R2015/0812 | June 2018

Australian Government
Australian Fisheries Management Authority

Monitoring interactions with bycatch species using crew-member observer data collected in the Northern Prawn Fishery: 2014 – 2016





www.afma.gov.au

Protecting our fishing future

Box 7051, Canberra Business Centre, ACT 2610 Tel (02) 6272 5029 Fax (02) 6272 5175 AFMA Direct 1300 723 621

Enquiries should be addressed to:

Gary Fry
CSIRO Oceans and Atmosphere
Queensland Biosciences Precinct
The University of Queensland, Brisbane, QLD 4072
Ph: (07) 3833 5938
gary.fry@csiro.au

Marine Resources and Industries / Oceans & Atmosphere

Citation

Fry, G., Laird, A., Lawrence, E., Miller, M. and Tonks, M. (2018) Monitoring interactions with bycatch species using crew-member observer data collected in the Northern Prawn Fishery: 2014 – 2016. Final Report to AFMA; R2015/0812. June 2018. CSIRO, Australia. Pp. 236.

Copyright and disclaimer

Important disclaimer

CONTENTS

FIGURES

TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the many Northern Prawn Fishery fishers that participated in the project; crew-member observers and their vessel crew, skippers and owners, who made it possible for them to complete their role in data collection.

We would like to thank our many CSIRO colleagues who have undertaken research surveys and scientific observer surveys to record and collect samples of bycatch for numerous projects over the years. We especially thank Robert Kenyon and Tonya van der Velde, for all their efforts in photographing and collecting bycatch data during the prawn population monitoring fieldwork from 2002 to 2016.

We would also like to thank the Australian Fisheries Management Authority for supplying us with their scientific observer data from 2005 to 2016 and commercial logbook data from 1998 to 2016.

This Sustainability Assessment Project, and its predecessors; 'Assessing the sustainability of the NPF bycatch from annual monitoring data: 2008', ‘Ensuring ongoing sustainable interactions bycatch species in the Northern Prawn Fishery; 2011 – 2013’ and ‘Monitoring interactions with bycatch species using crew-member observer data collected in the Northern Prawn Fishery: 2013 – 2014’ was funded by the Australian Fisheries Management Authority. The NPF Industry Pty Ltd funded the crew-member observer program and annual crew-member observer training workshops.

1. NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY

2015/0812 Monitoring interactions with bycatch species using crew-member observer data collected in the Northern Prawn Fishery: 2014 – 2016

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Gary Fry
ADDRESS: CSIRO Oceans and Atmosphere
Queensland Biosciences Precinct
The University of Queensland, Brisbane, QLD 4072
Telephone: 07 3833 5938
Email: gary.fry@csiro.au

OUTCOMES

- The effectiveness of the Northern Prawn Fishery crew-member observer program varies from species to species. It is also highly dependent on the participation of crew-member observers and the quality of the data collected. Changes in catch rates for the more abundant species targeted by the program could be detected from the current data sets collected, especially from 2011 to 2016. Some species are so rare that longer time series (or greater observer effort) are required, and a continuation of the program may achieve this. For others, their rarity and difficulty picking them out of the catch during commercial fishing operations has led to the likely impossibility of detecting real changes in catch rates from this type of monitoring procedure. To overcome this would involve large numbers of samples collected on board in conjunction with the detailed sorting of these samples in the laboratory to provide reliable data on their catch rates and trends over time. Alternative approaches for dealing with these species could be considered.

- Trends in catch rates for 11 ‘Threatened, Endangered and Protected’ and ‘at risk’ bycatch species are statistically measureable and assessable by the monitoring and assessment program in the 14 years of data collected to date. The current program appears to be a cost effective way to assess the sustainability of these species. In time, as more long-term data is accumulated, other less abundant, but conspicuous species should be included in this list.

- For the 11 species that were assessed, no statistically detectable declines in catch rates through time were observed. Most of the eight sea snake species assessed showed slight increases in catch rates from 2010 to 2016. Other sea snake species showed relatively stable catch rate trends over the same time period. The Narrow Sawfish (*Anoxypristis cuspidata*) showed a slight decline in catches from 2011 to 2016, however this was not significant. Both the Straightstick Pipefish (*Trachyrhamphus longirostris*) and Brown-striped Mantis Shrimp (*Dictyosquilla tuberculata*) showed steady increases in catch rates over the last seven years with a marked decline in catch rates in 2014 and 2016.

