REVIEW OF THE STATISTICAL DATA AVAILABLE FOR BYCATCH SPECIES

PREPARED BY: IOTC SECRETARIAT, 13 JULY 2012
Miguel Herrera[1] & Lucia Pierre[2]

PURPOSE

To provide the Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch (WPEB) with a review of the status of the information available on non-targeted, associated and dependent species from IOTC fisheries in the databases at the IOTC Secretariat as of June 2012. It covers data on sharks, seabirds, marine turtles, marine mammal, and other bycatch.

BACKGROUND

Prior to each WPEB meeting the IOTC Secretariat develops a series of maps, figures and tables that highlight historical and emerging trends in the fisheries data held by the IOTC Secretariat. This information is used during each WPEB meeting to inform discussions around stock assessment and in developing advice to the Scientific Committee.

This document summarises the standing of a range of information received for non-IOTC species, in accordance with:

All bycatch

- IOTC Resolution 10/02: ***Mandatory statistical requirements*** *for IOTC Members and Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties (CPC's)*
    - *Paragraph 3(end): These* ***provisions***[3]*,* ***applicable to*** *tuna and tuna-like species, shall also be applicable to the most commonly caught* ***shark species*** *and, where possible, to the less common shark species. CPC's are also* ***encouraged*** *to record and provide data on* ***species other than sharks*** *and tunas taken as bycatch.*
- IOTC Resolution 12/03: *On The* ***recording of Catch and Effort by fishing vessels*** *in the IOTC Area of Competence*
    - *Paragraph 1: Each flag CPC shall ensure that all* ***purse seine, longline, gillnet, pole and line, handline, and trolling*** *fishing vessels flying its flag and authorized to fish species managed by IOTC be* ***subject to a data recording system****.*
    - *Paragraph 8 (start): The flag State and the States which receive this information shall* ***provide all the data*** *for any given year to the* ***IOTC Secretariat*** *by June 30th of the following year* ***on an aggregated basis****.*
- IOTC Resolution 11/04: *On a* ***Regional Observer Scheme***
    - *Paragraph 2: In order to improve the collection of scientific data, at least 5 % of the number of operations/sets for each gear type by the fleet of each CPC while fishing in the IOTC Area of competence of* ***24 meters overall*** *length and over, and* ***under 24 meters*** *if they fish* ***outside their EEZs*** *shall be covered by this observer scheme. For vessels under 24 meters if they fish outside their EEZ, the above mentioned coverage should be achieved progressively by January 2013.*
    - *Paragraph 4: The number of the* ***artisanal*** *fishing vessels landings shall also be monitored at the landing place by field samplers. The indicative level of the coverage of the artisanal fishing vessels should progressively increase towards 5% of the total levels of vessel activity (i.e. total number of vessel trips or total number of vessels active).*
    - *Paragraph 11: The* ***observer*** *shall, within 30 days of completion of each trip, provide a* ***report*** *to the CPCs of the vessel. The CPCs shall send* ***within 150 days*** *at the latest each report, as far as continuous flow of report from observer placed on the longline fleet is ensured, which is recommended to be provided with* ***1°x1° format*** *to the Executive Secretary, who shall make the report*

[1] Data Coordinator IOTC (mh@iotc.org)
[2] Data Assistant IOTC (data.assistant@iotc.org)
[3] Refers to nominal catch, catch-and-effort, and size frequency data for sharks

available to the Scientific Committee upon request. In a case where the vessel is fishing in the EEZ of a coastal State, the report shall equally be submitted to that coastal State.

Sharks

- IOTC Resolution 05/05: *Concerning the conservation of **SHARKS** caught in association with fisheries managed by IOTC*
    - *Paragraph 1: Contracting Parties, Cooperating non-Contracting Parties (CPCs) shall annually report data for catches of sharks, in accordance with IOTC data reporting procedures, including available historical data.*
- IOTC Resolution 10/12: *On the conservation of **THRESHER SHARKS** (family Alopiidae) caught in association with fisheries in the IOTC Area of Competence*
    - *Paragraph 1: This measure shall apply to all fishing vessels on the IOTC Record of authorised Vessels.*
    - *Paragraph 4: CPCs shall **encourage** their **fishers** to record and **report incidental catches** as well as **live releases**. These data will be then kept at the IOTC Secretariat.*
    - *Paragraph 8: The Contracting Parties, Co-operating non-Contracting **Parties**, especially those **directing fishing activities for sharks**, shall **submit data for sharks**, as required by IOTC data reporting procedures.*

Seabirds

- IOTC Resolution 12/06 *On reducing the incidental bycatch of **SEABIRDS** in **longline fisheries***
    - *Paragraph 1 (start): CPCs shall **record data on seabird incidental bycatch by species**, notably through scientific observers in accordance with Resolution 11/04 and report these annually.*
    - *Paragraph 2: CPCs that have not fully implemented the provisions of the IOTC Regional Observer Scheme outlined in paragraph 2 of Resolution 11/04 shall **report seabird incidental bycatch through logbooks**, including details of species, if possible.*

Marine turtles

- IOTC Resolution 12/04 *On the conservation of **MARINE TURTLES***
    - *Paragraph 3: CPCs shall **collect** (including through logbooks and observer programs) and **provide to the IOTC Secretariat** no later than 30 June of the following year in accordance with Resolution 10/02 (or any subsequent revision), **all data on their vessels' interactions with marine turtles**. The data shall include the level of logbook or observer coverage and an **estimation of total mortality of marine turtles** incidentally caught in their fisheries.*

The document describes the progress achieved in relation to the collection and verification of data, identifies problem areas and proposes actions that could be undertaken to improve them.

A list of actions for the improvement in the standing of the data on non-IOTC species currently available at the IOTC Secretariat is proposed for the consideration of the Working Party (see below).

