scaring lines for vessels <35m in total length

Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries

Proven and recommended mitigation method. For vessels <35 m in length, a single BSL in combination with night setting and appropriate line weighting, has been found to be effective for mixed and short BSLs (ATF 2011; Domingo *et al.* 2017, Gianuca *et al.* 2011, Meyer & MacKenzie 2022).

Notes and Caveats

Vessels <35 m total length should deploy BSLs with a minimum aerial extent of 75 m. To achieve this minimum aerial extent, BSLs should be attached to the vessel such that it is suspended from a point a minimum of 6 m above the water at the stern. Sufficient drag must be created to maximise aerial extent and maintain the line directly behind the vessel during crosswinds. This may be achieved using either towed devices or longer in-water sections (Goad & Debski 2017). Diving species increase vulnerability of surface foragers (albatrosses) due to secondary interactions.

Minimum standards

To achieve a minimum recommended aerial extent of 75 m, BSLs should be attached to the vessel such that they are suspended from a point a minimum of 6 m above the water at the stern. Short streamers (>1 m) should be placed at 1 m intervals along the length of the aerial extent. Two designs have been shown to be effective:

- (i) a mixed design that includes long and short streamers. Long streamers should be placed at 5 m intervals over at least the first 55 m of the BSL (Domingo *et al.* 2017). Streamers may be modified over the first 15 m to avoid tangling (Goad & Debski 2017); and,
- (ii) a design that only includes short streamers. In all cases, BSLs should be brightly coloured and the lightest practical strong fine line. Lines should be attached to the vessel with a barrel swivel to minimise rotation of the line from torque (created as it is dragged behind the vessel).

Sufficient drag must be created to maximise aerial extent and maintain the line directly behind the vessel during crosswinds. To avoid tangling, this is best achieved using a long in-water section of rope or monofilament. Alternatively, short streamers can be tied into the line to 'bristle' the line (creating a bottlebrush like configuration) to generate drag while minimising the chance of fouling streamer lines on float lines.

To minimise safety and operational problems it is recommended to use a weak link to allow the bird scaring line to break-away from the vessel in the event of a tangle with the main line, and, a secondary attachment between the bird scaring line and the vessel to allow the tangled bird scaring line to be subsequently attached to mainline and recovered during the haul (Goad & Debski 2017).

Need for combination

Should be used with appropriate line weighting and night setting. BSLs used alone can rarely protect baited hooks beyond the aerial extent of the line.

Implementation monitoring

Requires fisheries observers, video surveillance, or at-sea surveillance (e.g. patrol boats or aerial over-flights).

Research needs

Developing methods that minimise entanglements of the in-water portion of BSLs with longline floats remains the highest priority for research on bird-scaring lines. Other research priorities include: (i) evaluating the effectiveness of one vs. two BSL, (ii) BSL design features including steamer lengths, configurations and materials, especially for very small vessels.

Mitigation Fact Sheet

<https://www.acap.aq/en/bycatch-mitigation/bycatch-mitigation-fact-sheets/1867-fs-07b-pelagic-longline-streamer-lines-vessels-less-than-35-m/file>

4. Hook-shielding devices

Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic longline fisheries

Proven and recommended mitigation method. Hook-shielding devices encase the point and barb of baited hooks to prevent seabird attacks during line setting until a prescribed depth is reached (a minimum of 10 meters), or until after a minimum period of immersion has occurred (a minimum of 10 minutes) that ensures that baited hooks are released beyond the foraging depth of most seabirds. The following performance requirements are used by ACAP to assess the efficacy of hook-shielding devices in reducing seabird bycatch:

- (a) the device shields the hook until a prescribed depth of 10 m or immersion time of 10 minutes is reached
- (b) the device meets current recommended minimum standards for branch line weighting described in Section 1
- (c) experimental research has been undertaken to allow assessment of the effectiveness, efficiency and practicality of the technology against the ACAP best practice seabird bycatch mitigation criteria developed for assessing and recommending best practice advice on seabird bycatch mitigation measures

At this time, the 'Hookpod-LED' (Sullivan *et al.* 2018, Barrington 2016a), 'Hookpod-mini' (Goad *et al.* 2019, Gianuca *et al.* 2021, Sullivan & Barrington 2021) and the 'Smart Tuna Hook' (Baker *et al.* 2016, Barrington 2016b) have been assessed as having met the performance requirements and are therefore considered to represent best practice.

Notes and Caveats

The assessment of these three devices as best practice is conditional on continuing to meet the above performance requirements.

Minimum standards

'Hookpod-LED' – 68 g minimum weight that is positioned at the hook, encapsulating the barb and point of the hook during setting, and remains attached until it reaches 10 m in depth, when the hook is released.

'Hookpod-mini' – 48 g minimum weight that is positioned at the hook, encapsulating the barb and point of the hook during setting, and remains attached until it reaches 10 m in depth, when the hook is released.