- The Northern Prawn Fishery will need to use alternative strategies for ensuring the sustainability of those rare and inconspicuous species targeted by this program that may never be effectively assessed using the current methods.

- There has been a significant improvement in the accuracy and reliability of data collected in the crew-member observer program since 2011. This has been evident in the participation rates of crew-member observers and data collection procedures such as being able to record catches to species via comprehensive photographic records. The crew-member observers have performed their data collection tasks effectively as outlined in the 'Crew-member Observer Manual' and provided catch data on ‘Threatened, Endangered and Protected’ and 'at risk' bycatch species.

- The crew-member observer data was validated using the Australian Fisheries Management Authority scientific observer and Northern Prawn Fishery prawn population monitoring data by comparing modelled catch rates over time. While species catch rates varied between datasets for some species, the trends over time were statistically similar demonstrating that the crew-member observer data was of sufficient quality to be used in scientific catch trend analysis.

- Continued monitoring by the Northern Prawn Fishery of all ‘Threatened, Endangered and Protected’ species is required (turtles, sea snakes, syngnathids and most sawfishes). We recommend monitoring to continue for all sawfish species as they are highly vulnerable to impacts of fishing and the most common species, *Anoxypristis cuspidata*, showed a slight decline in modelled catch rates from 2011 to 2016.

- The one ‘at risk’ elasmobranch species, *Urogymnus asperrimus*, has only been observed and recorded in the crew-member observer program five times in a Try net since 2006. This species is likely to be effectively removed from trawl nets with Turtle Excluder Devices and is widely distributed outside of the Northern Prawn Fishery high effort areas. We conclude that this species is unlikely to be at risk from this fishery and should be removed from the list of species being monitored.

- The two ‘at risk’ teleost species, *Lepidotrigla spinosa* and *Lepidotrigla* sp A, have not been observed and recorded in the crew-member observer program. However, they are unlikely to be effectively sampled by this program as there is very little distribution data and suitable descriptive information available to assist in species identification onboard vessels. For these reasons, it is recommended that they continue to be monitored by the Northern Prawn Fishery prawn population monitoring surveys until there is more available information collected.

- The two ‘at risk’ mantis shrimp species, *Dictyosquilla tuberculata* and *Harpiosquilla stephensoni*, have widespread distributions across the NPF. *Dictyosquilla tuberculata* has shown steady increases in crew-member observer catches since 2010 and is unlikely to be adversely impacted by current trawling patterns. *Harpiosquilla stephensoni* had similar increased catches in 2010 to 2012. Although catches showed a marked drop in 2013, from 2014 to 2016 catches again steadily increased. It is recommended that *Dictyosquilla tuberculata* is unlikely to be at risk from this fishery and should be removed from the list of species being monitored. However, it is recommended that *Harpiosquilla stephensoni* be monitored until further distribution and catch data is available to undertake a robust catch rate trend analysis.

- This knowledge is valuable to the fishery to demonstrate their obligation in ecological sustainability of trawl bycatch species and ongoing monitoring and assessment is recommended.

OBJECTIVE 1: Attend the 2015, 2016 and 2017 annual crew-member observer workshops and collaborate with NPFI representatives to deliver an annual training program for crew-member observers in identifying and recording all TEP and 'at risk' species interactions during the 2015 – 17 prawn seasons

From 2003 to 2008, Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO) scientists have participated in organizing and delivering annual training workshops, in conjunction with staff from the Australian Fisheries Management Authority (AFMA) and the NPF Industry Pty Ltd (NPFI). This included preparing field manuals and datasheets, sampling kits and information packs for each crew-member observer. A number of CSIRO scientists attended these courses to aid facilitation and to deliver talks to the crew members on current catch data collected and biological information on Threatened, Endangered and Protected' species and 'at risk' bycatch species that are being recorded by the crew member observers.