The report covers the following areas:

- Overview
- Status of reporting
- Main issues identified concerning the data on non-IOTC species available to the IOTC
- Overview of IOTC fisheries and fisheries statistics for main shark species:
    - Main species of sharks caught on IOTC fisheries
    - Data available on the total catches of sharks in the Indian Ocean
- Overview of IOTC fisheries and seabird bycatch levels
    - Main species and fisheries concerned
    - Status of data on seabird bycatch
- Overview of IOTC fisheries and marine turtle bycatch levels
    - Main species and fisheries concerned
    - Status of data on marine turtle bycatch

- Other species caught incidentally by IOTC fisheries

Major data categories covered by the report

Sharks: The same standards as those existing for IOTC species apply to the most common species of sharks, as defined by the Commission in 2007 and extended in 2012 (**Table 1**), including:

- **Nominal catches** which are highly aggregated statistics for each species estimated per fleet, gear and year for a large area. If these data are not reported the Secretariat attempts to estimate a total catch although this is not possible in many cases. A range of sources is used for this purpose (including: partial catch and effort data; data in the FAO FishStat database; catches estimated by the IOTC from data collected through port sampling and data published through web pages or other means).
- **Catch-and-effort data** which refer to the fine-scale data – usually from logbooks, and reported per fleet, year, gear, type of school, month, grid and species. Information on the use of fish aggregating devices (FADs) and supply vessels is also collected.
- **Length frequency data** which refer to individual body lengths of IOTC species per fleet, year, gear, type of school, month and 5 degrees square areas.
- **Observer data** which refer to fine-scale data as collected by scientific observers onboard vessels authorized to operate in the IOTC Area, and reported at the end of each observer trip.

Seabirds, marine turtles, marine mammals, and other species (**Table 1):** the following standards apply:

- **Total bycatch** which are highly aggregated statistics for all species combined or, where available, by species, estimated per fleet, gear and year for the whole IOTC Area.
- **Catch-and-effort** and **observer data:** As in sharks above.

IOTC CPCs are also encouraged to collect and report detailed data on other species, where possible (**Table 1**)

Table 1. Listing of bycatch species of concern to IOTC and reporting requirements, by type of fishery. Fisheries: Purse seine (PS), Longline (LL), Gillnet (GN), Pole-and-line (BB), Hand line (HL), Trolling (TR)

Common name	Scientific name	Species Code	Reporting requirements by fishery					
			PS	**LL**	**GN**	**BB**	**HL**	**TR**
Blue shark	*Prionace glauca*	BSH		**O**	**o**			
Mako sharks	*Isurus spp.*	MAK		**O**	**o**			
Porbeagle	*Lamna nasus*	POR		**O**	**o**			
Hammerhead Sharks	*Sphyrnidae*	SPN		**o**	**o**			
Whale shark	*Rhincodon typus*	RHN	**o**		**o**			
Thresher sharks	*Alopias spp.*	THR	v	v	v			
Crocodile shark	*Pseudocarcharias kamoharai*	PSK		v	v			
Silky shark	*Carcharhinus falciformis*	FAL	v					
Oceanic whitetip shark	*Carcharhinus longimanus*	OCS		v	v			
Tiger shark	*Galeocerdo cuvier*	TIG		v	v			
Great White Shark	*Carcharodon carcharias*	WSH		v				
Pelagic stingray	*Pteroplatytrygon violacea*	PSL		v	v			
Mantas and devil rays	*Manta spp. (Mobulidae)*	MAN	v	v	v			
Other sharks nei		SKH	v	**O**	**o**	**o**	**o**	**o**
Other rays nei		SRX	v	v	v	**o**	**o**	**o**
Other marine fish nei		MZZ	v	**o**	**o**	**o**	**o**	**o**
Marine turtles nei		TTX	**o**	**o**	**o**	**o**	**o**	**o**
Seabirds nei				**o**	**o**			
Marine mammals nei			**o**	**o**	**o**			

Reporting requirements:
O: As from 2008 catch shall be recorded in logbooks and reported to the IOTC
o: As from 2013 catch shall be recorded in logbooks and reported to the IOTC
v: As from 2013 recording and reporting of catches to the IOTC is encouraged

STATUS OF REPORTING BY TYPE OF DATASET

A summary of the type of datasets that need to be provided for sharks, and other bycatch species, respectively, including, in each case: the parties and time periods concerned; deadlines and status of reporting (obligatory or voluntary) are provided in **Tables 2** and **3**. The Parties having provided data; and remarks, in particular focusing on areas were reporting standards are considered to be vague.

The most common bycatch species (shown as **O** and **o**) and other species (shown as v), as identified by the Commission in 2012, are defined in **Table 1**, by type of fishery. Species of sharks that are known to occur in Indian Ocean fisheries directed at IOTC species or pelagic sharks are shown in **Appendix 1**. Species of seabirds and marine turtles are presented in **Tables 5** and **6**, respectively.

It is important to note that **Table 2** records all parties having provided datasets, regardless of how complete those datasets might be.

Table 2. Types of datasets to be provided for sharks caught on fisheries for IOTC species and parties having provided data in each case.

SHARKS

Historical data on SHARKS according to IOTC reporting requirements

Applies to: All CPC
Time period: All years before 2006
Deadline: June (December) 30th 2006
Binding status: Obligatory (Table 1, **O; o**); Voluntary (Table 1, v)
Parties having provided data for industrial fleets:

- Surface: EU-France; EU-Spain
- Longline: Australia; Belize; China; Taiwan,China; EU-France; EU-Portugal; EU-Spain; EU-UK; France; Guinea; Indonesia; Republic of Korea; Malaysia; Mauritius; Oman; Senegal; Seychelles; South Africa; Thailand
- Driftnet: Pakistan

Remarks: The majority of reports referred to retained catches of all shark species combined, excluded discards, and did not account for shark fins.

Nominal catch data for MAIN SHARK species

Applies to: All CPC
Time period: 2006 and later years
Deadline: June (December) 30th of year following that for which data are due
Binding status: Obligatory (Table 1, **O; o**)
Parties having provided data for industrial fleets:

- Surface: EU-France; EU-Spain
- Longline: Australia; Belize; China; Taiwan,China; EU-Portugal; EU-Spain; EU-UK; Indonesia; Japan; Kenya; Philippines; Sri Lanka; South Africa; Thailand
- Driftnet: Nil

Remarks: The majority of reports referred to retained catches of all shark species combined, excluded discards, and did not account for shark fins.

Nominal catch data for OTHER SHARK species

Applies to: All CPC
Time period: 2006 and later years
Deadline: June (December) 30th of year following that for which data are due
Binding status: Voluntary (Table 1, v)
Parties having provided data for industrial fleets:

- Surface: EU-France; EU-Spain
- Longline: Australia; Belize; China; Taiwan,China; EU-France; EU-Portugal; EU-Spain; EU-UK; France; Indonesia; Japan; Kenya; Republic of Korea; Malaysia; Mauritius; Oman; Philippines; Seychelles; South Africa; Thailand; Uruguay
- Driftnet: Pakistan

Remarks: As above

Catch-and-effort data for MAIN SHARK species

Applies to: All CPC
Time period: 2008 and later years
Deadline: June (December) 30th of year following that for which data are due
Binding status: Obligatory (Table 1, **O; o**)
Parties having provided data for industrial fleets:

- Surface: Nil
- Longline: China; Taiwan,China; EU-Portugal; EU-UK; Japan; Philippines; Seychelles; South Africa; Republic of Korea ;
- Driftnet: Nil

Remarks: Same as above.