'Smart Tuna Hook' – 40 g minimum weight that is positioned at the hook, encapsulating the barb and point of the hook during setting, and remains attached for a minimum period of 10 minutes after setting, when the hook is released.

Need for combination

Both of these assessed hook-shielding devices have been designed as stand-alone measures that do not need to be combined with other mitigation measures. However, it is useful to note that they integrate two performance components: i) protecting and ii) increasing the sink rate of the baited hooks to reduce the opportunities for seabirds to access them.

Implementation monitoring

A combination of port-based inspections and vessel-based monitoring and surveillance (e.g. observer inspection of line setting operations; video surveillance; at-sea compliance checks) will be required to assess use and compliance.

Research needs

Conduct further field research to evaluate the relative contributions of the sink rates and hook protection components of hook-shielding devices in reducing seabird bycatch.

5. Underwater Bait Setting devices

Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic longline fisheries

Proven and recommended mitigation method. Underwater Bait Setting devices deploy baited hooks at a pre-determined depth immediately at the stern of the vessel. Underwater Bait Setting devices deploy baited hooks individually underwater down a track fitted to the fishing vessel's transom in a vertical manner enclosed in a capsule or similar device to eliminate any visual stimulus for seabirds following the vessel. The capsule is pulled quickly underwater to a predetermined target depth that can be adjusted in response to the dive capabilities of seabirds attending the vessel during line setting to prevent interactions. The following performance requirements are used by ACAP to assess the efficacy of underwater bait setting devices in reducing seabird bycatch:

- (a)** the device deploys encapsulated hooks in a vertical manner at the stern of the vessel until a minimum prescribed depth of 5 m is reached;
- (b)** branch lines meet current recommended minimum standards for branch line weighting described in Section 1; and
- (c)** experimental research has been undertaken to allow assessment of the effectiveness, efficiency and practicality of the technology against the ACAP best practice seabird bycatch mitigation criteria developed for assessing and recommending best practice advice on seabird bycatch mitigation measures.

At this time, the 'Underwater Bait Setter (Skadia Technologies)' (Robertson *et al.* 2015, Robertson *et al.* 2018, Barrington 2021) has been assessed as having met the performance requirements and are therefore considered to represent best practice.

Notes and Caveats

The assessment of this devices as best practice is conditional on continuing to meet the above performance requirements.

Minimum standards

'Underwater Bait Setter (Skadia Technologies)' – a computer operated and hydraulically powered machine that deploys baited hooks individually underwater in a capsule, and where recommended minimum standards for branch line weighting are met. The capsule is pulled down a removable track fitted to the vessel's transom and then catapulted to a target depth. The capsule descends along the track at 6 m.sec⁻¹ and thereafter at ≥3 m.sec⁻¹.

Need for combination

The assessed underwater bait setting device has been assessed on the basis that branch lines meet current recommended minimum standards for branch line weighting. However, it is useful to note that the device integrates two performance components: i) protecting and ii) increasing the sink rate of the baited hooks to reduce the opportunities for seabirds to access them.

Implementation monitoring

A combination of port-based inspections and vessel-based autonomous data collection and surveillance (e.g. observer inspection of line setting operations; autonomous electronic surveillance and data collection; at-sea compliance checks) will be required to assess use and compliance.

Research needs

Conduct further field research to evaluate the effect of shallow set (e.g. 4-5 m depth) baits and deep-set baits (e.g. 6-10 m depth) on seabird ship-following behaviour and attacks on bait with an Underwater Bait Setter (Skadia Technologies) in *constant* use. This was not assessed by Robertson et al. (2018) who set alternate groups of hooks underwater and groups of hooks at the surface to compare relative effects). Conduct further field research to evaluate the performance of the Underwater Bait Setter (Skadia Technologies) with unweighted branch lines.

6. Time - Area closures

Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries

Proven and recommended mitigation method. Avoiding fishing in peak areas and/or during periods of intense foraging activity, has been used effectively to reduce rapidly and substantially bycatch in longline fisheries.

Notes and Caveats

This is an important and effective management response, especially for high-risk areas, and when other measures prove ineffective. Although this can be highly effective in targeted

locations and/or during a specific season, time-area closures may displace fishing effort into areas that are not as well regulated, leading to greater incidental mortality levels.

Minimum standards

None defined, but highly recommended.

Need for combination

Must be combined with other measures, both in the targeted areas when they are subsequently opened again for fishing, and also in adjacent areas to ensure displacement of fishing effort does not merely lead to a spatial shift in the incidental mortality.

Implementation monitoring

Vessels equipped with VMS combined with monitoring of activities by appropriate management authority is considered appropriate monitoring. Areas/seasons should be patrolled to ensure effectiveness if Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) fishing activities are suspected.

