



**Australian Government**  
**Department of Agriculture  
and Water Resources**  
ABARES

# **Australian Country Report**

## **Ecologically Related Species in the Australian Southern Bluefin Tuna Fishery 2013–14 and 2014–15**

Heather M. Patterson, Patricia I. Hobsbawn, Simon Nicol

Research by the Australian Bureau of Agricultural  
and Resource Economics and Sciences

---

February 2017



### **Ownership of intellectual property rights**

Unless otherwise noted, copyright (and any other intellectual property rights, if any) in this publication is owned by the Commonwealth of Australia (referred to as the Commonwealth).

### **Creative Commons licence**

All material in this publication is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Australia Licence, save for content supplied by third parties, logos and the Commonwealth Coat of Arms.



Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Australia Licence is a standard form licence agreement that allows you to copy, distribute, transmit and adapt this publication provided you attribute the work. A summary of the licence terms is available from [creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/au/deed.en](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/au/deed.en). The full licence terms are available from [creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/au/legalcode](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/au/legalcode).

### **Cataloguing data**

This publication (and any material sourced from it) should be attributed as: Patterson, HM, Hobsbawn, PI & Nicol, S 2017, *Australian Country Report: Ecologically related species in the Australian southern bluefin tuna fishery 2013–14 and 2014–15*, report for the CCSBT Ecologically Related Species Working Group, ABARES, Canberra, February. CC BY 3.0

### **Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics and Sciences (ABARES)**

Postal address GPO Box 858 Canberra ACT 2601

Switchboard +61 2 6272 2010|

Facsimile +61 2 6272 2001

Email [info.abares@agriculture.gov.au](mailto:info.abares@agriculture.gov.au)

Web [agriculture.gov.au/abares/](http://agriculture.gov.au/abares/)

Inquiries regarding the licence and any use of this document should be sent to: [copyright@agriculture.gov.au](mailto:copyright@agriculture.gov.au).

The Australian Government acting through the Department of Agriculture and Water Resources, represented by the Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics and Sciences, has exercised due care and skill in preparing and compiling the information and data in this publication. Notwithstanding, the Department of Agriculture, ABARES, its employees and advisers disclaim all liability, including for negligence and for any loss, damage, injury, expense or cost incurred by any person as a result of accessing, using or relying upon information or data in this publication to the maximum extent permitted by law.

### **Acknowledgements**

The authors thank Rupert Summerson (ABARES), Matt Daniel (AFMA), Jonathon Barrington (Australian Antarctic Division), Kimberley Layton (Department of the Environment and Energy) and Neil Hughes (Department of Agriculture and Water Resources) for their input and comments on this report. Work was funded by Fisheries Resources Research Fund and ABARES.

# Contents

Summary.....	1
1 Introduction .....	2
2 Review of SBT Fisheries .....	2
Fleet size and distribution .....	3
Distribution of catch and effort .....	6
3 Fisheries monitoring for each fleet .....	8
Catch documentation.....	8
Observer programs.....	8
Vessel Monitoring System.....	9
Port monitoring .....	9
4 Seabirds.....	10
Observed seabird interactions.....	10
Non-observed seabird interactions .....	13
5 Non-target fish .....	14
Observed and non-observed fish interactions.....	15
Observed and non-observed shark interactions.....	20
6 Marine mammals and marine reptiles.....	29
7 Mitigation measures to minimise seabird and other species bycatch.....	29
Current measures.....	32
Measures under development/testing .....	37
8 Public relations and education activities .....	39
Public relations activities.....	39
Education.....	39
9 Information on other ERS (non-bycatch) such as prey and predator species .....	41
10 Other .....	42
11 Implementation of the IPOA-Seabirds and IPOA-Sharks.....	43
References.....	44
Appendix I .....	46
Mandatory seabird mitigation measures in the ETBF 2013 .....	46
Appendix II.....	48
Mandatory seabird mitigation measures in the WTBF 2013 .....	48
Appendix III .....	50
Summary of papers submitted by Australia .....	50
Appendix IV .....	51
Common and scientific names .....	51

# Summary

## **Purpose**

This report includes information and data on ecologically related species (ERS) from Australia's southern bluefin tuna (SBT) fishery, updated for the 2013–14 fishing season and new data for the 2014–15 fishing season.

## **Catch and effort**

Australian SBT catches for the 2014 and 2015 calendar years were 4559 t and 5824 t, respectively. The 2013–14 quota year catch was 5420 t, and the 2014–15 quota year catch was 5519 t. Australia voluntarily reduced its effective total allowable catch in 2014–15 by 108 t to account for overcatch in the 2013–14 season.

In 2013–14, 25 vessels landed SBT in Australian waters: 92.8 per cent of the catch was taken by six purse seiners off South Australia, with the remainder taken by 15 longliners in the Eastern Tuna and Billfish Fishery (ETBF), and two longliners, two vessels conducting pole-and-line operations and four vessels conducting trolling operations (some vessels using multiple methods) in the Western Tuna and Billfish Fishery (WTBF).

In 2014–15, 26 vessels landed SBT in Australian waters: 89.6 per cent of the catch was taken by six purse seiners off South Australia, with the remainder taken by 18 longliners and one vessel conducting rod-and-reel operations in the ETBF and one vessel conducting pole-and-line operations in the WTBF.

## **Observer coverage**

In 2013–14, purse-seine observer coverage was 17.0 per cent of sets, representing 16 sets observed where SBT were retained. In 2014, observers monitored 5.9 per cent of shots where SBT was caught in the ETBF. No SBT were observed caught in the WTBF in 2014, therefore observer coverage, defined as shots where SBT were caught, was zero per cent.

In the 2014–15 fishing season, the purse-seine observer coverage was 9.1 per cent of sets, representing 14 sets observed where SBT were retained. In 2015, observers monitored 7.5 per cent of shots where SBT was caught in the ETBF and 21.9 per cent in the WTBF.

## **Interactions with ERS**

Details of ERS interactions in the SBT fishery and ETBF and WTBF are provided in the report. Interactions in the ETBF are for only those shots where SBT was taken as SBT is targeted only at certain locations and time periods. Interactions with seabirds, sharks, non-target fish and marine mammals are reported for the ETBF and WTBF where data are available. No ERS interactions were reported for the purse seine SBT fishery.

## **Mitigation measures**

Australia has implemented mitigation measures to address seabird and turtle bycatch in the longline fisheries to ensure the best practice mitigation measures are in place. These measures are provided in detail.

# 1 Introduction

Three domestic fisheries managed by the Australian Government interact with southern bluefin tuna (SBT; *Thunnus maccoyii*) in varying quantities: the Southern Bluefin Tuna Fishery (SBTF), the Eastern Tuna and Billfish Fishery (ETBF) and the Western Tuna and Billfish Fishery (WTBF). The SBTF targets SBT in the Great Australian Bight using purse seine, with the fishing season running from 1 December to 30 November<sup>1</sup>. After capture, the SBT are transferred to grow-out cages and fattened for up to approximately 6 months before being harvested. The ETBF and WTBF are longline fisheries primarily targeting yellowfin tuna (*Thunnus albacares*), bigeye tuna (*Thunnus obesus*), albacore (*Thunnus alalunga*), swordfish (*Xiphias gladius*) and striped marlin (*Tetrapturus audax*). Longlining for SBT occurs primarily in the Australian winter months between May and October in the ETBF. The fishing season in the WTBF begins on 1 February each year, while in the ETBF the fishing season begins on 1 March. Because the three fisheries have distinct characteristics and management plans, they are separated within this report.

Australia separates its ecologically related species (ERS), or non-target catch, into byproduct and bycatch (including protected species under the *Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act 1999)). The purse seine fishery has very little interaction with ERS as the purse seine fishing method is highly selective. The longline fisheries are multi-species fisheries that, while being relatively selective, catch a range of fish and shark species and have reported interactions with seabirds and, to a lesser extent, marine turtles. A reduction in discarding of species with little commercial value has been a focus of management initiatives. For example, in 2000 the Australian Fisheries Management Authority (AFMA) implemented Bycatch Action Plans for the SBTF, WTBF and ETBF. Since 2008, a bycatch and discarding program has been in place to deal with bycatch issues and develop workplans for each fishery <http://www.afma.gov.au/sustainability-environment/bycatch-discarding/>.

Australia has made considerable investments to mitigate the rate of seabird, turtle and shark interactions and capture during longline fishing operations. Through government and industry initiatives, the incidence of seabird bycatch during longline operations has declined in recent years (e.g. Patterson et al. 2016). Australia has also completed research on mitigation measures to reduce the capture of seabirds and other ERS in longline fisheries (e.g. Robertson et al. 2013).

This report includes information and data on ERS from Australia's SBT fishery, updated for the 2013–14 fishing season and new data for the 2014–15 fishing season.

---

<sup>1</sup> Various time periods, such as 'calendar years', 'fishing seasons' and Australian 'quota years', can be used when describing Australia's SBTF. Unless otherwise indicated, we have used fishing seasons in this report, but note that fishing seasons of the various fishery components often span quota years.

## 2 Review of SBT Fisheries

### Fleet size and distribution

#### Historical fleet size and distribution

Fishing for SBT began in the early 1950s off New South Wales and South Australia and then later, in 1970, off Western Australia. The catch, then used primarily for canning, peaked at 21 500 t in 1982.

Progressively over the mid to late 1980s, the Australian catch focused on supplying the Japanese sashimi market. The introduction of an individual transferable quota-based management plan in the Australian SBTF in 1984, based on an Australian total allowable catch (TAC) of 14 500 t, resulted in the redistribution of quota ownership. In the late 1980s, the Australian quota was reduced to 5265 t, which led to further restructuring of quota distribution. Since 1992 there has been a progressive increase in the proportion of SBT taken under farming operations. Currently, about 93 per cent of the Australian SBT quota is captured using the purse-seine method.

From 1990 to 1994, approximately half the Australian quota was taken by Australia-Japan joint venture longliners. With the termination of the joint venture arrangement in 1995, Australian catches again focused on the surface fishery with poling operations supplying the fresh chilled sashimi market and purse seiners providing SBT to farms for mariculture.

Historically, there has been longlining for SBT off Tasmania and Western Australia, with occasional catches in South Australian waters. There were also some purse seine, trolling and poling operations in the offshore waters of the Australian Fishing Zone (AFZ). Currently, longlining in which SBT is taken occurs primarily off south eastern New South Wales during the winter months (May to October), in core and buffer zones (described below) which move as the SBT migrate.