Catch-and-effort data for OTHER SHARK species

Applies to: All CPC
Time period: 2008 and later years
Deadline: June (December) 30th of year following that for which data are due
Binding status: Voluntary (Table 1, v)
Parties having provided data for industrial fleets:

- Surface: Nil
- Longline: China; Taiwan,China; EU-France; EU-Portugal; EU-UK; Japan; Republic of Korea; Malaysia; Mauritius; Oman; Seychelles; South Africa; Sri Lanka; Thailand; Uruguay
- Driftnet: Nil

Remarks: Same as above.

Size frequency data for MAIN SHARK species

Applies to: All CPC
Time period: 2008 and later years
Deadline: June (December) 30th of year following that for which data are due

SHARKS

Binding status: Obligatory (Table 1, **O; o**)
Parties having provided data for industrial fleets:
- Surface: Nil
- Longline: Japan; Republic of Korea; Seychelles; South Africa; Sri Lanka;
- Driftnet: Nil

Remarks: Same as above.

Size frequency data for OTHER SHARK species

Applies to: All CPC
Time period: 2008 and later years
Deadline: June (December) 30th of year following that for which data are due
Binding status: Voluntary (Table 1, v)
Parties having provided data for industrial fleets:
- Surface: Nil
- Longline: Indonesia; Japan; Republic of Korea; Seychelles; South Africa; Sri Lanka;
- Driftnet: Nil

Remarks: Same as above.

Estimates of amounts of THRESHER SHARKS discarded dead and size frequency distribution of discards

Applies to: CPC having vessels in the IOTC Record of Authorized vessels
Time period: 2010 and later years
Deadline: IOTC Scientific Committee Meeting in December 2011
Report to: IOTC Scientific Committee
Binding status: Obligatory
Parties having provided data:.Australia,; Taiwan,China; EU-France(LL port sample); Republic of Korea; South Africa;
Remarks: It is unclear if it is required to collect size data on all discards or only on dead discards; collecting size frequency data on thresher sharks before release may compromise survival of those specimens that are caught alive (rates of mortality at capture have been estimated at around 50% in the Atlantic Ocean)

Reports from scientific observers onboard vessels 24m LOA or greater under the IOTC Regional Observer Scheme

Applies to: CPC having vessels 24m LOA or greater in the IOTC Record of Authorized vessels
Time period: Since July 2010
Deadline: No later than 150 days after the end of each observer trip
Report to: IOTC Secretariat
Binding status: Obligatory
Parties having provided data: Australia; China; Taiwan,China; EU-France; Japan; Republic of Korea; South Africa;
Remarks: Refer to Annex 3 for more details about the data submitted.

Reports from scientific observers onboard vessels less than 24m LOA under the IOTC Regional Observer Scheme

Applies to: CPC having vessels less than 24m LOA in the IOTC Record of Authorized vessels
Time period: Progressive implementation to achieve recommended levels of coverage by January 2013
Deadline: No later than 150 days after the end of each observer trip
Report to: IOTC Secretariat
Binding status: Obligatory
Parties having provided data: None
Remarks: Refer to Annex 3 for more details about the data submitted.

Table 3. Types of datasets to be provided for other bycatch of fisheries for IOTC species and parties having provided data in each case.

OTHER SPECIES

Estimates of total incidental catches of SEABIRDS from longline and gillnet fisheries

Applies to: CPC having longline fisheries in the IOTC Area
Time period: 2011 and later years
Deadline: June (December) 30th of year following that for which data are due
Binding status: Obligatory
Parties having provided data for industrial fleets: Not applicable; first report due for December 2012. Australia; Japan (observer); France; Republic of Korea; South Africa; China (nil); Taiwan,China;
Remarks: Requirements do not specify that incidental catches of seabirds have to be reported by species. There is also need to identify for which species of seabirds, out of the many occurring in the Indian Ocean, reporting of data by species is considered to be a priority. Estimation of total levels of bycatch of seabirds by IOTC longline fisheries will be compromised or not possible unless requirements are extended to account for this.

Estimates of total incidental catches of MARINE TURTLES

Applies to: All CPC
Time period: 2010 and later years
Deadline: June (December) 30th of year following that for which data are due
Binding status: Obligatory
Parties having provided data for industrial fleets:
- Surface: EU-France; EU-Spain
- Longline: Australia; China(nil); Taiwan,China; EU-France; EU-Spain; EU-UK; France; Republic of Korea; South Africa; Japan (Observer)
- Driftnet: Nil

Remarks: Requirements do not specify that incidental catches of marine turtles have to be reported by species. Estimation of total levels of bycatch of marine turtles by IOTC fisheries will be compromised or not possible unless requirements are extended to account for this.

Estimates of total incidental catches of MARINE MAMMALS from purse seine, longline, and gillnet fisheries

Applies to: All CPC
Time period: 2006 and later years
Deadline: June (December) 30th of year following that for which data are due
Binding status: Voluntary
Parties having provided data for industrial fleets: Several parties have provided data concerning this requirement.
Remarks: This group refers to species of very different nature, including marine mammals, and other groups of other marine species. For the sake of clarity it would be better to clarify which species or species groups are the focus of this requirement. It would also be better to create specific requirements for marine mammals, along the lines of those created for Seabirds or marine turtles.

Reports from scientific observers onboard vessels 24m LOA or greater under the IOTC Regional Observer Scheme

Reports from scientific observers onboard vessels less than 24m LOA under the IOTC Regional Observer Scheme

Remarks: Refer to Table 1 (SHARKS)

MAIN ISSUES IDENTIFIED CONCERNING DATA ON BYCATCH

The following list is provided by the IOTC Secretariat for the consideration of the WPEB. The list covers the main issues which the Secretariat considers affect the quality of the statistics available at the IOTC, by type of dataset and type of fishery.