As of 2009, the organising and running of the crew-member training workshop was handed over to NPFI via the co-management arrangement with AFMA. Each year since then, a two day workshop was held during July in Cairns. Two CSIRO scientists participate in these workshops, presenting training information focused on past data collected on the TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species and biological information; species identifications and general life-history information for these species. The project staff were also involved in gathering observer feedback for the ongoing evaluation of the bycatch data collection methods.

The crew-member observer workshops were held in Palm Cove, Cairns on the 23rd and 24th July 2015 and on the 21st July in 2016 and at Cairns City on the 23rd July 2017. There were 12 crew-member observers attending the workshops. This represented a fleet coverage of around 20% in boat day. Two AFMA scientific observers attended the 2016 crew-member observer workshop.

OBJECTIVE 2: Process and summarize all crew-member observer and AFMA scientific observer catch and image data on TEPs and 'at risk' species collected in 2014, 2015 and 2016 banana and tiger prawn seasons and report on data collected via annual milestone reports

Since the last Bycatch Sustainability Assessment in 2014, catch data on 'Threatened, Endangered and Protected' (TEP) and 'at risk' bycatch species has continued to be collected from a number of sources. Catch data recorded by the Northern Prawn Fishery (NPF) crew-member observer program up to 2016 was obtained from the NPFI. Catches of all TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species have also been recorded during the annual NPF prawn population monitoring surveys up to 2016 (as part of '*An integrated monitoring program for the Northern Prawn fishery 2009-2010 R2009/0863*', '*An integrated monitoring program for the Northern Prawn fishery 2011-2015 R2011/0811*' and '*An integrated monitoring program for the Northern Prawn fishery 2015-2018 R2015/0810*' Projects). In addition, AFMA's NPF scientific observer program has provided additional catch data on TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species from 2014 to 2016.

The data collected from these sources to date, was used in the current Bycatch Sustainability Assessment. A detailed description of these datasets is below:

1. **Crew-member observer program** (2003 – 2016); long-term bycatch monitoring program in the NPF where trained crew members collect fishery-dependent catch data on ‘Threatened, Endangered and Protected’ species, sawfish species and ‘at risk’ elasmobranch, teleost and invertebrate bycatch species.

2. **AFMA scientific observer program** (2005 – 2016); fishery-dependent data collection by AFMA scientific observers onboard NPF commercial vessels during the tiger and banana prawn seasons for catch data on Threatened, Endangered and Protected’ species, sawfish species and ‘at risk’ elasmobranch, teleost and invertebrate bycatch species.

3. **NPF prawn population monitoring survey** (2002 – 2016); bi-annual fishery-independent monitoring surveys carried out in the NPF by CSIRO to collect prawn stock catch data, including catch data on ‘Threatened, Endangered and Protected’ species, sawfish species and ‘at risk’ elasmobranch, teleost and invertebrate bycatch species.

4. **CSIRO scientific research and observer surveys** (1976 – 2005); fishery-independent research trawl surveys and CSIRO scientific observers onboard NPF commercial vessels collecting catch data on ‘Threatened, Endangered and Protected’ species, sawfish species and ‘at risk’ elasmobranch, teleost and invertebrate bycatch species.

For the 2017 Bycatch Sustainability Assessment, the ‘Delta’ statistical approach was initially applied to the crew-member observer, AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring data sets separately, where sufficient data was available for each animal group. The ‘Delta’ approach involved modelling the probability of obtaining a zero catch and catch rate, given that the catch is non-zero, using separate generalised linear models (GLMs). Comparisons of catches between these three data sets were made to check for consistency and validation of the crew-member observer data. Species catch rates slightly differed between the crew-member observer and NPF prawn population data sets however the trends in catch rates across ‘Years’ showed similar patterns. The AFMA scientific observer data set showed quite large discrepancies when compared to the crew-member observer data set in some ‘Regions’ but not others. This was due to smaller numbers of catch records across a larger number of ’Regions’ than the NPF prawn population monitoring survey. The crew-member observer data was therefore initially modelled separately. The AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring data sets were then combined and statistically compared with the crew-member observer data for catch rate trend analysis for the TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species where sufficient catch data was available.