#### Current fleet size and distribution

##### Southern Bluefin Tuna Fishery

All SBT caught commercially in Australia is taken under the Southern Bluefin Tuna Fishery Management Plan 1995 and is required to be covered by quota. The area of the SBTF encompasses the entire AFZ and extends onto the high seas (Figure 1). The AFZ is defined consistently with Australia's Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) and extends out to 200 nautical miles from the coast. There are two main components for the fishery: the purse seine fleet operating out of Port Lincoln, South Australia, and longline fleets operating off eastern and western Australia, which take SBT as a byproduct of fishing for other tuna and billfish species. To longline in these areas, operators are required to have a Boat Statutory Fishing Right in either the ETBF or WTBF, hold uncaught quota for SBT and meet observer requirements. Management measures in terms of gear restrictions and bycatch are managed separately in these fisheries.

The purse seine fleet operating out of Port Lincoln currently (2014–15) takes about 90 per cent of the total SBT commercial catch, fishing in the Great Australian Bight. The SBT are towed back to Port Lincoln, transferred into grow-out pontoons and farmed for a period of time before harvest. In 2013–14 and 2014–15, SBT were also landed by longline and minor line methods in the ETBF, mainly off New South Wales, and a small amount of SBT was taken by longline and minor line methods off South Australia in the WTBF.

**Figure 1 Area of Australia's Southern Bluefin Tuna Fishery**




### **Eastern Tuna and Billfish Fishery**

The ETBF extends from Cape York to the Victoria–South Australia border, including waters around Tasmania (Figure 2). Domestic longline vessels are mostly 15–25 m long and use monofilament gear. Fishing practices vary with target species, location and season. Vessels usually conduct one longline operation per day or night, depending on the target species. A typical longline set will comprise about 1200 hooks. Fishers commonly operate around 107 days per year. Most trips are between 2 and 15 days, but occasionally trips extend up to 30 days. Typical fishing trips range from 40–300 nautical miles from port, though in the past some vessels journeyed out to 1000 nautical miles or further to fish.

The *Eastern Tuna and Billfish Fishery Management Plan 2010* came into effect on 1 March 2011. The ETBF Plan outlines specific ecosystem requirements, the process for setting total allowable commercial catch (TACC) limits and the provisions for granting of statutory fishing rights (SFRs) in the ETBF. This is the first time that TACCs have been permanently implemented in the ETBF and marks a significant change in management as the fishery moves from input controls based on total allowable effort to output controls with individually transferable quotas operating under a TACC. The species managed under the ETBF Plan include albacore, bigeye tuna, billfish, longtail tuna, northern bluefin tuna, Ray's bream, skipjack tuna and yellowfin tuna.

Figure 2 Area of Australia's Eastern and Western Tuna and Billfish Fisheries



### Western Tuna and Billfish Fishery

The WTBF encompasses the area of the AFZ off the northern, western and southern coastline westward from Cape York Peninsula (142°30'E) off Queensland to 141°E at the Victoria–South Australia boarder (Figure 2). The fishery includes waters seaward of territorial waters (outside 12 nautical miles from the coast) adjacent to Christmas and Cocos (Keeling) Islands and high seas areas throughout the Indian Ocean, consistent with the area of competency of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission. Most longline vessels in the fishery are 15–25 m long and set 1000–1500 hooks on monofilament lines, with an average of one set per day. Vessels fish throughout the year with an average trip of 4 to 10 days.

The *Western Tuna and Billfish Management Plan 2005* came into effect on 12 November 2006. The WTBF Plan removes the internal barrier at 34°S, which had previously separated the Southern and the Western Tuna and Billfish Fisheries, and renamed the entire area the 'Western Tuna and Billfish Fishery'. The WTBF Plan provides for a system of individual transferable quota SFRs, with the quota species including bigeye tuna, yellowfin tuna, striped marlin and broadbill swordfish. For one fishing season, each SFR entitles an equal share to the TACC for the relevant species.




## Distribution of catch and effort

The Australian domestic SBT catches for the 2014 and 2015 calendar years were 4559 t and 5824 t, respectively. The 2013–14 quota year catch was 5420 t, and the 2014–15 quota year catch was 5519 t. Australia voluntarily reduced its effective total allowable catch in 2014–15 by 108 t to account for overcatch in the 2013–14 season.


In 2014–15, 26 vessels landed SBT in Australian waters: 89.6 per cent of the catch was taken by six purse seiners off South Australia. The remainder of the catch was taken by 18 longliners and one vessel conducting rod-and-reel operations in the ETBF and one vessel conducting pole-and-line operations in the WTBF. Longliners deployed a total of 399 353 hooks (in 2015) for shots that caught SBT (Figures 3a and 3b<sup>2</sup>).

**Figure 3a** Location of SBT catch by purse seine in 2013–14 and 2014–15.



<sup>2</sup> SBT catch has been filtered so that only operations from a total of five or more vessels over the time period from 2013–14 and 2014–15 are shown. The catch was first aggregated using a kernel density algorithm at a spatial resolution of 25 km square. A neighbourhood analysis was then carried out on the same data and at the same spatial resolution; only the cells where five boats or more operated were then used to make the final map of catch per units of area. The footprint shows grid cells at a spatial resolution of one degree (111 km square) where vessels have reported catch during the time period.

Figure 3b Location of SBT catch by longline in 2013–14 and 2014–15.



# 3 Fisheries monitoring for each fleet

## Catch documentation

There are a series of compulsory fishery-specific logbooks and associated catch disposal records that are required by law to be completed by Australian fishers. Current fishery-specific logbooks and catch disposal records can be downloaded from <http://www.afma.gov.au/fisheries-services/logbooks-and-catch-disposal/>

All of the data provided in logbooks and catch disposal records must be supplied to AFMA within specified time periods. Verification of these data is undertaken through observer programs and, as a minimum, through an annual audit process undertaken by AFMA. In addition, specific reporting forms for protected species under the EPBC Act 1999 (e.g. seabirds, marine mammals etc) are included with the fishery-specific logbooks in all Australian Commonwealth fisheries.

## Observer programs

Observer programs for the purse seine and longline fisheries have been in place for a number of years. The observer program began in 2001 in the ETBF and 2003 in the WTBF and SBTf. Approximately 15 observers are currently employed in the AFMA observer program. They are sourced from universities and the maritime industries and require the ability to live and work at sea, have demonstrated experience in collecting biological data at sea, and have experience in fisheries research methodologies and collection of associated scientific data. Observers must complete an AFMA observer training course.

Observer reports include details of daily fishing operations, the mitigation measures employed and any non-target species interactions. In terms of ERS species interactions, the number (and weight where appropriate) of each species caught is recorded for each shot observed as well as the life status (alive, dead, injured) and whether it was retained or discarded. Australia's observer program aims to monitor 10 per cent of SBT fishing activities and employs international and domestic observers in compliance with CCSBT observer standards.

Recently, AFMA has introduced electronic monitoring (e-monitoring) to its longline fisheries. E-monitoring of the WTBF and ETBF became compulsory from 1 July 2015 for vessels operating within the Australian Exclusive Economic Zone. As a minimum, e-monitoring information from 10 per cent of the hauls is reviewed and used to acquit information provided in logbooks.

In the 2013–14 fishing season, the purse-seine coverage was 17.0 per cent of sets, representing 16 sets observed where SBT were retained and one aborted set where fish were reported as too small, and 21.9 per cent of the estimated SBT catch. In 2014, observers monitored 5.9 per cent of shots where SBT was caught in the ETBF. No SBT were observed caught in the WTBF in 2014, therefore observer coverage, defined as shots where SBT were caught, was zero per cent.

In the 2014–15 fishing season, observers monitored 9.1 per cent of purse seine sets, representing 14 sets observed where SBT were retained and one aborted set because of net damage, and 19.9 per cent of the estimated SBT catch. In 2015, observers monitored 7.5 per cent of shots where SBT was caught in the ETBF and 21.9 per cent in the WTBF.

## Vessel Monitoring System

All vessels operating in the SBTF, ETBF and WTBF are required to operate Integrated Computer Vessel Monitoring Systems (ICVMS) while fishing and transiting to and from fishing grounds. This allows real-time vessel position and activity reporting to a central Vessel Monitoring Systems (VMS) operations area at AFMA.

Australian SBT purse seine and tow vessels off Port Lincoln are required to report their locations and catch details on a daily basis. This may be done by ICVMS, or at sea by satellite phone, mobile phone or fax.

## Port monitoring

Australian fisheries officers conduct random inspections of landings at key SBT ports, as well as at-sea boardings and inspection of vessels taking SBT in the longline and purse seine fisheries.

Compliance risk assessments for all sectors taking SBT are completed annually. Likewise, a specific compliance operational plan is developed and implemented on an annual basis for each fishery.

# 4 Seabirds

Seabirds can be attracted to longline vessels by discharged offal and baits, and on occasion ingest baited hooks during the setting or, less commonly, hauling of longlines. Bait is not used when purse seining, therefore the rate of seabird interactions in this sector is very low.

Oceanic longline fishing is listed as a key threatening process for seabirds under the EPBC Act 1999, requiring the development of a Threat Abatement Plan (TAP) for the Incidental Catch (or bycatch) of Seabirds during Oceanic Longline Fishing Operations (Commonwealth of Australia 2014). The current TAP (2014) requires the ETBF and WTBF to reduce the bycatch of seabirds in oceanic longline operations and maintain a bycatch rate of less than 0.05 seabirds per 1000 hooks in all fishing areas southwards of the parallel of 25°S (by 5° latitudinal bands) and season (1 September–30 April; 1 May–31 August). More recently, Australia has recognised the need to extend our commitment to addressing the incidental catch of seabirds from other fishing methods. Australia is currently developing an NPOA seabirds which will cover trawl, gillnet and recreational fisheries.

Australia has implemented permit conditions on fishing operators that are designed to prevent the capture of seabirds. For example, Australian vessel fishing south of 25°S must deploy bird-scaring lines (streamers), known as ‘tori’ lines, to deter seabirds from diving on the line and line weighting to quickly sink the line out of reach of seabirds.

Vessel/crew responses to interactions with seabirds are mandated in the TAP (2014). Consistent with the objectives and prescriptions of the TAP, Australia has implemented conditions aimed at reducing seabird mortality through requirements on fishing permits. These are detailed in Section 7 of this report.