SHARKS

1. **Catch-and-Effort data from gillnet fisheries:**
   - **Drifting gillnet** fisheries of **Iran** and **Pakistan**: To date, Iran and Pakistan have not reported catches of sharks, by species, for their gillnet fisheries.
   - **Gillnet/longline** fishery of **Sri Lanka**: Sri Lanka has not reported catch-and-effort data for sharks as per the IOTC standards.
   - **Driftnet fishery of Taiwan,China** (1982–92)**:** Catch-and-effort data does not include catches of sharks by species.
2. **Catch-and-Effort data from Longline Fisheries:**
   - **Historical catches of sharks from major longline** fisheries: To date, **Japan**, **Taiwan,China**, **Indonesia** and **Rep. of Korea,** have not provided estimates of catches of sharks, by species, for years before 2006.
   - **Fresh-tuna longline** fisheries of **Indonesia** and **Malaysia**: Indonesia and Malaysia have not reported catches of sharks by IOTC standards for longliners under their flag. In addition Indonesia has not reported catch-and-effort data for its longline fishery to date.
   - **Deep-freezing longline** fisheries of **EU-Spain**, **India**, **Indonesia**, **Malaysia**, and **Oman:** These countries have not reported catch-and-effort data of sharks by IOTC standards for longliners under their flag.
3. **Catch-and-Effort data from coastal fisheries:**
   - **Coastal** fisheries of **Comoros**[4], **India**, **Indonesia**, **Madagascar**, **Sri Lanka** and **Yemen**: To date, these countries have not provided detailed catches of sharks to the IOTC, in particular Thresher and other pelagic shark species caught by their coastal fisheries.
4. **Discard levels from surface and longline fisheries:**
   - **Discard levels of sharks from major longline** fisheries: To date, **European Union**, **Japan**, **Indonesia** and **Rep. of Korea,** have not provided estimates of discards of sharks, by species, in particular Thresher sharks.
   - **Discard levels of sharks for industrial purse seine** fisheries: To date, the **European Union** (before 2003), **Iran**, **Japan**, **Seychelles**, and **Thailand**, have not provided estimates of discards of sharks, by species, for industrial purse seiners under their flag.
5. **Size frequency data:**
   - **Gillnet** fisheries of **Iran** and **Pakistan:** To date, Iran and Pakistan have not reported size frequency data for their driftnet fisheries.
   - **Longline** fisheries of **China**, **Taiwan,China**, **India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Oman** and **Philippines:** To date, these countries have not reported size frequency data for their longline fisheries, including length frequency of discards of thresher sharks.
   - **Coastal** fisheries of **Comoros**[5], **India, Indonesia, Madagascar, Sri Lanka** and **Yemen**: To date, these countries have not reported size frequency data for their coastal fisheries.
6. **Biological data:**
   - Surface and longline fisheries, in particular **China**, **Taiwan,China**, **Indonesia** and **Japan**: The Secretariat had to use length-age keys, length-weight keys, ratios of fin-to-body weight, and processed weight-live weight keys, for sharks from other oceans due to the general paucity of biological data available from the Indian Ocean.

[4] The "Direction national des resources haléutiques" of the Comoros conducted a fisheries census in 2011, with the assistance of the IOTC-OFCF Project. In addition, the IOTC Secretariat provided support for the implementation of a sampling system. These activities will make it possible for Comoros to estimate catches of tropical tunas and other species for 2011 and following years.

[5] *Ibid.* 7

OTHER BYCATCH

1. Incidental catches of SEABIRDS:

- **Longline** fisheries operating in areas with high densities of seabirds, notably **Indonesia,** and **Seychelles:** These parties have not reported incidental catches of seabirds for longliners under their flag. In addition, **Japan** has not reported estimates of total incidental catches of seabirds for longliners under its flag.

2. Incidental catches of MARINE TURTLES:

- **Gillnet** fisheries of **Iran** and **Pakistan:** To date, Iran and Pakistan have not reported incidental catches of marine turtles for their driftnet fisheries.
- **Gillnet/longline** fishery of **Sri Lanka**: To date, Sri Lanka has not reported incidental catches of marine turtles for its gillnet/longline fishery.
- **Longline** fisheries of, **India, Indonesia, , Malaysia, Oman, Philippines,** and **Seychelles:** To date, these countries have not reported incidental catches of marine turtles for their longline fisheries. In addition, **Japan** has not reported estimates of total incidental catches of marine turtles for longliners under its flag.
- **Purse seine** fisheries of the **European Union** (excluding 2003–07), **Iran**, **Japan**, **Seychelles**, and **Thailand**: To date these countries have not reported incidental catches of marine turtles for their purse seine fisheries, including incidental catches of marine turtles on Fish Aggregating Devices.

STATUS OF FISHERIES STATISTICS FOR SHARKS

Main species of sharks caught in IOTC fisheries

Following standard international practice, the term shark is accepted to include both sharks and rays.

Table 1 shows the main species of sharks as identified by the Commission in 2012, through the adoption of IOTC Resolution 12/03 *On The recording of Catch and Effort by fishing vessels in the IOTC Area of Competence* (Annexes II and III, 2.3).

Species of sharks that are known to occur on Indian Ocean fisheries directed at IOTC species or pelagic sharks is provided at **Appendix 1**.

Data available on the total catches of sharks in the Indian Ocean

The availability of shark nominal catch data over the period 1950–2010 for those shark species identified by the Commission (**Table 1**), by species, gear type, and year, is presented in **Appendix 2**. The collection and reporting of catches of sharks caught in association with species managed by the IOTC (tuna and tuna-like species) has been very uneven over time. The information on the bycatch of sharks gathered in the IOTC database is thought to be very incomplete. The catches of sharks, when reported, are thought to represent simply the catches of these species that are retained on board (or nominal catches). They refer, in many cases, to dressed weights and no indication is given on the type of processing that the different specimens underwent. The weights or numbers of sharks for which only the fins were kept on board are rarely recorded in the vessels' logbooks. This makes it really difficult any attempt to estimate the total catches of sharks in the Indian Ocean. However, it should be noted that in recent years the levels of reporting of statistics of sharks has improved (**Appendix 2**), following the adoption of new measures by the Commission on sharks and other bycatch, which call for IOTC CPC's to collect and report more detailed statistics on bycatch species to the IOTC.

Catches by species: The main problem areas identified for sharks are indicated below:

Some catch data not available: several countries were not collecting fishery statistics, especially in years prior to the early 1970's, and others have not reported catches of sharks to IOTC (**Figures 1** and **2**). It is thought that important catches of sharks might have gone unrecorded in several countries. The catches recorded in other cases might not represent the total catches of sharks but simply the amounts retained on board (e.g. dressed weights instead of live weights). The catches of sharks for which only the fins are kept on board or of sharks usually discarded, because of their size or condition, are seldom, if ever, recorded.



