



SUMMARY

ACAP's Seabird Bycatch Working Group (SBWG) conducted a comprehensive review of the scientific literature dealing with seabird bycatch mitigation measures in pelagic longline fisheries at its fifth meeting, held from 1-3 May, 2013. The SBWG determined that weighted branch lines, bird scaring lines and night setting constitute best practice mitigation in pelagic longline fisheries.

Currently, no single mitigation measure can reliably prevent the incidental mortality of seabirds in most pelagic longline fisheries. The most effective approach is to use the above measures in combination.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the CCSBT ERSWG:

1. Review the advice provided by the SBWG and take this into account when advising on seabird bycatch mitigation measures to be used in the CCSBT pelagic longline fishery.

**REVIEW OF SEABIRD BYCATCH MITIGATION MEASURES FOR
PELAGIC LONGLINE FISHERIES CONDUCTED AT THE FIFTH MEETING OF THE
SEABIRD BYCATCH WORKING GROUP, LA ROCHELLE, FRANCE, 1-3 MAY 2013**

SUMMARY

ACAP's Seabird Bycatch Working Group (SBWG) conducted a comprehensive review of the scientific literature dealing with seabird bycatch mitigation measures in pelagic longline fisheries at its fifth meeting, held from 1-3 May, 2013. The SBWG determined that a combination of weighted branch lines, bird scaring lines and night setting are best practice mitigation in pelagic longline fisheries. These 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. Other factors such as safety, practicality and the characteristics of the fishery should also be recognised.

Currently, no single mitigation measure can reliably prevent the incidental mortality of seabirds in most pelagic longline fisheries. The most effective approach is to use the above measures in combination.

BEST PRACTICE MEASURES	
1.	Branch line weighting
2.	Night setting
3 a)	Bird scaring lines for vessels >35m in total length
b)	Bird scaring lines for vessels <35m in total length
OTHER CONSIDERATIONS	
4.	Side setting with line weighting and bird curtain
5.	Blue dyed bait
6.	Line shooter
7.	Bait caster
8.	Underwater setting chute
9.	Management of offal discharge
10.	Live bait
11.	Bait thaw status
12.	Area closures

BEST PRACTICE MEASURES

1. Branch line weighting

Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries

PROVEN AND RECOMMENDED. 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; Gilman *et al.* 2003a, Hu *et al.* 2005; Melvin *et al.*, In Press; Melvin *et al.*, 2011.

Caveats /Notes

Weights will shorten but not eliminate the zone behind the vessel in which birds can be caught. Branch lines should be weighted to sink the baited hooks rapidly out of the diving range of feeding seabirds. Weighted lines sink faster and more consistently, resulting in dramatic reductions in seabird attacks on baited hooks. Scientific studies have demonstrated that branch line weighting configurations with more mass close to the hook sinks the hooks most rapidly (Gianuca *et al.* 2011; Robertson *et al.* 2013), reduces seabird attacks on baits (Jiménez *et al.* 2013; Gianuca *et al.* 2011) and consequently is most likely to reduce mortalities (Jiménez *et al.* 2013). Studies of a range of weighting regimes, including regimes with weight at the hook, have shown no negative effect on target catch rates (Jiménez *et al.* 2013; Robertson *et al.* 2013; Gianuca *et al.* 2013). 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.

Line weighting has been shown to improve the effectiveness of night setting and bird scaring lines in reducing seabird bycatch. Of this combination that makes up this best practice mitigation, line weighting is integral to the fishing gear and has the advantage of being more consistently implemented and thus facilitates 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, *inter alia*:

- a) weighting regime characteristics adequately specified;
- b) safety issues adequately addressed;
- c) issues relating to application to artisanal fisheries are taken into account.

Need for combination

Should be combined with bird scaring lines and night setting

Research needs

Continue work to identify branch line weighting configurations (mass, placement, shape, number of leads and materials) that are effective at reducing seabird bycatch rates. Studies should include evaluations of the effects of branch line weighting on the catch rate of pelagic fishes and provide data that allow evaluation of the relative safety and practicality attributes of various weighting configurations. Studies evaluating the response of seabirds (mortality rates and attack rates) and fishes (catch rates of target and non-target species) to weights

(of varying mass) positioned at the hook (hook weights) and the safety attributes of hook weights are the highest priority for research.