## Observed seabird interactions

### **Southern Bluefin Tuna Fishery**

There are very few recorded incidences of seabirds interacting with fishing vessels or purse-seine gear in the SBTF. There have been no observed seabird interactions in the purse-seine sector since the 2007–08 fishing season.

### **Eastern Tuna and Billfish Fishery**

The ETBF does interact with seabirds, although the current interaction rate is low. With the implementation of the TAP, a large proportion of the longline fleet on the east coast began to set their lines during the night to avoid interactions with albatross species. In doing so, they reduced the probability of catching albatross but increased the probability of catching of shearwaters. Through a number of at-sea trials with a variety of mitigation measures, the catch of all seabirds has been reduced to a level under the 0.05 seabirds per 1000 hooks set as the performance indicator under the TAP (Lawrence et al. 2009).

There were no observed seabird interactions in the Australian ETBF in 2014 and four observed seabird interactions in 2015 (Table 1a). Seabird interactions occurring in the ETBF are reported annually to the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC; e.g. Patterson et al. 2016).

Table 1a Observed interactions between seabird species and ETBF vessels (CCSBT statistical area 4) in 2014 and 2015. Capture and mortality rates are given as per thousand hooks. Note: data are from shots in the ETBF where SBT were caught. Observed interaction in 2015 are from electronic monitoring. Scientific names are given in Appendix IV.

ETBF (2014)		Observed							Estimate	Proportion of observed effort with specific mitigation measures				
Species	Total effort (no. hooks)	Total observed effort (no. hooks)	Observer coverage (% no. hooks)	Captures (number)	Capture rate (per 1000 hooks)	Mortalities (number)	Mortality rate (per 1000 hooks)	Live releases	Estimated total mortalities (raised to total effort)	TP + NS (%)	TP + WB (%)	NS + WB (%)	TP + WB + NS (%)	NIL (%)
Nil	235 236	13 888	5.9	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	93.43	0	6.57	0

ETBF (2015)		Observed							Estimate	Proportion of observed effort with specific mitigation measures				
Species	Total effort (no. hooks)	Total observed effort (no. hooks)	Observer coverage (% no. hooks)	Captures (number)	Capture rate (per 1000 hooks)	Mortalities (number)	Mortality rate (per 1000 hooks)	Live releases	Estimated total mortalities (raised to total effort)	TP + NS (%)	TP + WB (%)	NS + WB (%)	TP + WB + NS (%)	NIL (%)
Shy albatoss	384 415	28 869	7.5	4	0.139	1	0.035	3	13.33	0	60.20	0	39.80	0

**Table 1b Observed interactions between seabird species and WTBF vessels (CCSBT statistical area 2) in 2014 and 2015. Capture and mortality rates are given as per thousand hooks. Note: data are from shots in the ETBF where SBT were caught. Observed interaction in 2015 are from electronic monitoring. Scientific names are given in Appendix IV.**

<b>WTBF (2014)</b>		<b>Observed</b>							<b>Estimate</b>	<b>Proportion of observed effort with specific mitigation measures</b>				
Species	Total effort (no. hooks)	Total observed effort (no. hooks)	Observer coverage (% no. hooks)	Captures (number)	Capture rate (per 1000 hooks)	Mortalities (number)	Mortality rate (per 1000 hooks)	Live releases	Estimated total mortalities (raised to total effort)	TP + NS (%)	TP + WB (%)	NS + WB (%)	TP + WB + NS (%)	NIL (%)
Nil	15 785	0	0	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	na	na	na	na	na

<b>WTBF (2015)</b>		<b>Observed</b>							<b>Estimate</b>	<b>Proportion of observed effort with specific mitigation measures</b>				
Species	Total effort (no. hooks)	Total observed effort (no. hooks)	Observer coverage (% no. hooks)	Captures (number)	Capture rate (per 1000 hooks)	Mortalities (number)	Mortality rate (per 1000 hooks)	Live releases	Estimated total mortalities (raised to total effort)	TP + NS (%)	TP + WB (%)	NS + WB (%)	TP + WB + NS (%)	NIL (%)
Nil	14 938	3 265	21.9	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	100.00	0	0	0

## **Western Tuna and Billfish Fishery**

There were no observed SBT captured in the WTBF in 2014, so there was no observer coverage, as defined by operations where SBT were caught, in that year. In 2015, there were no seabird interactions observed in the WTBF (Table 1b). Seabird interactions occurring in the WTBF are reported annually to the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC) (e.g. Hobsbawn et al. 2016).

The prevalence of seabirds on the west coast of Australia is considerably less than that of the east coast. In addition to the lower abundance of seabirds, the majority of the fleet in the WTBF targets swordfish and therefore sets at night. While observer data are only available for recent years, when fishing activity has been very low, the data indicate that seabird interactions are below the limit of 0.05 seabirds per 1000 hooks prescribed by the TAP (2014).

## **Non-observed seabird interactions**

### **Southern Bluefin Tuna Fishery**

No seabird interactions have been recorded in logbooks for the purse-seine fishery.

### **Eastern Tuna and Billfish Fishery**

Fishers in the ETBF encounter SBT during a limited time of the year when SBT migrate into the ETBF area, typically May to October. In addition, fishing for SBT is permitted only in designated areas. To minimise the risk of non-quota take of SBT by longliners off New South Wales, access to the waters through which SBT migrate has been restricted to only vessels holding SBT quota. This arrangement has resulted in a significant reduction in longline effort in southern areas, and corresponding reductions in seabird and bycatch species interactions. There were no seabird interactions in 2014 in shots where SBT was caught recorded in the logbooks, but there were several interactions in 2015 (Table 2). Seabird interactions are reported annually to the WCPFC (e.g. Patterson et al. 2016).

### **Western Tuna and Billfish Fishery**

There were no seabird interactions in 2014 or 2015 in shots where SBT was caught recorded in the logbooks. Seabird interactions occurring in the WTBF are reported annually to the IOTC (e.g. Hobsbawn et al. 2016).



Table 2 Unobserved interactions (logbooks) between seabirds and ETBF vessels (CCSBT statistical area 4) in 2015. Capture and mortality rates are given per thousand hooks. Mortalities and mortality rates are based on the number of retained individuals. Releases indicate the number of individuals released alive.

<b>Species</b>	<b>Total effort (no. hooks)</b>	<b>Captures</b>	<b>Capture rate (per 1000 hooks)</b>	<b>Mortalities</b>	<b>Mortality rate (per 1000 hooks)</b>	<b>Releases</b>
Black-browed albatross	384 415	6	0.016	3	0.008	3

# 5 Non-target fish

## Observed and non-observed fish interactions

### **Southern Bluefin Tuna Fishery**

The purse seine fishery is highly selective and takes few non-target fish. Because purse seine trips often exceed 20 days and there are limited freezer facilities on board the vessels, any non-target fish catch is generally discarded alive. There was no observed non-target catch for the 2013–14 and 2014–15 fishing seasons and no non-target fish catch was reported in logbooks.

### **Eastern Tuna and Billfish Fishery**

Table 3a provides observed non-target catch in the ETBF for 2014 and 2015. Table 4a provide the non-target scalefish catch recorded in logbooks. Again, only non-target fish captured during shots that captured SBT are provided.

### **Western Tuna and Billfish Fishery**

Table 3b provides observed non-target catch in the WTBF for 2014 and 2015. Table 4b provide the non-target scalefish catch recorded in logbooks.

Table 3a Observed interactions between non-target scalefish species and ETBF vessels (CCSBT statistical area 4) in 2014 and 2015. Capture and mortality rates are given per thousand hooks. Note: data are from shots in the ETBF where SBT were caught and only species where 10 or more individuals were caught are reported. Observed interaction in 2015 are from electronic monitoring. Scientific names are given in Appendix IV.

ETBF (2014)		Observed							Estimate	Proportion of observed effort with specific mitigation measures				
Species	Total effort (no. hooks)	Total observed effort (no. hooks)	Observer coverage (% no. hooks)	Captures (number)	Capture rate (per 1000 hooks)	Mortalities (number)	Mortality rate (per 1000 hooks)	Live releases	Estimated total mortalities (raised to total effort)	TP + NS (%)	TP + WB (%)	NS + WB (%)	TP + WB + NS (%)	NIL (%)
Mahi mahi	235 236	13 888	5.9	25	1.800	22	1.584	3	372.64	0	93.43	0	6.57	0

ETBF (2015)		Observed							Estimate	Proportion of observed effort with specific mitigation measures				
Species	Total effort (no. hooks)	Total observed effort (no. hooks)	Observer coverage (% no. hooks)	Captures (number)	Capture rate (per 1000 hooks)	Mortalities (number)	Mortality rate (per 1000 hooks)	Live releases	Estimated total mortalities (raised to total effort)	TP + NS (%)	TP + WB (%)	NS + WB (%)	TP + WB + NS (%)	NIL (%)
Lancetfishes	384 415	28 869	7.5	25	0.866	3	0.104	4	332.90	0	60.20	0	39.80	0
Mahi mahi	384 415	28 869	7.5	18	0.624	17	0.589	1	226.37	0	60.20	0	39.80	0
Short sunfish	384 415	28 869	7.5	13	0.450	1	0.035	2	13.32	0	60.20	0	39.80	0

Table 3b Observed interactions between non-target scalefish species and WTBF vessels (CCSBT statistical area 2) in 2015. There were no SBT observed caught in the WTBF in 2014, so there was no observer coverage, as defined by operations where SBT were caught. Capture and mortality rates are given per thousand hooks. Note: data are from shots in the ETBF where SBT were caught and only species where 10 or more individuals were caught are reported. Observed interaction in 2015 are from electronic monitoring. Scientific names are given in Appendix IV.