Fig. 1. Catches of pelagic sharks recorded in the IOTC nominal catches database versus the total catches of tuna and tuna-like species recorded for fleets presumed to catch pelagic sharks and the catches of tuna and tuna-like species recorded for fleets for which catches of pelagic sharks are available (1950–2010).



Fig. 2. Catches of coastal sharks recorded in the IOTC nominal catches database versus the total catches of tuna and tuna-like species recorded for fleets presumed to catch coastal sharks and the catches of tuna and tuna-like species recorded for fleets for which catches of coastal sharks are available (1950–2010).

The selection of fleets presumed to catch a majority of pelagic shark species *versus* those presumed to catch mostly coastal shark species was done by using the data in the IOTC database for fleets reporting catches of sharks by species or according to the presumed area of operation for fleets not reporting catches of sharks per species or not reporting catches of sharks at all.

- **Poor resolution of catch data:** The catches of sharks are usually not recorded by species and/or gear (**Figures 3** and **4**). Be it sharks caught on the high seas or in coastal areas the amount of species that may occur in these areas is usually high. The estimation of catches by species is highly compromised in these cases due to the paucity of the data available. Miss-identification of shark species is also common. The identification of sharks in port is usually compromised by the way in which the different species of sharks are processed, including shark carcasses, shark fins or other shark products (identification keys for sharks refer usually to unprocessed shark specimens).

The main consequence of this is that, at the moment, the estimation of total catches of sharks in the Indian Ocean is compromised by the paucity of the data available.



Fig. 3. Proportion of the catches of pelagic sharks that are recorded by species in the IOTC nominal catches database *versus* those recorded in aggregated form (1950–2010) (The total catches of pelagic sharks recorded per year are also shown (blue line, left axis)).



Fig. 4. Proportion of the catches of coastal sharks that are recorded by species in the IOTC nominal catches database *versus* those recorded in aggregated form (1950–2010 (The total catches of coastal sharks recorded per year are also shown (blue line, left axis)).

Catches by gear type: The catches of sharks that are not recorded by gear do not represent a high proportion of the total catches recorded for these species, especially in recent years (**Figures 5** and **6**).



Fig. 5. Proportion of the catches of pelagic sharks that are recorded by gear in the IOTC nominal catches database versus those recorded in aggregated form (1950–2010) (The total catches of pelagic sharks recorded per year are also shown (white line, left axis)).



Fig. 6. Proportion of the catches of coastal sharks that are recorded by gear in the IOTC nominal catches database versus those recorded in aggregated form (1950–2010) (The total catches of coastal sharks recorded per year are also shown (white line, left axis)).

While industrial longliners and drifting gillnets harvest important amounts of pelagic sharks, industrial purse seiners, pole-and-lines and most coastal fisheries are unlikely to harvest important amounts of pelagic sharks.

- **Deep-freezing tuna longliners** and **fresh-tuna longliners**: Catches of sharks are thought to represent between 20–40% of the total combined catch for all species. However, the catches of sharks recorded in the IOTC database only make for a small proportion of the total catches of all species over longline fleets. The catches series for sharks are, therefore, thought to be very incomplete. However, levels of reporting have improved in recent years, following the implementation of catch monitoring schemes in different ports of landing of fresh-tuna longliners[6], and the recording of catches of main species of sharks in logbooks and observer programmes. The catches estimated, however, are unlikely to represent the total catches of sharks for this fishery due to the paucity of information on levels of discards of sharks, which are thought high in some areas and for some species.
- **Freezing (fresh) swordfish longliners**: Catches of sharks are thought to represent between 40–60% of the total combined catch for all species. The amounts of sharks caught by longliners targeting swordfish in the Indian Ocean have been constantly increasing since the mid-90's. The catches of sharks recorded for these fleets are thought more realistic than those recorded for other longline fisheries. The high catches are thought to be due to:
  - Gear configuration and time fished: The vessels targeting swordfish use surface longlines and set the lines at dusk or during the night. Many pelagic sharks are thought to be abundant at these depths and most active during dusk or night hours.
  - Area fished: The fleets targeting swordfish have been deploying most of the fishing effort in the Southwest Indian Ocean, in the vicinity of South Africa, southern Madagascar, Reunion and Mauritius. High amounts of sharks are thought to occur in these areas.
  - Changes in the relative amounts of swordfish and sharks in the catches: Some of the vessels targeting swordfish are known to alternate swordfish and sharks, in particular blue shark, as main target, depending on the season, or when catch rates of swordfish are poor.
- **Industrial tuna purse seiners:** Catches of sharks are thought to represent less than 0.5% of the total combined catch for all species (10% of total discards). In 2012, the **European Union** reported preliminary estimates of catches of sharks for EU-France purse seiners for the period 2003–10, as derived from samples collected by observers during 2003–07. The Secretariat has not received data from other purse seine fleets concerning bycatch levels of sharks (**Iran**, **Seychelles** or **Thailand**).
- **Pole and line fisheries:** There are no catches of sharks recorded for the pole and line fisheries of Maldives and India in the IOTC database. The amounts of sharks caught by these fisheries, if any, are not thought significant.

[6] The IOTC-OFCF (Overseas Fisheries Cooperation Foundation of Japan) Project implemented programmes in cooperation with local institutions in Thailand and Indonesia

- **Gillnet fisheries:** The species of sharks caught are thought to vary significantly depending on the area of operation of the gillnets:
    - Gillnets operated in areas having low concentrations of pelagic sharks: The gillnet fisheries of most coastal countries operate these gears in coastal waters. The abundance of pelagic sharks in these areas is thought low.
    - Gillnets operated in areas having high concentrations of pelagic sharks: Gillnets operated in **Sri Lanka**, **Indonesia** and **Yemen** (waters around Socotra), in spite of being set in coastal areas, are likely to catch significant amounts of pelagic sharks.
    - Gillnets operated on the high seas: Vessels from **Taiwan,China** were using drifting gillnets (driftnets) from 1982 to 1992, the year in which the use of this gear was banned worldwide. The catches of pelagic sharks were very high during that period, representing around 25% of the total catch of all species. Driftnet vessels from **Iran** and **Pakistan** have been fishing on the high seas since the early-1990ies, initially in waters of the Arabian Sea but covering a larger area in recent years, as they moved to operate also in tropical waters of the western Indian Ocean and Mozambique Channel. The amounts of sharks that are caught by these fleets are thought high, representing between 25–50% of the total combined catches of sharks and other species.
- **Gillnet/longline fishery of Sri Lanka:** Catches of sharks represent between 2% and 45% of the total combined catch for all species, depending on the year. Between 1,200 and 3,200 vessels (average size of 12 m) operating gillnets and longlines in combination have been harvesting important amounts of pelagic sharks since the mid–80's. The longlines are believed to be responsible for most of the catches of sharks. Since the mid–1990's the proportion of sharks, all species combined, in the catches of gillnet and longline vessels has been constantly decreasing (**Figure 7**), to represent less than 2% of the total catch in recent years (45% of the catch in 1995). Catches of sharks by vessel by year have also decreased markedly since the mid–90's.