For the rarest species, the above analysis procedures were not suitable. For these species, unmodelled catch rate data were plotted on a spatial and temporal scale to describe trends in catches.

OBJECTIVE 3: Undertake a catch trends analysis of NPF crew-member observer and AFMA scientific observer data collected over the 2014 – 16 banana and tiger prawn seasons, including an evaluation of the performance of the NPF crew-member observer and AFMA programs over the last three years

All available crew-member observer and AFMA scientific observer data from the years 2003 through to 2016 (includes data collected during FRDC Project 2002/035) has been collected. This data has undergone processing and quality control including image processing of all photographs taken of TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species by crew-member and AFMA scientific observers. Catches per unit effort for TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species caught during NPF prawn population monitoring projects from 2002 to 2016 have also been obtained (Projects: MIRF R01/1144 [2002]; FRDC 2002/101 [2002]; FRDC 2003/075 [2003-04]; FRDC 2004/099 [2004-05]; AFMA R05/0599 [2005-06]; AFMA R05/1024 [2006-08]; AFMA R08/0827 [2008-10]; AFMA R2009/0863 [2009-10]; AFMA R2011/0811 [2011-2015]; AFMA R2015/0810 [2015-18]).

Since the AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring data was collected on a similar spatial and temporal scale as the crew-member observer data was collected, they were initially used to validate the crew-member observer data. A large amount of catch per unit effort data from previous CSIRO scientific research and observer fieldwork from 1976 to 2005 was sourced and included in this assessment. This early CSIRO data was included to (i) potentially provide a longer term view of catches and (ii) to compensate for the overall low numbers of catch data records for most of these TEP and 'at risk' species in the NPF. All catch data was standardised to numbers of individuals caught per swept area (km^2).

There were sufficient data available to undertake the catch rate trend analysis for eight sea snake species (*Aipysurus mosaicus*, *Aipysurus laevis*, *Astrotia stokesii*, *Disteira major*, *Hydrophis elegans*, *Hydrophis ornatus*, *Hydrophis pacificus* and *Lapemis curtis*), one syngnathid (*Trachyrhamphus longirostris*), one sawfish species (*Anoxypristis cuspidata*), and one invertebrate species (*Dictyosquilla tuberculata*). None of these species showed clear declines in catches from 2003 to 2016 during either the crew-member observer program or the AFMA scientific observer program and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys. For most of these species, catches had appeared to increase slightly over the last few years. There was one species; *Anoxypristis cuspidata*, that did show a slight decline in catches over the same time period. However this decline was not significant and catch rates were highly variable within years.

The remaining TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species were not able to be assessed by the GLM method due to the scarcity of catch records in the time series data. For these species, the most suitable method of assessing their susceptibility to trawling in the NPF was to plot standardised catches on a spatial and temporal scale to look for trends in their catch rates. Most of these species also appeared to show no consistent downward trend in their catch rates from 2002 to 2016 that would indicate an unsustainable impact from trawling. There was a decline in catches from 2011 to 2016 for one species of marine turtle; *Natator depressus*, seen in the crew-member observer data. The only other noticeable declines in catches over the last few years were in the unidentified groups from the crew-member observer program and indicates an improvement in crew-member observer data collection.

For the rarest TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species, catch records were very low and no catch rate trends could be determined. Future interactions with these species will need continued monitoring by the crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program and during the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys, especially if the current commercial fishing intensity and effort distribution changes.

Because all of the marine turtle, sea snake, syngnathid and sawfish species are listed through the EPBC Act 1999, any interactions with fishing activities in the NPF needs to be recorded. Therefore, continued monitoring by fishery-dependent and fishery-independent programs is necessary. We also recommend monitoring to continue for all sawfish species as they are highly vulnerable to impacts of fishing and unmodelled catch data showed lower catch rates in 2013 and 2016 in the crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program and during the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys for the most common species; *Anoxypristis cuspidata*.