WTBF (2015)		Observed							Estimate	Proportion of observed effort with specific mitigation measures				
Species	Total effort (no. hooks)	Total observed effort (no. hooks)	Observer coverage (% no. hooks)	Captures (number)	Capture rate (per 1000 hooks)	Mortalities (number)	Mortality rate (per 1000 hooks)	Live releases	Estimated total mortalities (raised to total effort)	TP + NS (%)	TP + WB (%)	NS + WB (%)	TP + WB + NS (%)	NIL (%)
Lancetfishes	14 938	3 265	21.9	15	4.594	4	1.225	2	18.30	0	100.00	0	0	0
Oilfish	14 938	3 265	21.9	41	12.557	31	9.495	4	141.83	0	100.00	0	0	0

**Table 4a Unobserved interactions (logbooks) between non-target scalefish species and ETBF vessels (CCSBT statistical area 4) in 2014 and 2015. Capture and mortality rates are given per thousand hooks. Mortalities and mortality rates are based on the number of retained individuals. Releases indicate the number of individuals released, but life status at the time of release is unknown. Note: data are from shots in the ETBF where SBT were caught and only species where 10 or more individuals were caught are reported.**

<b>Species 2014</b>	<b>Total effort (no. hooks)</b>	<b>Captures</b>	<b>Capture rate (per 1000 hooks)</b>	<b>Mortalities</b>	<b>Mortality rate (per 1000 hooks)</b>	<b>Releases</b>
Lancetfishes	235 236	169	0.718	0	0	169
Mahi mahi	235 236	348	1.479	345	1.467	3
Ray's bream	235 236	123	0.523	123	0.523	0
Escolar	235 236	17	0.072	15	0.064	2
Rudderfish	235 236	78	0.332	57	0.242	21
Ocean sunfish	235 236	26	0.111	0	0	26

<b>Species 2015</b>	<b>Total effort (no. hooks)</b>	<b>Captures</b>	<b>Capture rate (per 1000 hooks)</b>	<b>Mortalities</b>	<b>Mortality rate (per 1000 hooks)</b>	<b>Releases</b>
Lancetfishes	384 415	221	0.575	0	0	221
Mahi mahi	384 415	63	0.164	62	0.161	1
Ray's bream	384 415	198	0.515	198	0.515	0
Escolar	384 415	209	0.544	88	0.229	121
Rudderfish	384 415	144	0.375	73	0.190	71
Short sunfish	384 415	70	0.182	0	0	70
Ocean sunfish	384 415	293	0.762	0	0	293

Table 4b Unobserved interactions (logbooks) between non-target scalefish species and WTBF vessels (CCSBT statistical area 2) in 2014 and 2015. Capture and mortality rates are given per thousand hooks. Mortalities and mortality rates are based on the number of retained individuals. Releases indicate the number of individuals released, but life status at the time of release is unknown. Note: data are from shots in the WTBF where SBT were caught and only species where 10 or more individuals were caught are reported.

<b>Species 2014</b>	<b>Total effort (no. hooks)</b>	<b>Captures</b>	<b>Capture rate (per 1000 hooks)</b>	<b>Mortalities</b>	<b>Mortality rate (per 1000 hooks)</b>	<b>Releases</b>
Lancetfishes	15 785	11	0.697	0	0	11
Mahi mahi	15 785	26	1.647	10	0.634	16
Rudderfish	15 785	12	0.760	12	0.760	0

<b>Species 2015</b>	<b>Total effort (no. hooks)</b>	<b>Captures</b>	<b>Capture rate (per 1000 hooks)</b>	<b>Mortalities</b>	<b>Mortality rate (per 1000 hooks)</b>	<b>Releases</b>
Lancetfishes	14 938	79	5.289	0	0	79
Ray's bream	14 938	15	1.004	15	1.004	0
Escolar	14 938	27	1.807	0	0	27
Rudderfish	14 938	81	5.422	42	2.812	39

## Observed and non-observed shark interactions

### **Southern Bluefin Tuna Fishery**

Bycatch of sharks during pole-and-line and purse seine fishing (including farm operations) for SBT is minimal. Sharks taken incidentally during purse seining are able to be released before the net is retrieved and fish are transferred to tow cages. Sharks are known to interact with tow cages containing SBT being towed back to farms, and divers work to release these sharks alive.

No interactions, observed or non-observed, between purse-seine vessels and sharks were recorded in 2014 or 2015.

### **Eastern Tuna and Billfish Fishery**

Shark catch details from observers in the ETBF are provided in Table 5a for 2014 and 2015. Catches from logbooks are provided in Table 6a for 2014 and 2015. Mitigation measures to reduce shark bycatch are in place in the ETBF and WTBF (see section 7). The catch of sharks in the ETBF is reported annually to the WCPFC (e.g. Patterson et al. 2016).

### **Western Tuna and Billfish Fishery**

Shark catch details from observers in the WTBF are provided in Table 5b for 2014 and 2015. Catches from logbooks are provided in Table 6b for 2014 and 2015. Mitigation measures to reduce shark bycatch are in place in the ETBF and WTBF (see section 7). The catch of sharks in the WTBF is reported annually to the IOTC (e.g. Hobsbawn et al. 2016).

Table 5a Observed interactions between shark species and ETBF vessels (CCSBT statistical area 4) in 2014 and 2015. Capture and mortality rates are given per thousand hooks. Note: data are from shots in the ETBF where SBT were caught. Observed interaction in 2015 are from electronic monitoring. Scientific names are given in Appendix IV.

ETBF (2014)		Observed							Estimate	Proportion of observed effort with specific mitigation measures				
Species	Total effort (no. hooks)	Total observed effort (no. hooks)	Observer coverage (% no. hooks)	Captures (number)	Capture rate (per 1000 hooks)	Mortalities (number)	Mortality rate (per 1000 hooks)	Live releases	Estimated total mortalities (raised to total effort)	TP + NS (%)	TP + WB (%)	NS + WB (%)	TP + WB + NS (%)	NIL (%)
Blue shark	235 236	13 888	5.9	36	2.592	7	0.504	28	474.27	0	93.43	0	6.57	0
Longfin mako	235 236	13 888	5.9	1	0.072	1	0.072	0	0	0	93.43	0	6.57	0
Oceanic whitetip	235 236	13 888	5.9	1	0.072	0	0.000	0	0	0	93.43	0	6.57	0
Bluntnose sixgill shark	235 236	13 888	5.9	2	0.144	2	0.144	0	0	0	93.43	0	6.57	0
Shortfin mako	235 236	13 888	5.9	3	0.216	2	0.144	1	16.94	0	93.43	0	6.57	0
Australian angel shark	235 236	13 888	5.9	1	0.072	1	0.072	0	0	0	93.43	0	6.57	0



ETBF (2015)		Observed							Estimate	Proportion of observed effort with specific mitigation measures				
Species	Total effort (no. hooks)	Total observed effort (no. hooks)	Observer coverage (% no. hooks)	Captures (number)	Capture rate (per 1000 hooks)	Mortalities (number)	Mortality rate (per 1000 hooks)	Live releases	Estimated total mortalities (raised to total effort)	TP + NS (%)	TP + WB (%)	NS + WB (%)	TP + WB + NS (%)	NIL (%)
Longfin mako	384 415	28 869	7.5	4	0.139	0	0	4	0	0	60.20	0	39.80	0
Shortfin mako	384 415	28 869	7.5	6	0.208	5	0.173	1	66.67	0	60.20	0	39.80	0
Dusky whaler	384 415	28 869	7.5	1	0.035	1	0.035	0	13.33	0	60.20	0	39.80	0
Blue shark	384 415	28 869	7.5	125	4.329	6	0.208	50	79.98	0	60.20	0	39.80	0
Tiger shark	384 415	28 869	7.5	2	0.069	0	0	2	0	0	60.20	0	39.80	0
Sharks (unidentified)	384 415	28 869	7.5	6	0.208	0	0	1	0	0	60.20	0	39.80	0

Table 5b Observed interactions between shark species and WTBF vessels (CCSBT statistical area 2) in 2014 and 2015. Capture and mortality rates are given per thousand hooks. Note: data are from shots in the ETBF where SBT were caught. Observed interaction in 2015 are from electronic monitoring. Scientific names are given in Appendix IV.

WTBF (2014)		Observed							Estimate	Proportion of observed effort with specific mitigation measures				
Species	Total effort (no. hooks)	Total observed effort (no. hooks)	Observer coverage (% no. hooks)	Captures (number)	Capture rate (per 1000 hooks)	Mortalities (number)	Mortality rate (per 1000 hooks)	Live releases	Estimated total mortalities (raised to total effort)	TP + NS (%)	TP + WB (%)	NS + WB (%)	TP + WB + NS (%)	NIL (%)
Nil	15 785	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	na	na	na	na	na

WTBF (2015)		Observed							Estimate	Proportion of observed effort with specific mitigation measures				
Species	Total effort (no. hooks)	Total observed effort (no. hooks)	Observer coverage (% no. hooks)	Captures (number)	Capture rate (per 1000 hooks)	Mortalities (number)	Mortality rate (per 1000 hooks)	Live releases	Estimated total mortalities (raised to total effort)	TP + NS (%)	TP + WB (%)	NS + WB (%)	TP + WB + NS (%)	NIL (%)
Longfin mako	14 938	3 265	21.9	1	0.306	0	0	0	0	0	100.00	0	0	0
Shortfin mako	14 938	3 265	21.9	3	0.919	1	0.306	1	4.57	0	100.00	0	0	0
Crocodile shark	14 938	3 265	21.9	2	0.613	0	0	2	0	0	100.00	0	0	0
Bigeye thresher	14 938	3 265	21.9	1	0.306	0	0	0	0	0	100.00	0	0	0

Dusky whaler	14 938	3 265	21.9	1	0.306	0	0	1	0	0	100.00	0	0	0
Blue shark	14 938	3 265	21.9	43	13.17	3	0.919	3	13.32	0	100.00	0	0	0
Sharks (unidentified)	14 938	3 265	21.9	5	1.531	0	0	1	0	0	100.00	0	0	0

Table 6a Unobserved interactions (logbooks) between shark species and ETBF vessels (CCSBT statistical area 4) in 2014 and 2015. Capture and mortality rates are given per thousand hooks. Mortalities and mortality rates are based on the number of retained individuals. Releases indicate the number of individuals released, but life status at the time of release is unknown. Note: data are from shots in the ETBF where SBT were caught. Scientific names are given in Appendix IV.

