



CCSBT-EC/1210/21

Data Exchange for the Ecologically Related Species Working Group (ERSWG)

Purpose

To consider, and potentially adopt, the draft ERSWG Data Exchange proposal that was prepared intersessionally by members of the ERSWG.

Background

The Ninth Meeting of the Ecologically Related Species Working Group (ERSWG) agreed that:

“work should continue on development of protocols for an ERS data exchange, and that this work should be held intersessionally with the intention that further discussion could be held during the margins of CCSBT19”¹.

The ERSWG Workplan² further specified that:

“Members will undertake intersessional discussion to develop an agreement concerning the exchange of ERS data by CCSBT 19”.

Intersessional discussion on an ERS data exchange took place via e-mail and then in the margins of the Seventeenth meeting of the Extended Scientific Committee. The draft ERSWG Data Exchange proposal that was developed through this intersessional discussion is provided at **Annex 1**. The draft appears to have general support of the Members' participants that were involved in the discussions, but no formal agreement has been sought on the draft and the Extended Commission may wish to make further changes to the draft before considering it for adoption.

¹ Paragraph 112 of the ERSWG 9 report

² Attachment 5 of the ERSWG 9 report

Draft ERSWG Data Exchange

Introduction

The ERSWG Data Exchange proposal is divided into three sections:

1. Data to be provided;
2. Frequency & timeframe for data provision; and
3. Confidentiality.

The Data Exchange described here is intended for the sharing of information for “general” ERSWG purposes. It is expected that the ERSWG will conduct assessments from time to time that will require more detailed information and CCSBT Members have expressed their willingness, in principle, to share more detailed information on a case by case basis with those who have been tasked with leading such assessments.

1. Data to be provided

ERSWG 9 made three important recommendations to the Extended Commission that form the basis of this data exchange proposal. These are that:

- For the purpose of the ERS Data Exchange, the SBT fishery is defined as all fishing effort by authorised vessels¹ for shots/sets where SBT was either targeted or caught². Data for the full SBT fishery as defined here is to be provided as part of this data exchange. Data should not be provided for fishing that does not match this definition.
- Data is to be provided by stratum, with the default stratum being CCSBT statistical areas unless an analysis has shown that better strata could be defined for the ERS interactions in the national fishery.
- The specific data items to be provided are as specified in Table 1 of the new ERSWG template for annual reports³, which are:
 - Country/Fishing Entity (*suggest using 2 digit country code, e.g. “JP”*)
 - Calendar year
 - Species (*or group*⁴)
 - Fishery (*defined by a combination of gear and fleet – see Attachment A*)
 - Stratum (*CCSBT statistical area*)
 - Total effort⁵
 - Total observed effort⁵
 - Observer coverage (*percentage*⁶)
 - Observed captures (*number*)
 - Observed capture rate⁷
 - Observed mortalities (*number*)
 - Observed mortality rate⁷
 - Observed number of live releases
 - Estimated total number of mortalities in year/stratum⁸

For the actual exchange of data, the above data items will be provided in two separate tables as outlined in **Attachment A**. This style of data provision would prevent double counting and possible confusion in relation to the effort information.

¹ Authorised vessels are vessels on the CCSBT authorised list of vessels during the relevant calendar year.

² For clarification, it is intended that the only information that would be included in the exchange is information from those shots that targeted **or** caught SBT. Hence, if a bycatch vessel only caught 1 SBT for the year, it would only be data from that one SBT shot that would be included in the exchanged information.

³ Attachment 4 of the ERSWG 9 report.

⁴ Information should be provided by species (including the scientific name) wherever practical. For species where species specific reporting is not practical (e.g. due to insufficient data, or the high level of work involved), then the level of taxonomic reporting should be at least to the level specified in Table 3. The ideal way to provide species information would be to use the 3 alpha FAO Species Code. If this is not possible, provide a code for the species and provide a separate lookup table that gives the species code, scientific and common names, family name etc.

⁵ For longline provide number of hooks, for purse seine provide number of sets.

⁶ For longline provide as a percentage of the number of hooks, for purse seine provide as a percentage of the number of shots.

⁷ For longline provide as captures/mortalities per thousand hooks, for purse seine provide as captures/mortalities per set.

⁸ In cases where there is no estimate for the total number of mortalities (e.g. due to no or insufficient observer coverage in the strata), then this field should be left empty.

To be consistent with standard practise of the Extended Scientific Committee (ESC):

- Data will be provided for the most recently completed calendar year (e.g. the 2013 data exchange would provide data for the 2012 calendar year); and
- The data exchange will include any updates for the previous calendar year (i.e. the 2013 data exchange would also include revised data for 2011).

For the very first exchange of data:

- Two years of data will be provided (e.g. data for both 2011 & 2012) for all species⁹.

For an initial period after the first data exchange (possibly 3 years, but still to be determined), Members will work towards improving the quality of their data and they will be able to revise any submitted data with improved information during this period. After this initial period of data improvement, changes to past data should be accompanied by an explanation of the changes.