Research needs

Further research is required on the seasonal variability in patterns of seabird distribution and behaviour in relation to fisheries, including whether closing areas to fishing causes a shift in the distribution of seabirds to adjacent areas.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

7. Side-setting with line weighting and bird curtain

Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries

Shown to be more effective than other simultaneously tested mitigation measures, including setting chutes and blue dyed bait, on relatively small vessels in the Hawaiian pelagic longline tuna and swordfish fisheries (Gilman *et al.* 2003b). **Effectiveness in southern hemisphere fisheries has not been researched and consequently it is not recommended as a proven mitigation measures in these fisheries at this time** (Brothers & Gilman 2006; Yokota & Kiyota 2006).

Notes and Caveats

Hooks must be sufficiently below the surface and protected by a bird curtain by the time they reach the stern of the vessel. In Hawaii, side-setting trials were conducted with a bird curtain and 45-60 g weighted swivels placed within 0.5 m of hooks. Japanese research concludes it must be used in combination with other measures (Yokota & Kiyota 2006). The Hawaiian trial was conducted in an area with an assemblage of largely surface-feeding seabirds, and this measure requires testing in other fisheries and areas where seabird abundance is higher and secondary ingestion (hooks retrieved by diving birds and secondarily – subsequently - attacked by surface foragers) is more important. Hence, it cannot be recommended for use in other fisheries at this time.

Minimum standards

Clear definition of side setting is required. Hawaiian definition is a minimum of only 1 m forward of the stern, which is likely to reduce effectiveness. The distance forward of the stern refers to the position from which baits are manually deployed. Baited hooks must be thrown by hand forward of the bait deployment location if they are to be afforded “protection” by being close to the side of the vessel.

Need for combination

Lines set from the side of vessels must be appropriately weighted in accordance with ACAP best practice advice and protected by an effective bird curtain.

Implementation monitoring

Requires fisheries observers or video surveillance.

Research needs

Currently untested in Southern Hemisphere fisheries against assemblages of diving seabirds (e.g. *Procellaria* sp. Petrels and *Puffinus* sp. Shearwaters) and albatrosses - urgent need for research.

Mitigation Fact Sheet

<https://www.acap.aq/en/bycatch-mitigation/bycatch-mitigation-fact-sheets/769-fs-09-pelagic-longline-side-setting/file>

8. Blue dyed bait

Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries

Unproven and not recommended as a mitigation method (Boggs 2001; Gilman *et al.* 2003b; Minami & Kiyota 2001; Minami & Kiyota 2004; Lydon & Starr 2005, Cocking *et al.* 2008; Ochi *et al.* 2011).

Notes and Caveats

The available data suggest only effective with squid bait (Cocking *et al.* 2008). Onboard dyeing requires labour and is difficult under stormy conditions. Results are inconsistent across studies.

Minimum standards

Mix to standardised colour placard or specify (e.g. use ‘Brilliant Blue’ food dye [Colour Index 42090, also known as Food Additive number E133] mixed at 0.5% for minimum 20 minutes).

Need for combination

Must be combined with bird scaring lines or night setting.

Implementation monitoring

The current practice of dyeing bait on board vessels at sea requires observer presence or video surveillance to monitor implementation. Assessment of implementation in the absence

of on-board observers or video surveillance requires baits be dyed on land and monitored through port inspection of all bait on vessels prior to departure on fishing trips.

Research needs

Further testing is needed in the Southern Ocean.

Mitigation Fact Sheet

<https://www.acap.aq/en/bycatch-mitigation/bycatch-mitigation-fact-sheets/770-fs-10-pelagic-longline-blue-dyded-bait-squid/file>

9. Line shooter

Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries

Unproven and not recommended as a mitigation measure (Robertson *et al.* 2010b).

Notes and Caveats

Use of a line shooter to set gear deep cannot be considered a mitigation measure. Mainline set into propeller turbulence with a line shooter without tension astern (e.g. slack), as is the case in deep setting, significantly slows the sink rates of hooks (Robertson *et al.* 2010b).

Minimum standards

Not Applicable.

Need for combination

Not Applicable.

Implementation monitoring

Not Applicable.

Research needs

Not Applicable.

Mitigation Fact Sheet

<https://www.acap.aq/en/bycatch-mitigation/bycatch-mitigation-fact-sheets/771-fs-11-pelagic-longline-bait-caster-and-line-shooter/file>

10. Bait caster

Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries

Unproven and not recommended as a mitigation measure (Duckworth 1995; Klaer & Polacheck 1998).

Notes and Caveats

Not a mitigation measure unless bait casting machines are available with the capability to control the distance at which baits are cast. This is necessary to allow accurate delivery of baits under a bird scaring line. Current machines (without variable power control) likely to deploy baited hooks well beyond the streaming position of bird scaring lines, increasing risks to seabirds. Few commercially available machines have variable power control. Needs more development.

Minimum standards

Not Applicable.

Need for combination

Not Applicable.

Implementation monitoring

Not Applicable

Research needs

Develop (and implement) casting machine with a variable power control.