<b>Species 2014</b>	<b>Total effort (no. hooks)</b>	<b>Captures</b>	<b>Capture rate (per 1000 hooks)</b>	<b>Mortalities</b>	<b>Mortality rate (per 1000 hooks)</b>	<b>Releases</b>
Shortfin mako	235 236	103	0.438	63	0.268	40
Longfin mako	235 236	1	0.004	0	0	1
Porbeagle	235 236	1	0.004	0	0	1
Thresher sharks (mixed)	235 236	2	0.009	1	0.004	1
Bronze whaler	235 236	1	0.004	0	0	1
Dusky whaler	235 236	1	0.004	0	0	1
Blue shark	235 236	578	2.457	0	0	578
Tiger shark	235 236	4	0.017	0	0	4
Oceanic whitetip	235 236	3	0.013	0	0	3
Giant manta ray	235 236	1	0.004	0	0	1

Table 6a Continued

Species 2015	Total effort (no. hooks)	Captures	Capture rate (per 1000 hooks)	Mortalities	Mortality rate (per 1000 hooks)	Releases
Shortfin mako	384 415	115	0.299	48	0.125	67
Longfin mako	384 415	1	0.003	0	0	1
Porbeagle	384 415	3	0.008	0	0	3
Thresher sharks (mixed)	384 415	9	0.023	0	0	9
Whaler and weasel sharks	384 415	1	0.003	0	0	1
Bronze whaler	384 415	3	0.008	0	0	3
Dusky whaler	384 415	86	0.224	0	0	86
Blue shark	384 415	2292	5.962	8	0.021	2292
Tiger shark	384 415	11	0.029	0	0	11
Oceanic whitetip	384 415	2	0.005	0	0	2
Hammerhead sharks	384 415	2	0.005	0	0	2
Stingrays	384 415	6	0.016	0	0	6
Giant manta ray	384 415	2	0.005	0	0	2

Table 6b Unobserved interactions (logbooks) between shark species and WTBF vessels (CCSBT statistical area 2) in 2014 and 2015. Capture and mortality rates are given per thousand hooks. Mortalities and mortality rates are based on the number of retained individuals. Releases indicate the number of individuals released, but life status at the time of release is unknown. Note: data are from shots in the WTBF where SBT were caught. Scientific names are given in Appendix IV.

<b>Species 2014</b>	<b>Total effort (no. hooks)</b>	<b>Captures</b>	<b>Capture rate (per 1000 hooks)</b>	<b>Mortalities</b>	<b>Mortality rate (per 1000 hooks)</b>	<b>Releases</b>
Crocodile shark	15 785	21	1.330	0	0	21
Shortfin mako	15 785	42	2.661	37	2.344	5
Thresher sharks (mixed)	15 785	1	0.063	0	0	1
Bronze whaler	15 785	105	6.652	0	0	105
Blue shark	15 785	95	6.018	0	0	95
Stingrays	15 785	5	0.317	0	0	5
Giant manta ray	15 785	1	0.063	0	0	1

Table 6b Continued

Species 2015	Total effort (no. hooks)	Captures	Capture rate (per 1000 hooks)	Mortalities	Mortality rate (per 1000 hooks)	Releases
Crocodile shark	14 938	53	3.548	0	0	53
Shortfin mako	14 938	15	1.004	0	0	15
Thresher sharks (mixed)	14 938	2	0.134	0	0	2
Blue shark	14 938	127	8.502	0	0	127
Tiger shark	14 938	1	0.067	0	0	1
Stingrays	14 938	17	1.138	0	0	17

# 6 Marine mammals and marine reptiles

The SBTF and the ETBF and WTBF longline fisheries all have a very low incidence of marine mammal and reptile interactions.

## **Southern Bluefin Tuna Fishery**

No interactions with marine mammals or reptiles, observed or non-observed, were recorded in the SBTF in 2013–14 or 2014–15.

## **Eastern Tuna and Billfish Fishery**

There were no observed or unobserved interactions with marine mammals or reptiles in a shot where SBT was taken in the ETBF in 2014 or 2015. Interactions with marine mammals and reptiles are reported annually to the WCPFC (e.g. Patterson et al. 2016).

## **Western Tuna and Billfish Fishery**

There were no observed interactions with marine mammals or reptiles in a shot where SBT was taken in the WTBF in 2014 or 2015. A single interaction with a leatherback turtle was recorded in logbooks in the WTBF in 2015 (Table 7). Interactions with marine mammals and reptiles are reported annually to the IOTC (e.g. Hobsbawn et al. 2016).



**Table 7 Unobserved interactions (logbooks) between reptile species and WTBF vessels (CCSBT statistical area 2) in 2015. Capture and mortality rates are given per thousand hooks. Note: data are from shots in the ETBF where SBT were caught. na = data not available. Scientific names are given in Appendix IV.**

<b>Species</b>	<b>Total effort</b>	<b>Captures</b>	<b>Capture rate</b>	<b>Mortalities</b>	<b>Mortality rate</b>	<b>Releases</b>
Leatherback turtle	14 938	1	0.067	0	0	1

# 7 Mitigation measures to minimise seabird and other species bycatch

In Australia, the EPBC Act (1999) is the primary legislation that covers environmental issues, including the ecologically sustainable use of marine resources. The EPBC Act requires that:

- all Commonwealth-managed and State/Northern Territory wild capture marine fisheries with an export component be assessed to determine the extent to which management arrangements will ensure each fishery is being managed in an ecologically sustainable way;
- all Commonwealth-managed fisheries are also assessed to determine the impact of actions taken under a fishery management plan on matters of national environmental significance; and
- all Commonwealth-managed fisheries and any State-managed fisheries that operate in Commonwealth waters should also be assessed to determine the impacts of fishing operations on cetaceans, listed threatened species and ecological communities, migratory species, and listed marine species under the EPBC Act.

The assessments consider the impacts of the fishery on target and non-target species caught and the impacts of fishing on the broader marine environment. Initial and subsequent assessments have been completed for the SBT Fishery, ETBF and WTBF (see <http://environment.gov.au/coasts/fisheries/commonwealth/index.html>), and continue to guide the development of improved management arrangements to reduce the ecological impacts of Australian fisheries catching SBT.

Measures to reduce the ecological impacts of fisheries catching SBT rely initially on the analysis of fishery-dependent and -independent data collected through observer programs, logbooks and targeted research activities. As more data are collected and the impacts of SBT fishing operations on ERS become clearer, strategies to reduce these impacts continue to be developed and refined.

In this context, Australia has:

- Continued to use catch and effort logbooks to collect data on the catch of target and non-target species
- Introduced observer programs in the SBT surface fishery (2003), and its longline fisheries targeting SBT (2001 and 2003 for the ETBF and WTBF, respectively), which include specific reporting requirements for protected species
- Initiated a range of at-sea programs to trial strategies to reduce the incidental mortality of seabirds caught during longlining operations (e.g. by increasing hook sink rates, see Table 10)
- Introduced detailed strategies to reduce bycatch and impacts on ecologically related species, performance measures to monitor progress, and reporting and review targets to assess the effectiveness of these strategies, and refine them where necessary. An important part of these strategies is the development of fishing industry codes of practice to reduce impacts on ERS (see below)

AFMA has completed ecological risk assessments for each fishery managed by the Commonwealth to quantify impacts on ecologically related species and the broader marine environment (<http://www.afma.gov.au/managing-our-fisheries/environment-and-sustainability/Ecological-Risk-Management/>). Ecological risk management reports for the SBTF, ETBF and WTBF are also available and detail management priorities in those fisheries, based on the results of the assessments. The ecological risk assessments rely on existing biological and catch information and consider five ecosystem components: target species, by-product and bycatch species, TEP species, habitats, and communities. The assessments categorise various species as being at high, medium or low risk on the basis of inter alia susceptibility to capture by the various fishing methods, their distribution, and the ability for species populations to recover.

## Current measures

### Mandatory measures for each fleet

#### Mitigation measures to minimise seabird bycatch

Seabirds are opportunistic feeders and are attracted to longline vessels, particularly during line setting, but also during line hauling, when the seabirds are at risk of being caught or entangled in the fishing gear. Seabirds are also attracted to discarded offal and are at risk of ingesting discarded hooks still attached to discarded baits. The design of purse-seine nets and the way this fishing gear is deployed, means that the risk of seabird bycatch during purse seine fishing operations is very low.

The adverse impact of longline fishing activities on seabirds was not fully realised until the 1980s. The incidental catch of seabirds during pelagic longline fishing operations was listed as a key threatening process on 24 July 1995. Threat abatement plans for this key threatening process have been in place since 1998 with the current plan, *Threat Abatement Plan 2014 for the incidental catch (or bycatch) of seabirds during longline fishing operations*, made on 14 August 2014 (Commonwealth of Australia 2014). Copies of this plan may be obtained from the Department of the Environment:

<http://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/threatened/tap-approved.html>. The ultimate aim of this plan is to achieve zero bycatch of seabirds from longline fishing in Commonwealth fisheries. The plan is subject to review within five years.

Considerable progress has been made under successive threat abatement plans to reduce the impact of pelagic longlining on seabirds. This has been achieved through the combined efforts of the fishing industry, researchers and non-governmental stakeholders working with government to reduce seabird bycatch in longline fisheries in a feasible, effective and efficient way. The prescriptions in this plan recognise this success and seek to further reduce the incidental capture of seabirds.

Over the life of the previous threat abatement plans, substantial progress has been achieved towards reducing the key threatening process. The incidental bycatch rates for several fisheries are well below the 0.01 or 0.05 birds per 1000 hooks, the maximum permissible levels set as a performance indicator under the current and previous plan. The prescriptions in the current plan recognise this success and seek to further reduce the incidental capture of seabirds.

Information on the level and nature of interactions between seabirds and fishing gear has increased significantly since 1995 and there is now extensive information available upon which to base decision-making. Considerable research and development activities have been undertaken into seabird bycatch mitigation measures including at sea trials. This work could not have been achieved without the continued engagement and support of industry. The

prescriptions in this threat abatement plan also draw on best and improving practices in seabird bycatch mitigation for pelagic longline fishing developed under the *Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels* (ACAP). This international agreement, to which Australia is a Party, aims to achieve and maintain a favourable conservation status for albatrosses and petrels. ACAP has been developed under the auspices of another international agreement, the *Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals* (CMS). There is now increased confidence concerning the effectiveness of several mitigation measures, particularly line weighting strategies, use of bird-scaring lines, retention of offal during line setting, and night setting (in certain instances). These mitigation measures form the basis of the prescriptions set out in this threat abatement plan.