2. Frequency & timeframe for data provision

Consistent with standard practise of the Extended Scientific Committee (ESC), it is proposed that:

- The ERS data exchange occurs on an annual basis, regardless of whether there is an ERSWG meeting in that year¹⁰.
- The required ERS data is submitted to the Secretariat by 31 July.

3. Confidentiality

The data will be treated in accordance with the “[Rules and Procedures for the Protection, Access to, and Dissemination of Data Compiled by the CCSBT](#)” and will be rated as “medium risk”. This means that the data will not be publicly available, and that they require specific authorization to be released and may not be placed on the CCSBT Data CD or on the private area of the CCSBT web site (unless in a special part of the private area that is further restricted to specifically authorized people).

It is envisaged that the Secretariat would load exchanged ERS data to a special section of the private area of the web site titled “ERSWG Data Exchange” that only people with specific authorisation can access.

⁹ It may be useful to have a longer time-series of data, but there will almost certainly be problems in the first data submission so it makes sense to keep the initial time-series short while these problems are “ironed-out”. Discussion on whether or not a longer time-series is necessary could take place at an ERSWG meeting after the initial data submission.

¹⁰ For data required as part of the CCSBT Management Procedure, the ESC decided that these data should be provided every year despite these data only being required every third year. This was to ensure that the skills and knowledge required to provide the necessary data were retained and so that there would be very few problems in provision of that data when required. This has proved to be a successful strategy for the ESC that makes equally good sense for an ERS Data Exchange.

Proposed Format for Providing Data for the ERSWG Data Exchange

The information should be provided in electronic form in two separate tables (e.g. 2 MS-Excel spreadsheets) as described below. The common columns in the two tables are highlighted in yellow.

Table 1: Total fishing and observed effort per country, year, fishery and strata.

| Country / Fishing Entity ¹¹ | Calendar Year | Fishery | | CCSBT Statistical Area ¹² | Total Effort ⁵ | Total Observed Effort ⁵ | Observer Coverage (percentage ⁶) |
|--|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|---|------------------------------|--|--|
| | | Gear Code ¹³ | Fleet Code ¹⁴ | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

Table 2: Observed and estimated captures/mortalities for each species, by country, year, fishery and strata.

| Country / Fishing Entity ¹¹ | Calendar Year | Fishery | | CCSBT Statistical Area ¹² | Species (or group) ⁴ | Observed Captures (number) | Observed Capture Rate ⁷ | Observed Mortalities (number) | Observed Mortality Rate ⁷ | Observed Live Releases | Estimated total number of mortalities ⁸ |
|--|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|---|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|------------------------------|--|
| | | Gear Code ¹³ | Fleet Code ¹⁴ | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

¹¹ Use the two digit country code (e.g. AU, ID, JP, KR, NZ, TW, ZA and PH)

¹² The codes (1-15) are defined in the CCSBT CDS Resolution.

¹³ Use the gear codes described in the CCSBT CDS Resolution (e.g. “LL” for longline, “PS” for purse seine, “TROL” for troll, etc.)

¹⁴ In most cases, this is just the two digit country code, followed by “D” for domestic for the domestic fleet (e.g. AUD, IDD, JPD, KRD, NZD, TWD, ZAD and PHD). In some cases, the final letter is different, such as for the New Zealand Charter Fleet, which has the code “NZC”. Contact the Secretariat if in doubt.

Table 3: Minimum taxonomic level at which information should be reported in Table 2 (providing that such taxonomic detail is available)¹⁵. Information should be provided to species level where this is practical. Reporting of any of the following species and/or groups within table 2 should include an appropriate stratification of the data.

| Species/Species Group | Comments |
|---------------------------|--|
| Sharks | |
| Blue Shark | |
| Shortfin Mako Shark | |
| Porbeagle | |
| Other sharks | |
| Turtles | For sea turtles, the number of species is small (approximately 7), so it is feasible to report data by stratum for each species. |
| Species specific | <i>Data should be provided separately for each species</i> |
| Seabirds | For seabirds, there are a large number of species and it is often difficult to separately identify species by pictures only. Reporting of seabird data by species would contain identification errors. |
| Large albatrosses | <i>Including: Wandering, Tristan, New Zealand, Antipodean, Southern Royal, and Northern Royal</i> |
| Dark coloured albatrosses | <i>Including: Sooty and Light-mantled</i> |
| Other albatrosses | <i>Including: Black-browed, Campbell, Grey-headed, Atlantic yellow-nosed, Indian yellow-nosed, Buller's, Shy, Salvin's, Chatham and White-capped</i> |
| Giant petrels | <i>Including: White-chinned petrel, Grey petrel, Flesh-footed shearwater etc.</i> |
| Other seabirds | <i>Including: Skua etc.</i> |

¹⁵ The minimum taxonomic level will be subject to improvement (become more species specific) in future. Furthermore the ERSWG might recommend specific species to be reported based on risk assessments or based on advice it may seek from organisations with the necessary expertise.