Fig. 7. Proportion that the combined catches of sharks made out of the total combined catches of sharks and IOTC species for the gillnet and longline fishery of Sri Lanka, by year, for the period 1986–2010.

- **Fisheries using handlines and/or trolling:** The majority of fisheries using hand lines and trolling in the Indian Ocean operate these gears in coastal waters. The amounts of pelagic sharks caught are thought, for this reason, low. The amount that other species of sharks make out of the catches of tuna and tuna-like species might change depending on the area fished and time of the day.

Time-area catches: **Figure 8** present data available on sharks for deep-freezing longliners flagged in Taiwan,China, by decade (1980's to 2000s) and type of catch data reported, including total numbers of sharks recorded aggregated and by species on each five degree square grid. In addition, **Figure 9** presents total numbers of sharks by grid for major shark species, by species, and combined for other species, for the period 2007–10.

Finally, **Figure 10** present numbers of shark reported for the longline fleet of Japan, by species for the years 2009–10.

It is important to note that time-area catches of sharks by species are only available since 2007 or 2009 for Japan and Taiwan,China, respectively, while these fleets have been operating in the Indian Ocean since the 1950's. Unlike Taiwan,China, for which catches of sharks are available in aggregated form up to the late 1970's, Japan has not provided catches of sharks other than those reported for 2009 and 2010. In addition, the catches available are considered to be incomplete, as they do not include discards.

Time area catches of sharks are also available from other fleets, as recorded in **Table 2**.

Length frequency data: **Figure 11** shows length frequencies of blue shark as derived from the samples available from longliners flagged in Japan, Republic of Korea, Seychelles, and South Africa, for all periods and areas combined. Figure 12 shows length frequencies derived from the samples available for other important shark species, for all fleets, periods, and areas combined. Length frequency data of sharks are only available in recent years, for the fleets indicated in **Table 2**.



Fig. 8a–c: Time-area catches (total combined in number) of sharks available for the period 1980–2009 for deep-freezing longliners flagged in Taiwan,China, by decade and type of catch reported. Catch reported by species (**SPS**, Blue), Catch reported aggregated (**AGG,** Red).



Fig. 9a–d: Time-area catches (total combined in number) of sharks available for the period 2007–2010 for deep-freezing longliners flagged in Taiwan,China, by year and species. Blue shark (**BSH**, red); Dusky shark (**DUS,** green); Mako sharks (**MAK**, blue); Other shark species (**SKH**, purple).



Fig. 10a–b: Time-area catches (total combined in number) of sharks available for the period 2009–2010 for deep-freezing longliners flagged to Japan, by year and species. Blue shark (**BSH**, red); Porbeagle (**POR,** green); Shortfin mako (**MAK**, blue).



Fig. 11: Length frequency distributions (%) of blue shark derived from the samples available for the longline fleets of South Africa, Seychelles, Japan, and Rep. of Korea (2005–10). Broken horizontal gridlines refer to 10% of the fish.



Fig. 12. Length frequency distributions (%) of bigeye thresher, silky shark, porbeagle, and shortfin mako, as derived from the samples available from longline fleets (2005–10). Broken horizontal gridlines refer to 10% of the fish.

OVERVIEW OF IOTC FISHERIES AND SEABIRD BYCATCH LEVELS

Main species and fisheries concerned

The main species of seabirds likely to be bycatch of IOTC fisheries are presented in **Table 4** below[7].

Table 4. Main species of seabirds likely to be incidentally caught on longline operations.

Common Name	Status*	Scientific Name
Amsterdam Albatross	Critically Endangered	*Diomedea amsterdamensis*
Antipodean Albatross	Vulnerable	*Diomedea antipodensis*
Black-browed Albatross	Endangered	*Thalassarche melanophrys*
Buller's Albatross	Near Threaten	*Thalassarche bulleri*
Campbell Albatross	Vulnerable	*Thalassarche impavida*
Chatham Albatross	Vulnerable	*Thalassarche eremite*
Grey-headed Albatross	Vulnerable	*Thalassarche chrysostoma*
Light-mantled Albatross	Near Threatened	*Phoebetria palpebrata*
Northern Royal Albatross	Endangered	*Diomedea sanfordi*
Southern Royal Albatross	Vulnerable	*Diomedea epomophora*
Salvin's Albatross	Vulnerable	*Thalassarche salvini*
Shy Albatross	Near Threatened	*Thalassarche cauta*
White-capped Albatross	Near Threatened	*Thalassarche steadi*
Sooty Albatross	Endangered	*Phoebetria fusca*
Tristan Albatross	Critically Endangered	*Diomedea dabbenena*
Wandering Albatross	Vulnerable	*Diomedea exulans*
Atlantic Yellow-nosed Albatross	Endangered	*Thalassarche chlororhynchos*
Indian Yellow-nosed Albatross	Endangered	*Thalassarche carteri*
Northern Giant Petrel	Least Concern	*Macronectes halli*
Southern Giant Petrel	Least Concern	*Macronectes giganteus*
White-chinned Petrel	Vulnerable	*Procellaria aequinoctialis*
Westland Petrel	Vulnerable	*Procellaria westlandica*
Short-tailed Shearwater	Least Concern	*Puffinus tenuirostris*
Sooty Shearwater	Near Threatened	*Puffinus griseus*

*****Source IUCN 2006, BirdLife International 2004b.

The interaction between seabirds and IOTC fisheries is likely to be significant only in Southern waters (below 25 degrees South), an area where most of the effort is exerted by longliners. Incidental catches are, for this reason, likely

[7] As in IOTC–2007–WPEB–22, appendix 2, page 24. Paper submitted on behalf of the Agreement for the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP)

to be of importance only for longline fleets having vessels operating in these areas (**Taiwan,China**, **Japan**, **Rep. of Korea**, the **European Union, Indonesia,** and **Malaysia**).