Threat abatement plans must specify actions needed to achieve their objective. Under the current plan:

- AFMA will require all pelagic longline tuna fishers operating within either the ETBF or WTBF, or both fisheries, southwards of the parallel of 25 degrees South to:
  - a. employ a line-weighting strategy approved by AFMA that enables the bait to be rapidly taken below the reach of most seabirds;
  - b. employ at least one bird-scaring line constructed to a specified standard approved by AFMA, or use another proven mitigation measure approved by AFMA for use without such a line;
  - c. not discharge offal during line setting; and
  - d. employ, as part of an adaptive management approach to seabird bycatch mitigation, such other mitigation measures as AFMA may stipulate following consultation with the Department of the Environment (including, but not limited to, use of bird exclusion devices and/or managing offal discharge during line hauling, night setting, and area closures).
- AFMA will continue to require domestic and foreign vessels in all longline fisheries operating within Australian jurisdiction to adopt proven mitigation measures that ensure the performance criteria for each fishery are achieved in all areas and seasons.
- AFMA will implement an appropriate management response if identified circumstances occur, or data analysis indicates that the performance criteria, defined in this threat abatement plan, have not been met in any fishing area, season or fishery, or that independent monitoring has dropped below acceptable levels. Consistent with an adaptive management approach, the management response will be implemented as soon as practical, but no later than within three months of identification of a problem.
- Require that seabird bycatch in all fishing areas and seasons in the ETBF and WTBF is less than 0.05 birds per 1000 hooks.
- Areas within the ETBF or WTBF south of the parallel of 25 degrees South are divided for the purposes of the above bycatch rate criteria into five degree latitudinal bands. Seasons are defined, for the purposes of the criteria, into two: summer 1 September – 30 April, and winter 1 May – 31 August.

Following experiments showing that 40 g weights placed directly at the hook exhibit greater sink rates than the weighting regime of 60 g at 3.5 m from the hook and sea trials showing that there was no significant impact on catch rates of commercial species (Robertson et al. 2013),

AFMA has implemented permit conditions to allow 40 g weights to be used with dead bait. The new conditions were implemented from 1 February (WTBF) and 1 March (ETBF) 2012. Operators are still permitted to use 60 g, 3.5 m from the hook. In addition, 40 g weights at the hook are coated with luminescent plastic which reduces the need to use light sticks. Further trials to investigate the sink rates and commercial impact of using 60 g weights at the hook with live weight are being conducted (see Table 10 for more information).

See Appendix I and II for specific measures required for the ETBF and WTBF in 2014. Specific management arrangements for the ETBF and WTBF detailing all requirements for each fishery can be found in the management arrangements booklets on the AFMA website:

<http://www.afma.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/2010/06/ETBF-management-arrangements-booklet-2014-FINAL.doc>; <http://www.afma.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/2010/06/WTBF-management-arrangements-booklet-2014-.pdf>

A pre-season briefing booklet for the SBTf is also available: <http://www.afma.gov.au/managing-our-fisheries/fisheries-a-to-z-index/southern-bluefin-tuna/>

### **Mitigation measures to minimise shark bycatch**

Australia has developed a National Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks (Shark-plan 2004) in line with the FAO International Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks (IPOA-Sharks). This plan was reviewed and revised in 2012 (Shark plan 2; see section 11). Accordingly, regulations have been put in place in the pelagic longline fisheries to minimise shark bycatch and prevent indiscriminate finning.

The regulations applying to the ETBF and WTBF are:

- A ban on the use of wire leaders
- A limit of 20 sharks per trip, excluding school shark, gummy shark, elephantfish (Callorhynchidae), chimaerids (Chimaeridae and Rhinochimaeridae) and sawshark. This limit does not apply to great white sharks and grey nurse sharks, which are no-take protected species
- Fishing permit holders are prohibited from carrying, retaining, or landing all shark dorsal, pectoral, caudal, pelvic and anal fins that are not attached to their carcass
- Fishing permit holders are prohibited from carrying, retaining and landing livers obtained from sharks unless the individual carcasses from which the livers were obtained are also landed

Note that shortfin makos, longfin makos and porbeagles were listed under the Convention of Migratory Species (CMS) in 2008, which triggered a mandatory legal obligation to list them for protection under Australia's EPBC Act 1999. Listing under the EPBC Act 1999 came into effect on 29 January 2010. As a consequence, in February 2010 all Australian fisheries that interact with these species in Commonwealth waters were assessed under the EPBC Act. The management arrangements for each fishery was reaccredited on the basis that the arrangements in place required all reasonable steps to be taken to ensure that shortfin and longfin makos and porbeagles are not killed or injured as a result of fishing activities. These species may be retained in accredited fisheries if the sharks have come onboard dead. Live caught specimens must be released unharmed and fishers are required to report interactions.

### *CITES Appendix II listings for sharks and manta rays*

The 16th meeting the Conference of Parties to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) (Bangkok, March 2013) listed a number of shark and manta ray species (oceanic whitetip shark, great, smooth and scalloped hammerhead sharks, porbeagle shark, giant oceanic manta ray and reef manta ray) on Appendix II of CITES (CITES Appendix II lists species that, while not threatened with extinction now, may become so in the future if trade is not regulated). These listings took effect on 14 September 2014. All these species may be encountered by different fishing gears that target tuna and tuna-like species.

The CITES Appendix II listing of shark species does not entail a ban on capture, however the listing does require that any international trade, including any *Introduction from the Sea* (i.e. catch sourced from the High Seas), is informed by a non-detriment finding which determines the harvest is sustainable and that specimens are accompanied by CITES permits for either their import or export.

Non-detriment findings consider, but are not limited to, standard information on species biology and life history characteristics, historical and current range, population structure, status and trends, information on all sources of mortality and management measures in place.

Since 14 September 2014, Australia has had a non-detriment finding in place for the commercial harvest and export, with national harvest levels set for each of the newly-listed shark species. The manta ray species are not included in the non-detriment finding as they are not retained in Australian fisheries for trade. The non-detriment finding is available at:

<http://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/wildlife-trade/publications/non-detriment-finding-five-shark-species>

### **Mitigation measures to minimise sea turtle bycatch**

Interactions between sea turtles and pelagic longline fisheries in the AFZ are rare, particularly in areas where SBT I targeted. Guidelines for mitigating the impact of longline fisheries on marine turtles are described under 'Voluntary measures for each fleet', although there is compulsory carriage of line cutters and dehookers. Interactions with the purse seine fishery are negligible and there has been no need to develop mitigation measures for this sector.

In 2009, Australia formally submitted a mitigation plan, *Eastern Tuna and Billfish Fishery Sea Turtle Mitigation Plan*, for review by the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission Scientific Committee and Technical Compliance Committee, and approval by the Commission. The mitigation plan was submitted under CMM 2008-03 (Conservation and Management of Sea Turtles) and was designed to reduce the interaction rate of turtles in pelagic longline fisheries which target swordfish. It took effect 1 January 2010.

Prior to the start of the 2013 fishing season, AFMA revoked the mitigation plan as the trigger limits established were being breached and the plan was not proving effective. Instead, there is now a requirement for vessels targeting swordfish using shallow sets to use large circle hooks when setting less than 8 hooks per bubble. There is also a requirement that at least one de-hooker and one line cutter be carried at all times.

### **Mitigation measures to minimise fish bycatch**

Effective from 27 July 1998, the commercial take of blue and black marlin was banned under the Fisheries Management Act 1991. Regulations specified that blue and black marlin must be returned to the water irrespective of life status. In addition, specific limits for some species apply (see the management arrangement booklets noted above for further details).

## Compliance monitoring system

AFMA's observer program currently places observers on domestic and, if required, foreign vessels fishing within the AFZ and some adjacent areas under international arrangements. Observers are trained in specialised sampling techniques including environmental observations, and are briefed to educate fishers on their responsibilities to complete logbooks and other data sources, and to use mitigation strategies to reduce impacts on ERS.

AFMA has a responsibility to enforce the provisions of the Fisheries Management Act 1991 and the Torres Strait Fisheries Act 1984 through the detection and investigation of illegal activities by both domestic and foreign fishing boats in the AFZ and Commonwealth-managed fisheries. The Australian Customs and Border Protection Services also patrol waters in the AFZ as part of the Australian Government's anti-illegal fishing strategy.

## Level of Compliance

### Mitigation measures to minimise seabird bycatch

Australia's level of compliance with measures to minimise seabird bycatch is high based on observer and compliance reports. Australia is continuing to conduct research to develop and domestically implement new and more effective seabird mitigation measures and has promoted their adoption by various RFMOs. Australia is compliant with all relevant resolutions and conservation and management measures in the IOTC and WCPFC.

### Mitigation measures to minimise shark bycatch

Australia's level of compliance with measures to minimise shark bycatch is high based on observer and compliance reports. Australia has continued to promote the adoption of shark mitigation measures, such as a ban on wire trace and requiring that sharks be landed with fins attached, in various international meetings. Australia is compliant with all relevant resolutions and conservation and management measures in the IOTC and WCPFC.

### Mitigation measures to minimise sea turtle bycatch

Australia's level of compliance with sea turtles mitigation measures is high based on observer and compliance reports. Australia considers that current sea turtle bycatch management and mitigation measure in place in its pelagic longline fisheries, principally the ETBF and WTBF, fulfil Australia's obligations to *FAO Guidelines to Reduce Sea turtle Mortality in Fishing Operations*. In addition, AFMA has provided line cutters and de-hookers to all longline vessels in the ETBF and WTBF, thus ensuring the requirement to carry them is very likely to be met. Australia is compliant with all relevant resolutions and conservation and management measures in the IOTC and WCPFC.

### Mitigation measures to minimise fish bycatch

There is a very high level of compliance with the requirement that blue and black marlin be returned to the water (see management arrangement booklets for a complete list of species that cannot be taken), with no logbooks or observer reports noting the retention of these species in 2014 or 2015. In addition, there is a high level of compliance with the State finfish catch restrictions on some species.

## Voluntary measures for each fleet

'Industry codes of practice' are in place for a number of fisheries, including the ETBF. These generally include voluntary bycatch mitigation measures together with handling and release guidelines for seabirds, including:

- Puncturing of swim bladders of thawed baits to increase sinking rates
- Gear selection that minimises the probability of seabird bycatch
- Promoting safe handling and release of seabirds caught alive on longlines.

AFMA has run a 'seabird bycatch education program' in the ETBF to teach fishers about fishing practices designed to minimise seabird bycatch, effective line weighting, and correctly assembling/deploying tori lines.