The ‘at risk’ elasmobranch species; *Urogymnus asperrimus*, has only been recorded five times during the crew-member observer program from 2003 to 2016 and has not been found by the AFMA scientific observer program or the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys. As these are large animals and all five catch records were from Try net captures, they would likely be excluded by TEDs and available evidence suggests that they are widespread across the Indo-Pacific region. We conclude that it is unlikely that this species are at risk from trawling by the NPF and that it should be removed from the list of species being monitored.

An additional two teleost species; *Lepidotrigla spinosa* and *Lepidotrigla* sp A, were identified as 'at risk' and included in the priority monitoring list in 2011. Neither of these species have been found to date during the crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program or the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys and there is very limited distribution data and suitable descriptive information to assist in species identification onboard vessels. It is recommended that they continue to be monitored by the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys until there is more available information collected.

The two ‘at risk’ mantis shrimp species; *Dictyosquilla tuberculata* and *Harpiosquilla stephensoni*, have been regularly recorded across most of the NPF during the crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys from 2009 to 2016. *Dictyosquilla tuberculata* has shown consistent increases in crew-member observer catches from 2009 indicating that this species is quite common within the NPF and its distribution is likely to be more widespread than the catch records previously showed. Therefore our data suggest that this species is unlikely to be adversely impacted by trawling in the NPF.

While similar steady increases in crew-member observer catches were seen for *Harpiosquilla stephensoni* from 2009 to 2016, catch rates were lower in 2013 for both the crew-member observer program and AFMA scientific observer program. The reason for this decline in 2013 and a decline in catch rates recorded during the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys is unclear therefore it is recommended that *Harpiosquilla stephensoni* continue to be monitored, at least for the next three years, until further distribution and catch data is available to undertake a robust catch rate trend analysis.

OBJECTIVE 4: To deliver an updated triennial bycatch sustainability assessment report for the TEP and ‘at risk’ bycatch species impacted by the NPF

The objective of the crew-member observer program is to provide accurate and reliable data on TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species for catch rate trend analysis. An assessment of the success of the crew-member observer program was made during this project. This was carried out by comparisons of the number of species that could be assessed for catch rate trends and the similarities between the trends for the crew-member observer, AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring data sets.

The crew-member observer program over the last six years (2011 – 2016) has been successful in collecting robust and reliable catch data on the TEP and ‘at risk’ bycatch species and has led to an increase in number of species assessed for catch rate trend analysis; three species in 2009, 11 species in 2015 and 11 species (one new species) in this assessment. There was enough catch records in the NPF prawn population monitoring data to separately assess two of these species across six of the 10 'Regions' within the NPF. No species could be assessed using only the AFMA scientific observer data. However, when the AFMA scientific observer data was combined with the NPF prawn population monitoring data, there was adequate data to assess five of the 11 species across eight of the 10 'Regions'.

Although the modelled catch rates for these five species (*Disteira major*, *Hydrophis elegans*, *Lapemis Curtis*, *Anoxypristis cuspidata* and *Trachyrhamphus longirostris*) using the combined AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring data sets, were not always identical compared to the catch rates from the crew-member observer data, the modelled trends over time were quite similar. This was more evident over the last few years of the programs; 2011 to 2016. This indicates that the crew-member observers performed their data collection tasks effectively as outlined in the 'Crew-member Observer Manual' and provided accurate and reliable data on at least five of the TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species which was verified by the AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring data and could be used in scientific analysis of changes in catch rate trends.

KEYWORDS: AFMA scientific observer, at risk, bycatch, crew-member observer, elasmobranch, invertebrate, marine turtle, Northern Prawn Fishery, sawfish, scientific observer, sea snake, sustainability, syngnathid, teleost, Threatened, Endangered and Protected.

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND NEED

A critical part of demonstrating ecological sustainability in the NPF is measuring and reducing its trawling impacts on the marine environment. As a result, the NPF has developed and adopted the Bycatch Strategy (www.afma.gov.au) and strongly supported the development and funding of several scientific research projects aimed at reducing and assessing impacts on bycatch species.