Mitigation Fact Sheet

<https://www.acap.aq/en/bycatch-mitigation/bycatch-mitigation-fact-sheets/771-fs-11-pelagic-longline-bait-caster-and-line-shooter/file>

11. Underwater setting chute

Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries

Unproven and not recommended as a mitigation measure (Brothers 1991; Boggs 2001; Gilman *et al.* 2003a; Gilman *et al.* 2003b; Sakai *et al.* 2004; Lawrence *et al.* 2006).

Notes and Caveats

In pelagic fisheries, existing equipment is not yet sturdy enough for large vessels in rough seas. Problems with malfunctions and performance inconsistencies have been reported (e.g. Gilman *et al.* 2003a, and Australian trials cited in Baker & Wise 2005).

Minimum standards

Not yet established

Need for combination

Not recommended for general application at this time.

Implementation monitoring

Not Applicable.

Research needs

Design problems to overcome.

12. Strategic offal discharge

Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries

Unproven and not recommended as a primary mitigation measure in pelagic longline fisheries, but should be considered good practice (McNamara *et al.* 1999; Cherel *et al.* 1996).

Notes and Caveats

This should be considered a supplementary measure (i.e. used in addition to primary best practice mitigation measures). Offal attracts birds to vessels, and also conditions birds to attend vessels. Where practical, the discharge of offal should be eliminated or restricted to periods when not setting or hauling. Strategic discharge during line setting (dumping of homogenised offal to the side of the vessel during setting to attract birds to this area and away from the baited hooks, Cherel *et al.* 1996) can increase interactions and should be discouraged. Offal retention and/or incineration may be impractical on small vessels.

Minimum standards

Not yet established for pelagic fisheries. In the Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR), discharge of offal is prohibited during line setting for demersal longline fisheries. During line hauling, storage of waste is encouraged, and if discharged must be discharged on the opposite side of the vessel to the hauling bay.

Need for combination

Must be combined with other measures.

Implementation monitoring

Requires offal discharge practices and events to be monitored by fisheries observers or video surveillance.

Research needs

Further information needed on opportunities and constraints for the application of offal management in pelagic fisheries (short and long term).

13. Live bait

Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries

Not recommended, as use of live bait may lead to increased rates of seabird bycatch (Robertson *et al.* 2010a; Trebilco *et al.* 2010).

Notes and Caveats

Live fish bait sinks significantly slower than dead bait (fish and squid), increasing the exposure of baits to seabirds. Use of live bait is associated with higher seabird bycatch rates.

Minimum standards

Not Applicable.

Need for combination

Not Applicable.

Implementation monitoring

Not Applicable.

Research needs

Not Applicable.

14. Bait thaw status – use of thawed baits rather than frozen baits

Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries

Unproven and not recommended as a primary mitigation measure (Brothers 1991; Duckworth 1995; Klaer & Polacheck 1998; Brothers *et al.* 1999; Robertson & van den Hoff 2010).

Notes and Caveats

Thawed baits are believed to sink faster than frozen baits. However, Robertson & van den Hoff (2010) concluded that the bait thaw status has no practical bearing on seabird mortality in pelagic fisheries. Baits cannot be separated from others in frozen blocks of bait, and hooks cannot be inserted into baits unless they are partially thawed (it is not practical for fishers to use fully frozen baits). Partially thawed baits sink at similar rates to fully thawed baits.

Minimum standards

Not Applicable.

Need for combination

Not Applicable.

Implementation monitoring

Not Applicable.

Research needs

Not Applicable.

15. Haul Mitigation

Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries

Strategies to reduce seabird hooking during the haul have yet to be developed and properly tested for pelagic longline fisheries.

Notes and Caveats

The development and testing of seabird bycatch mitigation measures in pelagic longline fisheries has focussed almost exclusively on how to minimise or prevent bycatch during setting operations. Although some measures, such as Bird Curtains, have been designed and tested in demersal longline fisheries to reduce the incidence of haul captures, these methods are not directly transferable to pelagic longline fisheries.

Need for combination

No information

Research needs

Developing methods that minimize seabird hooking during line hauling in pelagic longline fisheries remains an urgent research priority.

Minimum standards

No information

Implementation monitoring

No information

Mitigation Fact Sheet

Note that this fact sheet is directed mostly at haul mitigation in demersal longline fisheries, and is not directly applicable to pelagic longline fisheries.

<https://www.acap.aq/en/bycatch-mitigation/bycatch-mitigation-fact-sheets/1907-fs-12-demersal-pelagic-longline-haul-mitigation/file>

16. Lasers

High Energy Lasers Strongly Discouraged

Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic longline fisheries

Available evidence shows that high energy lasers (Class 4 lasers, the highest class in terms of laser hazards) are ineffective at deterring seabirds from danger areas around fishing vessels

(Melvin *et al.* 2016) and likely damage seabird visual systems with negative effects on foraging behaviour of laser exposed seabirds (Fernandez-Juricic, 2023).