A recovery plan for sea turtles in Australia has been developed by the Australian Government Department of the Environment. The overall objective of the plan is to reduce the detrimental impacts on Australian populations of marine turtles and hence promote their recovery in the wild. A copy of the recovery plan can be obtained from <http://www.environment.gov.au/coasts/publications/turtle-recovery/index.html>.

A video 'Crossing the line: sea turtle handling guidelines for the longline fishing industry' has been produced by the Fisheries Research and Development Corporation to help the Australian longline fishing industry minimise its impact on sea turtle populations. It shows how to use de-hooking devices on deck and on turtles still in the water, how to safely bring turtles aboard and handle them on deck, how to help comatose turtles recover and how to release them back into the water. Similarly, AFMA conducted port visits in 2013 and 2014 in the ETBF to provide de-hookers to all boats with instructions on how to use them and on safe handling of marine turtles.

### **Proportion of fleet using voluntary measures**

The proportion of the fleets using the voluntary measures is generally thought to be high. This is based on information such as the generally low seabird bycatch in longline fisheries, as well as observer data reported to AFMA.

### **Measures under development/testing**

Australia has conducted, and is still conducting, a number of scientific trials to further reduce seabird bycatch in longline fisheries, including a variety of line-weighting trials, methods to increase line sink rates and an underwater bait setting machine (e.g. Robertson & van den Hoff 2010; Robertson et al. 2010a, b; Robertson & Candy 2013; Robertson et al. 2013; Robertson et al. 2015). Scientific studies have been conducted to investigate the most appropriate minimum sink rate of line, differences in the sink rates of live and dead baits, the sink rates of different stages of thawed bait and a variety of weighted branchline arrangements (Table 8).

Previous research on wire versus nylon leaders indicates that catch rates of sharks are significantly reduced when nylon leaders are used (Ward et al. 2008); conversely, catch rates of sharks increase when circle hooks are used instead of tuna hooks (Ward et al. 2009).

Despite the relatively rare occurrence of interactions between pelagic longliners and sea turtles within the AFZ, the Australian Government has recognised the potential for these interactions to threaten the survivability of the species. Australian research quantified the relative effects of circle and tuna hooks on catches of target and common non-target species (Ward et al. 2009). Although not designed to compare capture rates of marine turtles on circle and tuna hooks (owing to the rarity of sea turtle interactions in Australian longline fisheries), results demonstrated that higher catch rates of target species were attained when circle hooks were used (Ward et al. 2009).



**Table 8 Mitigation measures to reduce the incidental catch of seabirds under development or testing in Australia**

<b>Mitigation measure</b>	<b>Lead agency and collaborators</b>	<b>Results to date</b>	<b>Planned development/testing</b>	<b>Status</b>
Line weighting regimes	AFMA, Australian Antarctic Division (AAD), ETBF operators	Not yet available	Comparing the use of 60 g weights for live baits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• directly adjacent to the hook</li> <li>• 0.5 m from the hook</li> <li>• 3.5 m from the hook</li> </ul>	Results published as Abery et al. 2015 Report available at <a href="http://www.afma.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/2010/06/GloLead-BrochureFinal-13-903.pdf">http://www.afma.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/2010/06/GloLead-BrochureFinal-13-903.pdf</a>

# 8 Public relations and education activities

## Public relations activities

All mitigation strategies in place or being trialled by Australia to reduce impacts of SBT fishing on ERS include a level of education and extension to increase their effectiveness. Specific activities to educate fishers on ERS issues are included in the TAP, National Plan of Action for Sharks, and Bycatch Action Plans for both the tuna purse seine and longline fisheries. AFMA's Resource Assessment Groups and Management Advisory Committees are valuable forums in which government, non-government, industry and other stakeholders can discuss current and emerging mitigation strategies.

AFMA staff regularly visit key SBT fishing ports and engage in education and extension activities during these visits. AFMA also provides education materials in the form of brochures, fact sheets, communication post cards, media releases and other written material for extension to fishers and the general public. A large amount of material is made available through the websites of AFMA and the Fisheries Research and Development Corporation (FRDC). Industry representatives are continuing to refine existing codes of practice to reduce the environmental impacts of Australian tuna fisheries.

### **Communication (media releases, published material, video, public presentations)**

AFMA provides education materials in the form of booklets, posters, media releases, educational videos and other written material for further education of vessel skippers and crews. Industry and the general public are able to subscribe to AFMA for electronic media releases and be informed of upcoming extension activities in their local area. A large amount of material is made available through the websites of AFMA and the FRDC: see <http://www.afma.gov.au/sustainability-environment/and> <http://www.frdc.com.au/resources/resources> for further information. Media releases and other publications can be found at <http://www.afma.gov.au/news-media/>

## Education

### **Training of fishers**

Specific activities to educate fishers on ERS issues are included in the TAP, National Plans of Action for Sharks and Bycatch Action Plans for both the tuna purse seine and longline fisheries, and in the Ecological Risk Assessment project.

In addition, Australian observers are briefed to educate fishers on their responsibilities to complete logbooks and other data submission obligations, and in the requirements for, and use of, mitigation strategies to manage impacts on ERS. This information is passed onto vessel skippers and crews during observer trips and while in port.

A series of voluntary training workshops for ETBF operators about bycatch handling, reporting and mitigation was completed. The program was a key initiative under the Australian Tuna and Billfish Longline Fisheries Bycatch and Discarding Workplan, which came into effect on 1 November 2008. Through the program, on-shore workshop sessions and on-board demonstrations provided training to vessel owners, skippers, crew and shore managers on their

obligations in relation to bycatch, including reporting requirements and mitigations measures. Objectives under the new discarding plan, which came into effect 1 July 2014, include the development of a best practice handling guide for chondrichthyans and the development of more education courses for crew. The new discarding plan can be found here:

<http://www.afma.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/2010/06/ATB-Bycatch-and-Discarding-Workplan-2014-2016-FINAL.pdf>

### **Managers**

The Australian Government is committed to the ecologically sustainable development of Australian fisheries and all associated international obligations. On-the-job and specific training is provided to meet this commitment.

### **Observers**

AFMA has recruited and trained scientific observers since its establishment in 1992. Observers are sourced from universities and maritime industries and require the ability to live and work at sea, have demonstrated experience in collecting biological data at sea, and have experience in fisheries research methodologies and collection of associated scientific data. In July 2015, electronic monitoring became mandatory in the Australian longline fisheries (ETBF and WTBF).

### **Information exchange**

Australia is committed to its data exchange obligations, and information exchange in general, and actively encourages open and transparent regional approaches in line with the revised requirements for CCSBT member's annual report to ERSWG, and the Recommendation to Mitigate the Impact on Ecologically Related Species of Fishing for Southern Bluefin Tuna, adopted at the 15th meeting of the Commission in October 2008.

Australia's commitment is also evident in the priority given to meeting data exchange obligations to the WCPFC, IOTC and the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR).

## 9 Information on other ERS (non-bycatch) such as prey and predator species

In 2001, AFMA initiated the project Ecological Risk Assessment for Commonwealth Fisheries (ERACF). This project undertook ecological risk assessments (ERAs) that looked at the impact, both direct and indirect, of fisheries activities on all aspects of the marine ecosystem, which includes prey and predator species. This work forms part of a transition to ecosystem-based fisheries management by AFMA.

The ERA framework details a process for assessing and progressively addressing the impacts that fisheries activities have on five aspects of the marine ecosystem, including:

- Target species
- Bycatch and byproduct species
- Threatened, endangered and protected species
- Habitats
- Communities

All ERAs for Australian Government-managed fisheries are now publicly available, as are the management reports detailing the response planned to the results of the ERAs <http://www.afma.gov.au/sustainability-environment/ecological-risk-management-strategies/>

# 10 Other

Not applicable.

# 11 Implementation of the IPOA-Seabirds and IPOA-Sharks

Australia endorsed the IPOA-Seabirds, and has undertaken a national assessment of longline fisheries to determine seabird bycatch rates. The Australian longline fisheries that principally interact with seabirds operate in Commonwealth waters, which generally refers to waters from three nautical miles offshore to the extent of Australia's EEZ. To manage these interactions, Australia has put in place the TAP. The TAP is a legislative instrument that directs mandatory seabird bycatch management measures. It was first introduced in 1998 and was revised in 2006 and again in 2014, and applies to all longline fisheries managed by the Australian Government. The TAP (2014) is Australia's key national measure for mitigating the impact of longline fisheries on seabird populations, and is consistent with the IPOA-Seabirds.

Australia's National Plan of Action for Conservation and Management of Sharks (NPOA-Sharks) was released in 2004 according to guidelines as set out in the International Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks (IPOA-Sharks). The NPOA-Sharks was designed to provide advice and guidance to fisheries managers, conservation managers and the general public on action needed to ensure that Australia's shark populations are managed sustainably into the future.

As part of the review of Australia's NPOA-Sharks, the Australian Government produced the 2009 Shark Assessment Report (SAR) which is the scientific basis for the adoption of the NPOA. The 2009 SAR (Bensley et al. 2010) builds upon the information provided in the 2001 SAR and identifies any significant changes that have occurred in fisheries since the release of the 2001 SAR.

The second Australian NPOA-Sharks (Shark-plan 2) was released in July 2012 and identifies how Australia will manage and conserve sharks. In addition, an operational strategy was developed in conjunction with state and territory jurisdictions and stakeholders to identify what actions will be pursued in order to meet the objectives of the plan. Shark-plan 2 and the operational strategy can be found here: <http://www.agriculture.gov.au/fisheries/environment/sharks/sharkplan-2A> new SAR is currently being drafted and the 2012 NPOA is currently under review.

# References

Bensley N, Woodhams J, Patterson HM, Rodgers M, McLoughlin K, Stobutzki I & Begg GA 2009, Shark Assessment Report for the Australian National Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks, final report to the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, Bureau of Rural Sciences, Canberra.

Commonwealth of Australia 2014, *Threat Abatement Plan 2014 for the incidental catch (or bycatch) of seabirds during oceanic longline operations*, Department of the Environment, Canberra.

Hobsbawn PI, Patterson HM & Williams A 2016, Australian national report to the Scientific Committee of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission for the 2015, Indian Ocean Tuna Commission, IOTC-2016-SC19-NR-01, Seventeenth Session of the Scientific Committee, 1–5 December 2016, Victoria, Seychelles.