In 2001, as part of the *Ecological Sustainability of Bycatch and Biodiversity in Prawn Trawl Fisheries* Project (P/N FRDC 96/257), Stobutzki et al (2000) developed a qualitative approach to examine the likely impact of trawling on vertebrate bycatch species of the NPF. They used a two-axis matrix with scored criteria to determine a species' position within the matrix: (i) the susceptibility of a species to capture and mortality due to prawn trawling and (ii) the capacity of a species to recover once the population is depleted.

Following on from this study, Griffiths et al (2006c) undertook an Ecological Risk Assessment for Effects of Fishing (ERAEF V9.2) on bycatch of the NPF. This study highlighted a number of vertebrate and invertebrate bycatch species that were determined to be most 'at risk' from trawling in the NPF. In 2007, the bycatch monitoring project; *Design, trial and implementation of an integrated, long-term bycatch monitoring program road tested in the Northern Prawn Fishery* (P/N FRDC 2002/035) developed a cost-effective way of assessing sustainability of bycatch in the NPF. This included development and implementation of a risk assessment method to identify elasmobranch and teleost bycatch species that are or may be at risk to trawling (Brewer et al 2007). This method has been further developed into an ecological Sustainability Assessment for Fishing Effects (SAFE) approach to quantitatively assess the impacts of trawling on all bycatch species. This work highlighted a number of bycatch species potentially 'at risk' from prawn trawling in the NPF (Zhou and Griffiths 2008; Zhou et al 2009a).

The bycatch monitoring project; *Design, trial and implementation of an integrated, long-term bycatch monitoring program road tested in the Northern Prawn Fishery* (P/N FRDC 2002/035), also trialed methods for establishing a long-term bycatch monitoring program. As part of that project, in 2003 crew-member observers voluntarily collected species-specific bycatch data on an annual basis. In April 2008, the NPF commenced a long-term bycatch sustainability program with AFMA taking responsibility for ensuring the long-term sustainability of all bycatch species impacted by the fishery and consequently, for organizing and running an on-going bycatch data collection program; the crew-member observer program. The crew-member observer data collection process is now funded directly by the NPFI with participating crew members being employed to carry out their crew-member observer duties. The AFMA funds a separate component dedicated to the data analysing and reporting of the Bycatch Sustainability Assessment.

There have been two NPF Bycatch Sustainability Assessments undertaken, the first in 2009 and the second assessment in 2014. These assessments analysed all available catch and biological data on TEP and ‘at risk’ bycatch species sourced from the crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program, NPF prawn population monitoring surveys and CSIRO scientific research and observer surveys that were available up until the end of 2013. There were sufficient data available to undertake the catch rate trend analysis for the 'Unidentified Hydrophiidae' group, seven sea snake species (*Aipysurus mosaicus*, *Aipysurus laevis*, *Astrotia stokesii*, *Disteira major*, *Hydrophis elegans*, *Hydrophis ornatus* and *Lapemis curtis*), one syngnathid (*Trachyrhamphus longirostris*), one sawfish species (*Anoxypristis cuspidata*), and two invertebrates (*Dictyosquilla tuberculata* and *Solenocera australiana*). None of these species showed clear declines in catches from 2003 to 2013 during either the crew-member observer program or the AFMA scientific observer program and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys.

Some of the TEP and ‘at risk’ bycatch species were not able to be assessed using the catch rate trend analysis method due to the scarcity of catch records in the time series data. For these species, standardised catches were plotted on a spatial and temporal scale to look for trends in their catch abundance. None of the TEP and ‘at risk’ bycatch species appeared to show any consistent downward trend in their catch rates from 1990 to 2013 that would indicate an unsustainable impact from trawling. However these rarer TEP and ‘at risk’ bycatch species required continued monitoring by the crew-member observer program and during the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys, especially if the commercial fishing intensity and effort distribution changes over time.

The use of this long-term catch data is critical for monitoring the abundances of these species and re-assessing their risk to trawling with the changes in effort and spatial intensity of the fishing fleet. It is essential that this data collection continue through the AFMA scientific observer and crew-member observer programs; and that the data is assessed in order to determine whether these species are being fished in a manner that allows sustainable or viable populations into the long term. AFMA has requested that CSIRO use this and other historical data to continue to provide triennial assessments of the sustainability for all impacted bycatch species. This project delivers the third Bycatch Sustainability Assessment within this broader program.