Minimum standards

Current minimum standards for branch line weighting configurations are:

Greater than 45 g attached within 1 m of the hook or;

Greater than 60 g attached within 3.5 m of the hook or;

Greater than 98 g weight attached within 4 m of the hook.

Positioning weight farther than 4 m from the hook is not recommended.

These regimes have been adopted in the Hawaiian (45 g at 1 m) and Australian (60 g at 3.5 m and 98 g at 4 m) pelagic longline fisheries and latter two regimes have been adopted by the Western and Central Pacific Fishing Commission (the WCPFC provisions also include the option of branch lines being configured with weights of 45 g to 60 g within 1 m of the hook). NB. The 98 g weights specified in the Australian fishery pertain to the line weighting experiment of Robertson *et al.* 2010. The commercially available leaded swivels used in the experiment weighed 98 g (not 100 g).

Implementation monitoring

Coastal state fisheries (vessels <35 m total length): Line weights crimped into branch lines technically very difficult to remove at sea. Inspection before departure from port of all gear bins on vessels considered an acceptable form of implementation monitoring.

Distant water fisheries (vessels >35 m total length): Technically possible to remove and/or re-configure gear at sea. Implementation monitoring by monitoring line sets using appropriate methods (e.g., observer inspection of line setting operations; video surveillance; at-sea compliance checks). Video surveillance conditional on mainline setter being fitted with motion sensors to trigger cameras.

2. Night setting

Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries

PROVEN AND RECOMMENDED. Should be used in combination with weighted branch lines and bird scaring lines. Duckworth 1995; Brothers *et al.* 1999; Gales *et al.* 1998; Klaer & Polacheck 1998; Brothers *et al.* 1999; McNamara *et al.* 1999; Gilman *et al.* 2005; Baker & Wise 2005; Jiménez *et al.* 2009.

Caveats /Notes

Less effective during full moon, under intensive deck lighting or in high latitude fisheries in summer. Less effective on nocturnal foragers e.g. White-chinned Petrels (Brothers *et al.* 1999; Cherel *et al.* 1996).

Need for combination

Should be used in combination with bird scaring lines and weighted branch lines

Research needs

Determine effectiveness of bird scaring lines and branch line weighting at night by characterising seabird behaviour at night using thermal or night vision technologies.

Minimum standards

Night defined as between nautical twilight and nautical dawn.

Implementation monitoring

Requires VMS (satellite transmitter) 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 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.

3	a). Bird scaring lines for vessels > 35m in total length
----------	--

Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries

PROVEN AND RECOMMENDED. For vessels > 35 m in length two bird scaring lines is considered best practice. Bird scaring lines with the appropriate aerial extent can be more easily rigged on large vessels. Two bird scaring lines are considered to provide better protection of baited hooks in crosswinds (Melvin *et al.* 2004; Melvin *et al.* 2011). Hybrid bird scaring lines (with long and short streamers) were more effective than short bird scaring lines (only short streamers) in deterring diving seabirds (White-chinned petrels) (Melvin *e.al.* 2010; Melvin *et al.* 2011).

Caveats /Notes

Potentially increased likelihood of entanglement, particularly if attachment points on davits (tori poles) are insufficiently outboard of vessels. To achieve a minimum aerial extent bird-scaring lines line should be attached to the vessel such that it is suspended from a point a minimum of about 8 m above the water at the stern Development of a towed device to prevent tangling with fishing gear essential to improve adoption and compliance.

Diving species increase vulnerability of surface foragers (albatrosses) due to secondary interactions.

Need for combination

Should be used with appropriate line weighting and night setting.

Research needs

Developing methods that minimise entanglements of the in- water portion of bird-scaring lines with longline floats, while creating sufficient drag to maximise aerial extent, remains the highest priority for research on bird-scaring lines. Research evaluating the effectiveness of one vs. two bird-scaring lines; bird-scaring line design features (steamer lengths,

configurations, and materials); and methods for efficient retrieval and stowage of bird scaring lines remain research priorities.