Lawrence E, Giannini F, Bensley N & Crombie J 2009, Estimation of seabird bycatch rates in the Eastern Tuna and Billfish Fishery. Bureau of Rural Sciences, Canberra.

Patterson H, Hobsbawn P & Larcombe J 2016, Annual report to the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission, Part 1: Information on fisheries, research and statistics 2015, Australia, WCPFC-SC12-AR/CCM-01, Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission, Tenth Regular Session of the Scientific Committee, 3–11 August 2016, Bali, Indonesia.

Robertson G & van den Hoff 2010, Static water sink rate trials to improve understanding of sink rates estimated at sea, Third meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group, SBWG-3 Doc 31, Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels, 8–9 April 2010, Mar del Plata, Argentina.

Robertson G, Candy SG & Wienecke B 2010a, 'Effect of line shooter and mainline tension on the sink rates of pelagic longlines and implications for seabird interactions', *Aquatic Conservation: Marine Freshwater Ecosystems*, vol. 20, pp. 419–427.

Robertson G, Candy SG, Wienecke B & Lawton K 2010b, 'Experimental determinations of factors affecting the sink rates of baited hooks to minimize seabird mortality in pelagic longline fisheries', *Aquatic Conservation: Marine Freshwater Ecosystems*, vol. 20, pp. 632–643.

Robertson G & Candy SC 2013, 'Does propeller turbulence affect the sink rate of baited hooks and their availability to seabirds in pelagic longline fisheries?', *Aquatic Conservation: Marine Freshwater Ecosystems*, vol. 24, pp. 179–191.

Robertson G, Candy SC & 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 Freshwater Ecosystems*, vol. 23, pp. 885–900.

Robertson G, Ashworth P, Ashworth P, Carlyle I & Candy SC 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*, vol. 5, pp. 1–12.

Ward P, Lawrence E, Darbyshire R & Hindmarsh S 2008, 'Large-scale experiment shows that nylon leaders reduce shark bycatch and benefit pelagic longline fishers', *Fisheries Research*, vol. 90, pp. 100–108.

Ward P, Epe S, Kreutz D, Lawrence E, Robins C & Sands A 2009, 'The effects of circle hooks on bycatch and target catches in Australia's pelagic longline fishery', *Fisheries Research*, vol. 97, pp. 253–262.



# Appendix I

## Mandatory seabird mitigation measures in the ETBF 2016

### **At all times you must:**

- Carry an assembled tori line on board
- Carry either:
  - 1.) 1000 weighted swivels each weighing at least 60 grams; or
  - 2.) 1000 weights each weighting at least 40 grams
- Not discharge offal while setting
- Not discharge offal while hauling. An exemption for small boats may be given by AFMA.

### **When you are fishing south of 25°S you must:**

- Deploy a tori line before commencing a shot
- Use only thawed bait
- Weight longlines with either a minimum of:
  - 1.) 60 g swivels at a distance of no more than 3.5 m from each hook; or
  - 2.) 98 g swivels at a distance of no more than 4 m from each hook; or
  - 3.) 40 g weights at each hook with dead, non-frozen baits; or
- At all times carry 1000 weighted swivels each weighing at least 60 g or 1000 weights to be used at each hook each weighing at least 40 g
- Not discharge offal while setting
- Not discharge offal while hauling. An exemption for small boats may be given.

### **When you are fishing north of 25°S you must:**

- Carry an assembled tori line onboard
- At all times carry 1000 weighted snoods each weighing at least 60 g or 1000 weights to be used at each hook each weighing at least 40 g.

### **Your tori line must be:**

- At least 100 m long;

- Set up from a position on the boat that allows it to stay above the water for at least 90 m;
- Have streamers attached at least every 3.5 m;
  - o Streamers should be maintained ensuring that their lengths are as close to the water as possible.
- Have a drogue at the end of the line to give sufficient drag to meet the 90 m aerial coverage criteria.

# Appendix II

## Mandatory seabird mitigation measures in the WTBF 2016

### At all times you must:

- Carry an assembled tori line on board
- Carry either:
  - 1000 weighted swivels each weighing at least 60 grams; or
  - 1000 weights each weighting at least 40 grams
- Not discharge offal while setting
- Not discharge offal while hauling. An exemption for small boats may be given by AFMA.

### When you are longline fishing south of 25°S you must:

- Deploy a tori line before commencing all shots that take place between nautical dawn and nautical dusk
- Use only thawed bait
- Weight longlines with either a minimum of:
  - 1.) 60 g swivels at a distance of no more than 3.5 m from each hook; or
  - 2.) 98 g swivels at a distance of no more than 4 m from each hook; or
  - 3.) 40 g weights at each hook.
- At all times carry:
  - 1000 weighted swivels each weighing at least 60 g; or
  - 1000 weights each of at least 40 g
- Not discharge offal while setting
- Not discharge offal while hauling. An exemption for small boats may be given by AFMA.

### Your tori line must be:

- At least 100 m long;
- Set up from a position on the boat that allows it to stay above the water for at least 90 m;
- Have streamers attached at least every 3.5 m;
  - Streamers should be maintained ensuring that their lengths are as close to the water

as possible; and

- Have a drogue at the end of the line to give sufficient drag to meet the 90 m aerial coverage criteria.

# Appendix III

## Summary of papers submitted by Australia

### **Barrington, J. 2017, Comparing IOTC and WCPFC seabird conservation and management measures.**

This paper reviews each seabird conservation measure in tuna regional fisheries management organisations (RFMOs) relevant to southern bluefin tuna, illustrates consistency/variability between measures employed and provides recommendations for further action.

### **Larcombe, J, Noriega, R & Timmiss, T 2016. Catch reporting under E-monitoring in the Australian Pacific longline fishery. [WCPFC-2016ERandEMWG2-DP01]**

This study aims to share Australia's experience with EM implementation in Australia's Pacific longline fishery. Specifically, the objectives of this paper are to:

- 1) Describe the EM system used in the Australian Eastern Tuna and Billfish Fishery (ETBF).
- 2) Characterise the early performance of the EM system during its first eight months of operation.

The study focuses on the reporting and accurate estimation of retained catch and discards across the full suite of target, byproduct, bycatch and wildlife species categories. First, the design objectives and operating principles of the EM system are described. Second, we provide a brief summary of results from a trial of EM in Australia's ETBF previously reported in Piasente et al.(2012). Finally, we present some analysis of the initial eight months of the systems operation (July 2015–Feb 2016). This includes a comparison of catches derived from EM with the same catches derived from logbooks and an examination of the changes in the nature of logbook catch and discard reporting following the introduction of EM.

### **Summary report for the second e-reporting and e-monitoring intersessional working group meeting (ERandEMWG2) 2016.**

The report provides a summary of the working group meeting including papers presented and outcomes.

# Appendix IV

## Common and scientific names

<b>Common names</b>	<b>Scientific names</b>
Albatrosses (other)	<i>Diomedeidae</i> spp.
Australian fur seal	<i>Arctocephalus pusillus doriferus</i>
Australian sea lion	<i>Neophoca cinerea</i>
Black marlin	<i>Makaira indica</i>
Black-browed albatross	<i>Thalassarche melanophris</i>
Blacktip sharks	<i>Carcharhinus</i> spp.
Blue marlin	<i>Makaira nigricans</i>
Blue shark	<i>Prionace glauca</i>
Bronze whaler	<i>Carcharhinus brachyurus</i>
Buller's albatross	<i>Thalassarche bulleri</i>
Cape petrel	<i>Daption capense</i>
Common dolphin	<i>Delphinus delphis</i>
Dusky shark	<i>Carcharhinus obscurus</i>
Escolar	<i>Lepidocybium flavobrunneum</i>
Flatback turtle	<i>Natator depressa</i>
Flesh-footed shearwater	<i>Ardenna carneipes</i>
Great hammerhead shark	<i>Sphyrna mokarran</i>
Great-winged petrel	<i>Pterodroma macroptera</i>
Green turtle	<i>Chelonia mydas</i>
Grey-headed albatross	<i>Thalassarche chrysostoma</i>
Hammerhead shark	<i>Sphyrna</i> spp.
Hawksbill turtle	<i>Eretmochelys imbricata</i>
Humpback whale	<i>Megaptera novaeangliae</i>

Lancetfish	<i>Alepisaurus</i> spp.
Leatherback turtle	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>
Loggerhead turtle	<i>Carretta carretta</i>
Longnose lancetfish	<i>Alepisaurus ferox</i>
Manta rays	<i>Manta</i> spp.
Mahi mahi	<i>Coryphaena hippurus</i>
Moonfish (opah)	<i>Lampris guttatus</i>
New Zealand fur seal	<i>Arctocephalus forsteri</i>
Ocean sunfish	<i>Mola mola</i>
Oceanic whitetip shark	<i>Carcharhinus longimanus</i>
Oilfish	<i>Ruvettus pretiosus</i>
Pacific (olive) ridley turtle	<i>Lepidochelys olivacea</i>
Petrels, prions and shearwaters	<i>Procellariidae</i> spp.
Porbeagle	<i>Lamna nasus</i>
Ray's bream	<i>Brama brama</i>
Rudderfish	<i>Centrolophus niger</i>
Sailfish	<i>Istiophorus platypterus</i>
Scalloped hammerhead	<i>Sphyrna lewini</i>
Shortbill spearfish	<i>Tetrapturus angustirostris</i>
Shortfin mako	<i>Isurus oxyrinchus</i>
Short-finned pilot whale	<i>Globicephala macrorhynchus</i>
Short-tailed shearwater	<i>Ardenna tenuirostris</i>
Shy albatross	<i>Thalassarche cauta</i>
Silky shark	<i>Carcharhinus falciformis</i>
Smooth hammerhead	<i>Sphyrna zygaena</i>
Sooty shearwater	<i>Ardenna griseus</i>
Southern bluefin tuna	<i>Thunnus maccoyii</i>
Southern royal albatross	<i>Diomedea epomophora</i>
Thresher shark	<i>Alopias vulpinus</i>

Tiger shark	<i>Galeocerdo cuvier</i>
Wahoo	<i>Acanthocybium solandri</i>
Wandering albatross	<i>Diomedea exulans</i>
Wedge-tailed shearwater	<i>Ardenna pacificus</i>
Yellow-nosed albatross	<i>Thalassarche chlororhynchos</i>

---