Status of data on seabird bycatch

The parties having provided data on interactions of IOTC fisheries with species of seabirds are recorded in **Table 2** and **Appendix 3**. These are Australia, Japan, EU-France, Republic of Korea, South Africa, China (nil interactions), and Taiwan,China. The same countries provided reports on the activities of scientific observers under the IOTC Scientific Observer Programmes.

Some information on the incidental catches of seabirds by some longline fleets operating in the Southern Indian Ocean is also available with the Secretariat. The data available were provided by the CCSBT and will be completed with more recent information in the future.

The paucity of the information available makes it difficult or impossible to estimate total levels of seabird bycatch by vessels in the IOTC area of competence.

OVERVIEW OF IOTC FISHERIES AND MARINE TURTLE BYCATCH LEVELS

Main species and fisheries concerned

The main species of marine turtles likely to be bycatch of IOTC fisheries are presented in **Table 5** below.

Table 5. Main species of Indian Ocean marine turtles[8].

Common Name	Scientific Name
Loggerhead turtle	*Caretta caretta*
Olive ridley turtle	*Lepidochelys olivacea*
Green turtle	*Chelonia mydas*
Hawksbill turtle	*Eretmochelys imbricata*
Leatherback turtle	*Dermochelys coriacea*
Flatback turtle	*Natator depressus*

The interaction between marine turtles and IOTC fisheries is likely to be significant only in tropical areas, involving both industrial and artisanal fisheries, notably for:

- Industrial purse seine fisheries, in particular on sets using fish aggregating devices (**European Union**, **Seychelles**, **Iran**, **Thailand, Japan**)
- Gillnet fisheries operating in coastal waters or on the high seas (**Sri Lanka**, **Iran**, **Pakistan**, **Indonesia**)
- Industrial longline fisheries operating in tropical areas (**China**, **Taiwan,China**, **Japan**, **Indonesia**, **Seychelles**, **India, Oman**)

Both loggerhead and leatherback turtles are caught incidentally on IOTC fisheries in higher numbers than the other species.

Status of data on marine turtle bycatch

The parties having provided data on interactions of IOTC fisheries with species of marine turtles are recorded in **Table 2** and **Appendix 3**. These are, by type of fishery:

- Surface: EU-France; EU-Spain

[8] Memorandum of Understanding on the Conservation and Management of Marine Turtles and their Habitats of the Indian Ocean and South-East Asia

- Longline: Australia; China (nil interactions), Taiwan,China, EU-France, EU-Spain, EU-UK, Japan, Republic of Korea, South Africa
- Driftnet: None

The same countries provided reports on the activities of scientific observers under the IOTC Scientific Observer Programmes (**Appendix 3**).

The paucity of the information available makes it difficult or impossible to estimate levels of marine turtle bycatch by species.

APPENDIX 1

SHARK SPECIES THAT ARE KNOWN TO OCCUR ON FISHERIES DIRECTED AT IOTC SPECIES OR SHARKS

Code	English Name	Source	French Name	Scientific Name
AML	Grey Reef Shark	IOTC	Requin dagsit	*Carcharhinus amblyrhynchos*
BLR	Blacktip reef shark	IOTC	Requin pointes noires	*Carcharhinus melanopterus*
BRO	Copper shark	IOTC	Requin cuivre	*Carcharhinus brachyurus*
CCB	Spinner Shark	IOTC	Requin tisserand	*Carcharhinus brevipinna*
CCG	Galapagos shark	IOTC[3]	Requin des Galapagos	*Carcharhinus galapagensis*
DOP	Shortnose spurdog	IOTC	Aiguillat nez court	*Squalus megalops*
DUS	Dusky shark	IOTC	Requin de sable	*Carcharhinus obscurus*
GAG	Tope shark	IOTC	Requin-hâ	*Galeorhinus galeus*
GAM	Mouse Catshark	IOTC	Chien islandais	*Galeus murinus*
NTC	Broadnose sevengill shark	IOTC	Platnez	*Notorhynchus cepedianus*
OXY	Angular rough shark	IOTC	Centrine commune	*Oxynotus centrina*
SBL	Bluntnose sixgill shark	IOTC	Requin griset	*Hexanchus griseus*
SCK	Kitefin shark	IOTC	Squale liche	*Dalatias licha*
SHBC	Banded catshark	IOTC	Holbiche des plages	*Halaelurus lineatus*
SHCW	Cow sharks	IOTC	Requins griset	*Hexanchidae spp.*
SMD	Smooth-hound	IOTC	Emissole lisse	*Mustelus mustelus*
SPZ	Smooth hammerhead	IOTC	Requin marteau commun	*Sphyrna zygaena*
SSQ	Velvet dogfish	IOTC	Squale grogneur velouté	*Scymnodon squamulosus*
SSU	Australian angelshark	IOTC	Ange de mer australien	*Squatina australis*
AGN	Angelsharks, sand devils nei	FAO	Ange de mer commun	*Squatina squatina*
CCD	Whitecheek shark	IOTC[1]	Requin joues blanches	*Carcharhinus dussumieri*
CCM	Hardnose shark	IOTC[1]	Requin nez rude	*Carcharhinus macloti*
CCQ	Spot-tail shark	IOTC[1]	Requin queue tachet	*Carcharhinus sorrah*
CEM	Smallfin gulper shark	FAO[2]	Squale-chagrin cagaou	*Centrophorus moluccensis*
CLD	Sliteye shark	IOTC[3]	Requin sagrin	*Loxodon macrorhinus*
CPU	Little gulper shark	FAO[2]	Petit squale-chagrin	*Centrophorus uyato*
CYT	Ornate dogfish	FAO[2]	Aiguillat élégant	*Centroscyllium ornatum*
MTM	Arabian smooth-hound	IOTC[3]	Emissole d'Arabie	*Mustelus mosis*
ODH	Bigeye sand tiger shark	FAO[2]	Requin noronhai	*Odontaspis noronhai*
ORI	Slender bambooshark	FAO[2]	Requin-chabot élégant	*Chiloscyllium indicum*
ORR	Grey bambooshark	FAO[2]	Requin-chabot gris	*Chiloscyllium griseum*
ORZ	Tawny nurse shark	FAO[2]	Requin nourrice fauve	*Nebrius ferrugineus*
OSF	Zebra shark	FAO[2]	Requin zèbre	*Stegostoma fasciatum*
PWS	Sawsharks nei	FAO	Requins scies nca	*Pristiophorus spp*
RHA	Milk shark	IOTC[3]	Requin museau pointu	*Rhizoprionodon acutus*
SHL	Lanternsharks nei	FAO	Sagres nca	*Etmopterus spp*
SLA	Spadenose shark	IOTC[1]	Requin épée	*Scoliodon laticaudus*
RHN	Whale shark	IOTC[1]	Requin baleine	*Rhincodon typus*
PTH	Pelagic thresher	IOTC[1]	Renard pelagique	*Alopias pelagicus*
BTH	Bigeye thresher	IOTC[1]	Renard a gros yeux	*Alopias superciliosus*
ALV	Thresher	IOTC[1]	Renard	*Alopias vulpinus*
SMA	Shortfin mako	IOTC[1]	Taupe bleue	*Isurus oxyrinchus*
LMA	Longfin mako	IOTC[1]	Petite taupe	*Isurus paucus*
PSK	Crocodile shark	IOTC[1]	Crocodile shark	*Pseudocarcharias kamoharai*
ALS	Silvertip shark	IOTC[1]	Requin pointe blanche	*Carcharhinus albimarginatus*
FAL	Silky shark	IOTC[1]	Requin soyeux	*Carcharhinus falciformis*
OCS	Oceanic whitetip	IOTC[1]	Requin océanique	*Carcharhinus longimanus*
CCP	Sandbar shark	IOTC[1]	Requin gris	*Carcharhinus plumbeus*