Minimum standards

Vessels should deploy bird scaring lines with a minimum aerial extent of 100 m. Streamers should be: brightly coloured, a mix of long and short streamers, placed at intervals of no more than 5 m, and long streamers attached to the line with swivels that prevent streamers from wrapping around the line. Long streamers should reach the sea-surface in calm conditions.

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

Baited hooks shall be deployed within the area bounded by the two bird scaring lines. Bait-casting machines shall be adjusted so as to land baited hooks within the area bounded by bird scaring lines

Implementation monitoring

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

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

Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries

PROVEN AND RECOMMENDED. Imber 1994; Uozomi & Takeuchi 1998; Brothers *et al.* 1999; Klaer & Polacheck 1998; McNamara *et al.* 1999; Boggs 2001; CCAMLR 2002; Minami & Kiyota 2004; Melvin 2003. For vessels < 35 m in length a single BSL in combination with night setting and appropriate line weighting has been found effective for mixed and short bird scaring lines (ATF 2011; Domingo *et al.*, Gianuca *et al.* 2011).

Caveats /Notes

To achieve a minimum aerial extent bird-scaring lines line should be attached to the vessel such that it is suspended from a point a minimum of about 7 m above the water at the stern.

Development of a towed device to prevent tangling with fishing gear essential to improve adoption and compliance.

Diving species increase vulnerability of surface foragers (albatrosses) due to secondary interactions.

Need for combination

Should be used with appropriate line weighting and night setting.

Minimum standards

Vessels should deploy bird scaring lines with a minimum aerial extent 75 m. Streamers should be brightly coloured. 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: a mixed design that includes long streamers placed at 5 m intervals over the first 55 m of the bird scaring line and a design that does not include long streamers. Bird scaring lines 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.

Towed devices to create drag can tangle with float lines leading to interruptions in vessel operations and in some cases lost fishing gear. Short streamers can be tied into the line to bristle the line and create a bottlebrush like configuration to generate drag while minimising the chance of fouling streamer lines on float lines. Breakaways should be incorporated into the bird scaring line in-water extent to minimise safety and operational problems should a longline float foul or tangle with the in-water extent of a bird scaring line.

Implementation monitoring

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

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

4. Side setting with line weighting and bird curtain

Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries

UNPROVEN AND NOT RECOMMENDED FOR SOUTHERN HEMISPHERE FISHERIES.
Brothers & Gilman 2006; Yokota & Kiyota 2006.

Caveats /Notes

Only effective if hooks are sufficiently below the surface by the time they reach the stern of the vessel and protected by a bird curtain. In Hawaii, side-setting trials were conducted with bird curtain and 45-60 g weighted swivels placed within 0.5 m of hooks. Japanese research concludes must be used with other measures (Yokota & Kiyota 2006). Not tested in southern hemisphere fisheries and cannot be recommended at this time.

Need for combination

Lines set from the side of vessels must be appropriately weighted and protected by an effective bird curtain. Requires thorough testing in southern hemisphere fisheries.

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.

Minimum standards

Clear definition of side setting is required. As noted, side setting trials in Hawaii were conducted in conjunction with a bird curtain and 45-60 g leaded swivel < 1 m of the baited hook. 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.

Implementation monitoring

Requires fisheries observers or video surveillance.

5. Blue dyed bait

Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries

UNPROVEN AND NOT RECOMMENDED. Boggs 2001; Brothers 1991; Gilman *et al.* 2003a; Minami & Kiyota 2001; Minami & Kiyota 2004; Lydon & Starr 2005. Cocking *et al.* 2008.

Caveats /Notes

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

Need for combination

Must be combined with bird scaring lines or night setting.

Research needs

Need for tests in Southern Ocean.

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).

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.

6. Line shooter

Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries

UNPROVEN AND NOT RECOMMENDED. Robertson *et al.* 2010.

Caveats /Notes

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

Need for combination

Not Applicable.

Research needs

Not Applicable.

Minimum standards

Use of this measure is not recommended as a mitigation measure.

Implementation monitoring

Not Applicable.