Notes and Caveats

Concerns are ongoing regarding the safety (to both humans and birds) and efficacy of laser technology of unknown energy levels as a seabird bycatch mitigation tool, as they continue to be used currently in various fisheries. Available evidence shows that high energy lasers are no longer marketed for fishery applications. Currently evidence is lacking on the possibility that lasers of lower energy levels delivered in different ways (scanning, blinking, wave-length, etc.) could be used safely and be effective in some applications.

Minimum standards

Not applicable as strongly discouraged.

Need for combination

Not applicable as strongly discouraged.

Implementation monitoring

Not applicable as strongly discouraged.

Research needs

As high energy lasers continue to be used in some fisheries, we encourage reporting of the extent and output power levels of laser use by ACAP Parties, including any information on effectiveness, as well as bird welfare effects.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, S. and McArdle, B., 2002. Sink rate of baited hooks during deployment of a pelagic longline from a New Zealand fishing vessel. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* **36**: 185–195.
- ATF, 2011. Developments in experimental mitigation research – Pelagic longline fisheries in Brazil, South Africa and Uruguay. Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels, Fourth Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group, Guayaquil, Ecuador, 22 - 24 August 2011, [SBWG4 Doc 09](#).
- Baker, G.B., Candy, S.G. and Rollinson D., 2016. Efficacy of the 'Smart Tuna Hook' in reducing bycatch of seabirds in the South African Pelagic Longline Fishery. Abstract only. Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels, Seventh Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group, 2 - 4 May 2016, La Serena, Chile, [SBWG7 Inf 07](#).
- Baker, G.B. and Wise, B.S., 2005. The impact of pelagic longline fishing on the flesh-footed shearwater *Puffinus carneipes* in Eastern Australia. *Biological Conservation* **126**: 306–316.
- Barrington, J.H.S., 2016a. 'Hook Pod' as best practice seabird bycatch mitigation in pelagic longline fisheries. Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels, Seventh Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group, 2 - 4 May 2016, La Serena, Chile, [SBWG7 Doc 10](#).
- Barrington, J.H.S., 2016b. 'Smart Tuna Hook' as best practice seabird bycatch mitigation in pelagic longline fisheries. Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels, Seventh Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group, 2 - 4 May 2016, La Serena, Chile, [SBWG7 Doc 09](#).
- Barrington, J.H.S., Robertson, G. and Candy S.G., 2016. Categorising branch line weighting for pelagic longline fishing according to sink rates. Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels, Seventh Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group, La Serena, Chile, 2 - 4 May 2016, [SBWG7 Doc 07](#).
- Barrington, J.H.S., 2021. Underwater Bait Setting as best practice seabird bycatch mitigation in pelagic longline fisheries. Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels, Tenth Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group, virtual meeting, 17–19 August 2021, [SBWG10 Doc 12](#).
- Boggs, C.H., 2001. Detering albatrosses from contacting baits during swordfish longline sets. In: Melvin, E. and Parrish, J.K. (Eds.), *Seabird Bycatch: Trends, Roadblocks and Solutions*. University of Alaska Sea Grant, Fairbanks, Alaska, pp. 79–94.
- Brothers, N.P., 1991. Approaches to reducing albatross mortality and associated bait loss in the Japanese long-line fishery. *Biological Conservation* **55**: 255–268.
- Brothers, N. and Gilman, E., 2006. Technical assistance for Hawaii-based pelagic longline vessels to modify deck design and fishing practices to side set. Prepared for the National Marine Fisheries Service, Pacific Islands Regional Office, Blue Ocean Institute, September 2006.
- Brothers, N., Gales, R. and Reid, T., 1999. The influence of environmental variables and mitigation measures on seabird catch rates in the Japanese tuna longline fishery within the Australian Fishing Zone 1991-1995. *Biological Conservation* **88**: 85–101.