3. OBJECTIVES

OBJECTIVE 1: Attend the 2015, 2016 and 2017 annual NPF crew-member observer workshops and collaborate with NPFI representatives to deliver an annual training program for crew-member observers in identifying and recording all TEP and 'at risk' species interactions during the 2015 – 17 prawn seasons

CSIRO researchers will participate in the annual NPF cew-member observer training workshops in 2015, 2016 and 2017 to help educate NPF cew-member observers in the appropriate methods for identifying and measuring TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species, and recording data correctly.

OBJECTIVE 2: Process and summarize all NPF cew-member observer and AFMA scientific observer catch and image data on TEPs and 'at risk' species collected in 2014, 2015 and 2016 banana and tiger prawn seasons and report on data collected via annual milestone reports

CSIRO researchers will also process all digital data records of TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species submitted by NPF crew-member observers and AFMA scientific observers throughout the 2014-16 banana and tiger seasons to confirm species identifications and length measurements. This will include the entry of all biological data into a central database, and matching/merging NPF commercial logbook data with NPF crew-member observer and AFMA data in a central database to derive spatial and shot-based information not collected by NPF crew-member observers and AFMA observers.

OBJECTIVE 3: Undertake a catch trends analysis of NPF crew-member observer and AFMA scientific observer data collected over the 2014 – 16 banana and tiger prawn seasons, including an evaluation of the performance of the NPF crew-member and AFMA programs over the last three years

CSIRO researchers will undertake a triennial sustainability analysis in 2017 for the NPF using data collated through stages 1 and 2 above, involving re-running catch trend analysis to update the 2014 sustainability report ('Monitoring interactions with bycatch species using crew-member observer data collected in the Northern Prawn Fishery: 2013-14' - R2013/0806). The assessment will use time-series data from the crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys to analyse (using data modelling techniques) and monitor catch trend changes over time for each TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species. Recommendations will then be given in the report on the likely susceptibility of these species to trawling in the NPF and future monitoring priorities. The next sustainability analysis will be due in 2020.

OBJECTIVE 4: To deliver an updated triennial bycatch sustainability assessment report for the TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species impacted by the NPF

CSIRO researchers will deliver a scientific report documenting the scientific results of the bycatch sustainability assessment and provide recommendations to AFMA for priority bycatch species and future monitoring. This data set and report may be used to assess and demonstrate ecological sustainability of the TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species; one of the NPF's Ecological Risk Assessment and Management obligations for commonwealth fisheries.

4. GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The incidental take of bycatch species has become an important issue in trawl fisheries worldwide over the last decade. In Australia's NPF, this has led to considerable resources being expended on designing, implementing and monitoring new gear technologies; e.g. Turtle Excluder Devices (TEDs) and Bycatch Reduction Devices (BRDs), to reduce the catch of Threatened, Endangered and Protected (TEP) and other large bycatch species (Brewer et al 2004; Brewer et al 2006; Brewer et al 2007; Milton et al 2008). These species include marine turtles, sea snakes, sawfishes, sharks and rays. In 2000, AFMA introduced mandatory usage of these TEDs and BRDs in trawl nets for all vessels fishing in the NPF.

Recently, there has been increased focus directed towards ecosystem-based fishery management as a result of greater environmental concern for marine habitats. This has included assessing the long-term sustainability of all species caught in commercial fisheries, especially tropical trawl fisheries where large numbers of bycatch species are caught. These bycatch species, and the impacts of trawling on their populations, are generally poorly understood as a consequence of the limited amount of data that is available. However, demonstrating that populations of bycatch species impacted by trawl fishing are sustainable requires species-specific and quantitative approaches; in particular, quantitative risk or stock assessments, or long-term monitoring programs (Brewer et al 2007).