7. Bait caster

Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries

UNPROVEN AND NOT RECOMMENDED. Duckworth 1995; Klaer & Polacheck 1998.

Caveats /Notes

Not a mitigation measure unless 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.

Need for combination

Not recommended as a mitigation measure at this time.

Research needs

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

Minimum standards

Not recommended as a mitigation measure

Implementation monitoring

Not Applicable

8. Underwater setting chute

Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries

UNPROVEN AND NOT RECOMMENDED. Brothers 1991; Boggs 2001; Gilman *et al.* 2003a; Gilman *et al.* 2003b; Sakai *et al.* 2004; Lawrence *et al.* 2006.

Caveats /Notes

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

Need for combination

Not recommended for general application at this time.

Research needs

Design problems to overcome.

Minimum standards

Not yet established

Implementation monitoring

Not Applicable.

9. Management of offal discharge

Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries

UNPROVEN. McNamara *et al.* 1999; Cherel *et al.* 1996.

Caveats /Notes

Supplementary measure. Definition essential. Offal attracts birds to vessels and where practical should be eliminated or restricted to discharge when not setting or hauling. Strategic discharge during line setting can increase interactions and should be discouraged. Offal retention and/or incineration may be impractical on small vessels.

Need for combination

Must be combined with other measures.

Research needs

Further information needed on opportunities and constraints in pelagic fisheries (long and short term).

Minimum standards

Not yet established for pelagic fisheries. In CCAMLR demersal fisheries, discharge of offal is prohibited during line setting. 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.

Implementation monitoring

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

10. Live bait

Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries

LIVE BAIT NOT RECOMMENDED. Trebilco *et al.* 2010; Robertson *et al.* 2010.

Caveats /Notes

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.

Need for combination

Use of live bait is not a mitigation measure.

Research needs

Not Applicable.

Minimum standards

Live bait is not a mitigation measure.

Implementation monitoring

Not Applicable.

11. Bait thaw status

Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries

NOT RECOMMENDED. Brothers 1991; Duckworth 1995; Klaer & Polacheck; Brothers *et al.* 1999; Robertson & van den Hoff 2010.

Caveats /Notes

Baits cannot be separated from others in frozen blocks of bait, and hooks cannot be inserted in baits, unless baits 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.

Need for combination

Not a mitigation measure

Research needs

Not Applicable.

Minimum standards

Not recommended as a mitigation measure.

Implementation monitoring

Not Applicable.

12. Area closures

Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries

PROVEN AND RECOMMENDED. Avoiding fishing at peak areas and during periods of intense foraging activity has been used effectively to reduce bycatch in longline fisheries.

Caveats /Notes

An important and effective management response, especially for high risk areas, and when other measures prove ineffective. Highly effective for target locations/seasons but may displace fishing effort into adjacent or other areas which may not be as well regulated, thus leading to increased incidental mortality elsewhere.

Need for combination

Must be combined with other measures, both in the specific areas when the fishing season is opened, and also in adjacent areas to ensure displacement of fishing effort does not merely lead to a spatial shift in the incidental mortality.

Research needs

Further information about the seasonal variability in patterns of species abundance around fisheries.

Minimum standards

No work done but highly recommended.

Implementation monitoring

Vessels equipped with VMS and activities monitored by appropriate management authority is considered appropriate monitoring. Areas/seasons should be patrolled to ensure effectiveness if IUU activities are suspected.

13. Haul Mitigation

Scientific evidence for effectiveness in pelagic fisheries

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

Caveats /Notes

No information

Need for combination

No information

Research needs

Developing methods that minimize seabird hooking during line hauling

Minimum standards

No information

Implementation monitoring

No information

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. Sixth Meeting of Advisory Committee. *Guayaquil, Ecuador, 29 August – 2 September 2011*.
- 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.
- Boggs, C.H., 2001. Deterring albatrosses from contacting baits during swordfish longline sets. In: Melvin, E., Parrish, J.K. (Eds), *Seabird Bycatch: Trends, Roadblocks and Solutions*. University of Alaska Sea Grant, Fairbanks, Alaska, pp. 79–94.
- 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.P. 1991. Approaches to reducing albatross mortality and associated bait loss in the Japanese long-line fishery. *Biological Conservation*, 55: 255–268.
- 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.
- Brouwer, S. and Walker, N. 2008. Use of light bird scaring lines and line weighting on longline vessels and the implications for seabird bycatch. WCPFC Scientific Committee Fourth Regular Session, 11-22 August 2008 WCPFC-SC4-2008/EB-IP-3.
- 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 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.
- 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.