- Brothers, N., Gales, R. and Reid, T., 2001. The effect of line weighting on the sink rate of pelagic tuna longline hooks, and its potential for minimising seabird mortalities. CCSBT-ERS/0111/53.
- CCAMLR, 2002. Report of the working group on fish stock assessment. Report of the twenty-first meeting of the Scientific Committee of the Commission for the Conservation of Marine Living Resources. Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources, Hobart.
- Cherel, Y., Weimerskirch, H. and Duhamel, G., 1996. Interactions between longline vessels and seabirds in Kerguelen waters and a method to reduce seabird mortality. *Biological Conservation* **75**: 63–70.
- Claudino dos Santos, R.C., Silva-Costa, A., Sant’Ana, R., Gianuca, D., Yates, O., Marques, C. and Neves, T., 2016. Comparative trials of Lumo Leads and traditional line weighting in the Brazilian pelagic longline fishery. Abstract only. Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels, Seventh Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group, 2 - 4 May 2016, La Serena, Chile, [SBWG7 Doc 14](#).
- Cocking, L.J., Double, M.C., Milburn, P.J. and Brando, V.E., 2008. Seabird bycatch mitigation and blue-dyed bait: A spectral and experimental assessment. *Biological Conservation* **14**: 1354–1364.
- Domingo, A., Jiménez, S., Abreu, M., Forselledo, R. and Yates, O., 2017. Effectiveness of tori line use to reduce seabird bycatch in pelagic longline fishing. *PLoS ONE* **12**: e0184465.
- Duckworth, K., 1995. Analysis of factors which influence seabird bycatch in the Japanese southern bluefin tuna longline fishery in New Zealand waters, 1989–1993. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 95/26.
- Fernandez-Juricic, E. 2023. Laser technology for seabird bycatch prevention in commercial fisheries. Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels, Eleventh Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group, Edinburgh, United Kingdom, 15-17 May 2023, [SBWG11 Doc 11](#).
- Gales, R., Brothers, N. and Reid, T., 1998. Seabird mortality in the Japanese tuna longline fishery around Australia, 1988-1995. *Biological Conservation* **86**: 37–56.
- Gianuca, D., Canani, G., Silva-Costa, A., Milbratz, S. and Neves, T., 2021. Trialling the new Hookpod-mini, which releases the hook at 20 m depth, in pelagic longline fisheries off southern Brazil. Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels, Tenth Meeting of Seabird Bycatch Working Group, virtual meeting, 17–19 August 2021, [SBWG10 Inf 16](#).
- Gianuca, D., Peppes, F., César, J., Marques, C., Neves, T., 2011. The effect of leaded swivel position and light toriline on bird attack rates in Brazilian pelagic longline. Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels, Fourth Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group, Guayaquil, Ecuador, 22 - 24 August 2011, [SBWG4 Doc 40 Rev 1](#).
- Gianuca, D., Peppes, F.V., César, J.H., Sant’Ana, R. and Neves, T., 2013. Do leaded swivels close to hooks affect the catch rate of target species in pelagic longline? A preliminary study of southern Brazilian fleet. Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and

- Petrels, Fifth Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group, La Rochelle, France, 1 - 3 May 2013, [SBWG5 Doc 33](#).
- Gilman, E., Boggs, C. and Brothers, N., 2003a. Performance assessment of an underwater setting chute to mitigate seabird bycatch in the Hawaii pelagic longline tuna fishery. *Ocean and Coastal Management* **46**: 985–1010.
- Gilman, E., Brothers, N., Kobayashi, D.R., Martin, S., Cook, J., Ray, J., Ching, G. and Woods, B., 2003b. Performance assessment of underwater setting chutes, side setting, and blue-dyed bait to minimise seabird mortality in Hawaii longline tuna and swordfish fisheries. Final report. Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council. Honolulu, Hawaii, USA. 42 p.
- Gilman, E., Brothers, N. and Kobayashi, D., 2005. Principles and approaches to abate seabird bycatch in longline fisheries. *Fish and Fisheries* **6**: 35–49.
- Gilman, E., Musyl, M., Wild, M., Rong, H. and Chaloupka, M. 2022. Investigating weighted fishing hooks for seabird bycatch mitigation. *Scientific Reports* **12**: 2833.
- Gilman, E., Evans, T., Pollard, I. and Chaloupka, M., 2023. Adjusting time-of-day and depth of fishing provides an economically viable solution to seabird bycatch in an albacore tuna longline fishery. *Scientific Reports* **13**: 2621.
- Goad, D. and Debski, I., 2017. Bird-scaring line designs for small longline vessels. Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels, Eighth Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group, Wellington, New Zealand, 4 - 6 September 2017, [SBWG8 Doc 12](#).
- Goad, D., Debski, I. and Potts, J., 2019. Hookpod-mini: a smaller potential solution to mitigate seabird bycatch in pelagic longline fisheries. *Endangered Species Research* **39**: 1–8.
- Hu, F., Shiga, M., Yokota, K., Shiode, D., Tokai, T., Sakai, H. and Arimoto, T., 2005. Effects of specifications of branch line on sinking characteristics of hooks in Japanese tuna longline. *Nippon Suisan Gakkaishi* **71**: 33–38.
- Imber, M.J., 1994. Report on a tuna long-lining fishing voyage aboard Southern Venture to observe seabird by-catch problems. Science & Research Series 65. Department of Conservation, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Jiménez, S., Domingo, A. and Brazeiro, A., 2009. Seabird bycatch in the Southwest Atlantic: Interaction with the Uruguayan pelagic longline fishery. *Polar Biology* **32**: 187–196.
- Jiménez, S., Domingo, A., Abreu, M., Forselledo, R. and Pons, M., 2013. Effect of reduced distance between the hook and weight in pelagic longline branchlines on seabird attack and bycatch rates and on the catch of target species. Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels, Fifth Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group. La Rochelle, France, 1 - 3 May 2013, [SBWG5 Doc 49](#).
- Jiménez, S., Phillips, R.A., Brazeiro, A., Defeo, O. and Domingo, A., 2014. Bycatch of great albatrosses in pelagic longline fisheries in the southwest Atlantic: Contributing factors and implications for management. *Biological Conservation* **171**: 9–20.
- Jiménez, S., Forselledo, R. and Domingo, A., 2017. Effect of reduced distance between the hook and weight in pelagic longline branch-lines on seabird attack and bycatch rates and on the catch of target species. Abstract only. Agreement on the Conservation of