Code	English Name	Source	French Name	Scientific Name
TIG	Tiger shark	IOTC[1]	Requin tigre commun	*Galeocerdo cuvier*
BSH	Blue shark	IOTC[1]	Peau bleue	*Prionace glauca*
SPL	Scalloped hammerhead	IOTC[1]	Requin marteau halicorne	*Sphyrna lewini*
POR	Porbeagle	IOTC[1]	Requin-taupe commun	*Lamna nasus*
WSH	Great White Shark	IOTC[1]	Grand requin blanc	*Carcharodon carcharias*
CWZ	Other Requiem Sharks	IOTC[1]	Requins Carcharhinus nca	*Carcharhinus spp*
SPN	Hammerhead Sharks	IOTC[1]	Requins marteau nca	*Sphyrna spp*

Note that most of the catches of sharks are not available by species and when available by species they are not considered to be an unbiased sample of the catch in the Indian Ocean

1. IOTC–2007–WPEB–13 (Sharks of India)
2. FAO: Case studies of the management of elasmobranch fisheries
3. IOTC: Information collected in Yemen by the IOTC/OFCF Project

APPENDIX 2
AVAILABILITY OF CATCH DATA FOR SHARKS BY GEAR

Availability of catch data for the main shark species expressed as the amount of fleets (%) for which catch data on sharks are available out of the total number of fleets for which data on IOTC species are available, by fishery, species of shark, and year, for the period 1950–2010

Shark species in bold are those identified by the Commission in 2012, for which data shall be recorded in logbooks and reported to the IOTC Secretariat; reporting of catch data for other species can be done in aggregated form (i.e. all species combined as ***sharks nei*** or ***mantas and rays nei***).
Hook and line refers to fisheries using handline and/or trolling and ***Other gears nei*** to other unidentified fisheries operated in coastal waters
Catch rates of sharks on pole-and-line fisheries are thought to be nil or negligible.
Average levels of reporting for 1950–2010 and 2006–10 are shown column ***All*** and ***Last***, respectively.



APPENDIX 3

SUMMARIES OF BYCATCH DATA AVAILABLE FROM OBSERVER PROGRAMMES: SHARKS

Fleet	Gear	Time period	Sharks		Remarks
			No. individual species	% specimens by species	
Australia	Longline	2004-10	17	100	
China	Longline	2006-10	2	100	
Taiwan,China	Longline	2006-10	11	99	
European Union	Purse seine	2003-07	2	90	
EU-France	Longline	2010			Report as 16.6 % of total bycatch (no number given)
EU-Spain	Longline	2007-10	16	99.9	
EU-Portugal	Longline	2006-10	7	100	
Japan	Longline	July 2010-Jan 2011	13	99	Sharks and stingrays
Korea Rep.	Longline	2007-10	3	98	
South Africa	Longline	2006-10	3	95	

SUMMARIES OF BYCATCH DATA AVAILABLE FROM OBSERVER PROGRAMMES: MARINE TURTLES

Fleet	Gear	Time period	Type of data	Marine turtles			Remarks
				No. individual species	% specimens by species	No. of specimen	
Australia	Longline	2004-10	Total catch	5	100	24	
Taiwan,China	Longline	2006-10	Total catch	0	0	191	
EU-France	Longline	2010	Sample	4	100	7	
Indonesia	Longline	2005-10	Sample	5	0	51	
Japan	Longline	July 2010-Jan 2011	Sample	3	100	14	
Korea Rep.	Longline	2007-10	Total catch	2	100	36	
South Africa	Longline	2006-10	Total catch	4	77	97	

SUMMARIES OF BYCATCH DATA AVAILABLE FROM OBSERVER PROGRAMMES: SEABIRDS

Fleet	Gear	Time period	Type of data	Seabirds			Remarks
				No. individual species	% specimens by species	No. of specimen	
Australia	Longline	2004-10	Total catch	2	100	14	
Taiwan,China	Longline	2006-10	Total catch	0	0	329	
EU-Spain	Longline	2007-10	Total catch		-		Rate of interaction with hooks
Indonesia	Longline	2005-10	Sample	1	21	42	
Japan	Longline	July 2010-Jan 2011	Sample	5	72	11	
Korea Rep.	Longline	2007-10	Total catch	9	40	168	
South Africa	Longline	2006-10	Total catch	15	86	1980	

SUMMARIES OF BYCATCH DATA AVAILABLE FROM OBSERVER PROGRAMMES: MARINE MAMMALS

Fleet	Gear	Time period	Type of data	Marine mammals			Remarks
				No. individual species	% specimens by species	No. of specimen	
Taiwan,China	Longline	2006-10	Total catch	0	0	13	Marine mammals
EU-France	Longline	2010	Sample	0	0	5	Common Dolphin
Korea Rep.	Longline	2007-10	Total catch	2	100	2	Dolphin; whale
South Africa	Longline	2006-10	Total catch	3	54	11	Whale, Dolphin, Seal