- Dimas, G., Peppes, F., César, J., Marques, C., and Neves, T. 2011. The effect of leaded swivel position and light toriline on bird attack rates in Brazilian pelagic longline. Sixth Meeting of Advisory Committee. *Guayaquil, Ecuador, 29 August – 2 September 2011*.
- Domingo, A., Jiménez, S., Abreu, M., Forselledo, R., and Pons, M. 2011. Effectiveness of tori-line use to reduce seabird bycatch in the Uruguayan pelagic longline fleet. Sixth Meeting of Advisory Committee. *Guayaquil, Ecuador, 29 August – 2 September 2011*.
- 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.
- 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.
- Gilman, E., Brothers, N., Kobayashi, D. R., Martin, S., Cook, J., Ray, J., Ching, G., and Woods, B. 2003a. 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. 42pp.
- Gilman, E., Boggs, C. and Brothers, N. 2003b. 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. and Kobayashi, D. 2005. Principles and approaches to abate seabird bycatch in longline fisheries. *Fish and Fisheries*, 6: 35–49.
- 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.
- 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: 305–16.
- 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.
- Lokkeborg, S., 2003. Review and evaluation of three mitigation measures - bird-scaring line, underwater setting and line shooter - to reduce seabird bycatch in the north Atlantic longline fishery. *Fisheries Research*, 60: 11–16.
- 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. 12p.
- McNamara B, Torre L, and Kaaialii G. Hawaii longline seabird mortality mitigation project. Honolulu, HI, USA: Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council, 1999.
- Melvin, E. F., Guy, T. J. and Reid, L. B. In Press. 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.
- 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, SBWG-4 Doc 07.
- 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. Third Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group, ACAP, SBWG-3 Doc 13.rev1.
- 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. 2003. Streamer lines to reduce seabird bycatch in longline fisheries. Washington Sea Grant Program, WSG-AS 00-33.
- Melvin, E.F., Parrish, J.K., Dietrich, K.S. and Hamel, O.S. 2001. Solutions to seabird bycatch in Alaska's demersal longline fisheries. Project A/FP-7, WSG-AS 01-01, Washington Sea Grant.
- Minami, H. and Kiyota, M. 2001. Effect of blue-dyed bait on reducing incidental take of seabirds. CCSBT-ERS/0111/61. 7pp.
- 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.
- Robertson, G., Candy, S.G. and Wienecke, B. 2010. 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 DOI: 10.1002/aqc.1100.
- Robertson, G., and van den Hoff, J. 2010. Static water trials on the sink rates of baited hooks to improve understanding of sink rates estimated at sea. Report to the Third meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group of ACAP.
- Robertson, G., Candy, S. G., Wienecke, B., and Lawton, K. submitted, 2010. Experimental determinations of factors affecting the sink rates of baited hooks to minimise seabird mortality in pelagic longline fisheries.
- 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.

- Trebilco, R., Gales, R., Lawrence, E., Alderman, R., Robertson, G. and Baker, G.B. 2010 (in press). Seabird bycatch in the Eastern Australian Tuna and Billfish pelagic longline fishery: temporal, spatial and biological influences. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems*.
- 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. 5pp.
- Yokota, K. and Kiyota, M. 2006. Preliminary report of side-setting experiments in a large sized longline vessel. WCPFC-SC2-2006/EB WP-15. Paper submitted to the Second meeting of the WCPFC Ecosystem and Bycatch SWG. Manila, 10th August 2006
- Yokota, K., Minami, H. and Kiyota, M. 2008. Direct comparison of seabird avoidance effect between two types of tori-lines in experimental longline operations. WCPFC Scientific Committee Fourth Regular Session, 11-22 August 2008 WCPFC-SC4-2008/EB-WP-7.