- Albatrosses and Petrels, Eighth Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group, 4 - 6 September 2017, Wellington, New Zealand, [SBWG8 Inf 27 Rev 1](#).
- Jiménez, S., Domingo, A., Forselledo, R., Sullivan, B.J. and Yates, O., 2019. Mitigating bycatch of threatened seabirds: the effectiveness of branch line weighting in pelagic longline fisheries. *Animal Conservation* **22**: 376–385.
- Jiménez, S., Domingo, A., Winker, H., Parker, D., Gianuca, D., Neves, T., Coelho, R. and Kerwath, S., 2020. Towards mitigation of seabird bycatch: Large-scale effectiveness of night setting and Tori lines across multiple pelagic longline fleets. *Biological Conservation* **247**: 108642.
- Klaer, N. and Polacheck, T., 1998. The influence of environmental factors and mitigation measures on by-catch rates of seabirds by Japanese longline fishing vessels in the Australian region. *Emu* **98**: 305–316.
- Lawrence, E., Wise, B., Bromhead, D., Hindmarsh, S., Barry, S., Bensley, N. and Findlay, J., 2006. Analyses of AFMA seabird mitigation trials – 2001 to 2004. Bureau of Rural Sciences. Canberra.
- Lydon, G. and Starr, P., 2005. Effect of blue dyed bait on incidental seabird mortalities and fish catch rates on a commercial longliner fishing off East Cape, New Zealand. Unpublished Conservation Services Programme Report, Department of Conservation, New Zealand. 12 pp.
- McNamara, B., Torre, L. and Kaaialii, G., 1999. Hawaii longline seabird mortality mitigation project. Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA.
- Melvin, E.F., 2003. Streamer lines to reduce seabird bycatch in longline fisheries. Washington Sea Grant Program, WSG-AS 00-33.
- Melvin, E.F., Sullivan, B., Robertson, G. and Wienecke, B., 2004. A review of the effectiveness of streamer lines as a seabird bycatch mitigation technique in longline fisheries and CCAMLR streamer line requirements. *CCAMLR Science* **11**: 189–201.
- Melvin, E.F., Guy, T.J. and Reid, L.B., 2010. Shrink and Defend: A Comparison of Two Streamer Line designs in the 2009 South Africa Tuna Fishery. Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels, Third Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group, Mar del Plata, Argentina, 8 – 9 April 2010, [SBWG3 Doc 13 Rev 1](#).
- Melvin, E.F., Guy, T.J. and Reid, L.B., 2011. Preliminary report of 2010 weighted branch line trials in the tuna joint venture fishery in the South African EEZ. Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels, Fourth Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group, Guayaquil, Ecuador, 22 – 24 August 2011, [SBWG4 Doc 07](#).
- Melvin, E.F., Guy, T.J. and Reid, L.B., 2013. Reducing seabird bycatch in the South African joint venture tuna fishery using bird-scaring lines, branch line weighting and nighttime setting of hooks. *Fisheries Research* **147**: 72–82.
- Melvin, E.F., Guy, T.J. and Reid, L.B., 2014. Best practice seabird bycatch mitigation for pelagic longline fisheries targeting tuna and related species. *Fisheries Research* **149**: 5–18.
- Melvin, E.F., Asher, W.E., Fernandez-Juricic, E. and Lim, A., 2016. Results of initial trials to determine if laser light can prevent seabird bycatch in North Pacific Fisheries. Agreement

- on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels, Seventh Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group, La Serena, Chile, 2 – 4 May 2016, [SBWG7 Inf 12](#).
- Melvin, E.F., Wolfaardt, A., Crawford, R., Gilman, E. and Suazo, C.G. (2023). Bycatch reduction. In *Conservation of Marine Birds*. pp. 457–496. Academic Press.
- Meyer, S. and MacKenzie, D. 2022. Factors affecting protected species captures in domestic surface longline fisheries. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 296*. 84 p. [Available for download here](#).
- Minami, H. and Kiyota, M., 2001. Effect of blue-dyed bait on reducing incidental take of seabirds. CCSBT-ERS/0111/61.
- Minami, H. and Kiyota, M., 2004. Effect of blue-dyed bait and tori-pole streamer on reduction of incidental take of seabirds in the Japanese southern bluefin tuna longline fisheries. CCSBT-ERS/0402/08.
- Ochi, D., Sato, N. and Minami, H., 2011. A comparison of two blue-dyed bait types for reducing incidental catch of seabirds in the experimental operations of the Japanese southern bluefin tuna longline. WCPFC-SC7/EB-WP-09.
- Ochi, D., Sato, N., Katsumata, N., Guy, T., Melvin, E.F. and Minami, H., 2013. At-sea experiment to evaluate the effectiveness of multiple mitigation measures on pelagic longline operation in western North Pacific. WCPFC-SC9/EB-WP-11.
- Robertson, G. and van den Hoff, J., 2010. Static water trials of the sink rates of baited hooks to improve understanding of sink rates estimated at sea. Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels, Third Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group, Mar del Plata, Argentina, 8 – 9 April 2010, [SBWG3 Doc 31](#).
- Robertson, G., Ashworth, P., Ashworth, P., Carlyle, I. and Candy, S.G., 2015. The development and operational testing of an underwater bait setting system to prevent the mortality of albatrosses and petrels in pelagic longline fisheries. *Open Journal of Marine Science* **5**: 1–12.
- Robertson, G., Ashworth, P., Ashworth, P., Carlyle, I., Jiménez, S., Forselledo, R., Domingo, A. and Candy, S.G., 2018. Setting baited hooks by stealth (underwater) can prevent the mortality of albatrosses and petrels in pelagic fisheries. *Biological Conservation* **225**: 134–143.
- Robertson, G., Candy, S.G., Wienecke, B. and Lawton, K., 2010a. Experimental determinations of factors affecting the sink rates of baited hooks to minimize seabird mortality in pelagic longline fisheries. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems* **20**: 632–643.
- Robertson, G., Candy, S.G. and Wienecke, B., 2010b. Effect of line shooter and mainline tension on the sink rates of pelagic longlines and implications for seabird interactions. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems* **20**: 419–427.
- Robertson, G., Candy, S. and Hall, S., 2013. New branch line weighting regimes to reduce the risk of seabird mortality in pelagic longline fisheries without affecting fish catch. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems* **23**: 885–900.
- Rollinson, D.P., Wanless, R.M., Makhado, A.B. and Crawford, R.J.M., 2016. A review of seabird bycatch mitigation measures, including experimental work, within South Africa's tuna longline fishery. IOTC-2016-SC19-13 Rev_1.

- Rollinson, D.P., 2017. Understanding and mitigating seabird bycatch in the South African pelagic longline fishery. Thesis presented for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. University of Cape Town.
- Sakai, H., Fuxiang, H. and Arimoto, T., 2004. Underwater setting device for preventing incidental catches of seabirds in tuna longline fishing. CCSBT-ERS/0402/Info06.
- Sakai, H., Hu, F. and Arimoto, T., 2001. Basic study on prevention of incidental catch of seabirds in tuna longline. CCSBT-ERS/0111/62.
- Santos, R.C., Silva-Costa, A., Sant'Ana, R., Gianuca, D., Yates, O., Marques, C. and Neves, T. 2019. Improved line weighting reduces seabird bycatch without affecting fish catch in the Brazilian pelagic longline fishery. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems* **29**: 442–449
- Sato, N., Minami, H., Katsumata, N., Ochi, E. and Yokawa, K., 2013. Comparison of the effectiveness of paired and single tori lines for preventing bait attacks by seabirds and their bycatch in pelagic longline fisheries. *Fisheries Research* **140**: 14–19.
- Sullivan, B. and Barrington J.H.S., 2021. Hookpod-mini as best practice seabird bycatch mitigation in pelagic longline fisheries. Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels, Tenth Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group, virtual meeting, 17–19 August 2021, [SBWG10 Doc 13](#).
- Sullivan, B.J., Kibel, B., Kibel, P., Yates, O., Potts, J.M., Ingham, B., Domingo, A., Gianuca, D., Jiménez, S., Lebepe, B., Maree, B.A., Neves, T., Peppes, F., Rasehlomi, T., Silva-Costa, A. and Wanless, R.M., 2018. At-sea trialling of the Hookpod: a 'one-stop' mitigation solution for seabird bycatch in pelagic longline fisheries. *Animal Conservation* **21**: 159–167.
- Trebilco, R., Gales, R., Lawrence, E., Alderman, R., Robertson, G. and Baker, G.B., 2010. Characterizing seabird bycatch in the eastern Australian tuna and billfish pelagic longline fishery in relation to temporal, spatial and biological influences. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems* **20**: 531–542.
- Uozumi, Y. and Takeuchi, Y. 1998. Influence of tori pole on incidental catch rate of seabirds by Japanese southern bluefin tuna longline fishery in high seas. CCSBT-WRS/9806/9 revised.
- Yokota, K. and Kiyota, M., 2006. Preliminary report of side-setting experiments in a large sized longline vessel. Second meeting of the WCPFC Ecosystem and Bycatch SWG, Manila, Philippines, 10 August 2006. WCPFC-SC2-2006/EB WP-15.