In 2006, Griffiths et al (2006c) assessed the ecological impacts of the NPF on bycatch species by using the Ecological Risk Assessment for Effect of Fishing model (ERAEF V9.2) jointly developed by CSIRO and AFMA. This approach provided a hierarchical framework for a comprehensive assessment of the ecological risks to elasmobranch, teleost and invertebrate species arising from fishing, with impacts assessed against five ecological components: target species; byproduct and bycatch; threatened, endangered and protected species; habitats; and ecological communities (Griffiths et al 2006c). A new quantitative approach to the ecological Sustainability Assessment for Fishing Effects (SAFE) was then developed for the diverse and data-poor bycatch species of elasmobranchs (Brewer et al 2007; Zhou and Griffiths 2008) and teleosts (Brewer et al 2007; Zhou et al 2009a) in the NPF. This method estimated fishing impacts and compared the impact to sustainability reference points based on basic life-history parameters (Zhou and Griffiths 2008).

These bycatch assessment approaches identified a number of bycatch species that may be ‘at risk’ to trawling in the NPF. Each of these ‘at risk’ bycatch species are then assessed using the ‘Highest Level of Assessment’ method where the NPF Bycatch Subcommittee working group consults with an expert panel of scientists to evaluate all available data and provide justification on retaining or removing a species from the ‘at risk’ list. This approach is repeated periodically as more data for each species becomes available and then considered by the Northern Prawn Fishery Management Advisory Committee (NORMAC) and Northern Prawn Fishery Resource Assessment Group (NPRAG).

This is the third Bycatch Sustainability Assessment undertaken for the NPF and aims to use the additional crew-member observer, AFMA scientific observer, NPF prawn population monitoring surveys and CSIRO scientific research and observer data collected since 2013 to update the previous assessment of TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species. This up-to-date data set will increase the robustness of the analysis with a greater number of catch records, more precise catch rate estimates over time and increase the number of species for which individual catch rate trend analysis can be performed on. We further provide advice on future assessment strategies and alternative strategies for assessing sustainability where this is necessary.

5. METHODS

Data sources and data collection

All available catch and biological data on TEP species and 'at risk' bycatch species were sourced from within CSIRO and from AFMA and NPFI. These data were standardised and collated into a central database. This includes; (i) fishery-dependent data collected as part of the crew-member observer program, (ii) fishery-dependent data collected by AFMA scientific observers onboard commercial vessels, (iii) fishery-independent data collected from the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys and (iv) data collected from previous CSIRO scientific research and observer surveys onboard commercial vessels, from the early 1990's to 2016. The early CSIRO scientific research and observer data was included due to the overall low numbers of catch data records for these TEP and 'at risk' species in the NPF.

As the data has come from a number of sources, it consequently required a degree of preparation in order for the assessments and analyses to continue. To this end, we standardised each data set for trawl effort producing numbers of animals per km^2 swept area for each of the TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species. In each of the data sets, there was a proportion of catch records where individuals were only recorded to group level and not to species level; turtles, sea snakes, syngnathids and sawfishes. These records were treated as unidentified individuals of that group for the analysis. As a consequence of this, the species-specific catch rates calculated may be lower since some individuals of that species (the ones not identified to species) would have been included at the group level.

Nominated species for assessment

Threatened, Endangered and Protected Species

As legislated by the *Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999,* all Threatened, Endangered and Protected (TEP) species interactions are required to be recorded by fishers in the NPF. The TEP groups recorded in the NPF are one species of dolphin, five species of marine turtles, more than 15 species of sea snakes, more than 15 species of syngnathids (pipefish/seahorses) and the four species of sawfishes (Table 5-1). These species are included in this Bycatch Sustainability Assessment.

Catches of these species have been recorded during the crew-member observer program (2003 – 2016), AFMA scientific observer program (2005 – 2016) and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys (2002 – 2016). These TEP species have also been recorded during most of the previous CSIRO scientific research and observer surveys in the NPF from 1976 to 2005.

Sawfishes

All sawfishes are listed under the EPBC Act 1999 as vulnerable and/or migratory species. They are recognised as being highly susceptible to any activity that impacts their populations, with populations already being severely impacted by fishing. Furthermore, it is likely to take many years, if not decades, for sawfish populations to recover from significant declines. These species are listed under the International Union for Conservation or Nature (IUCN) as Critically Endangered (*Pristis pristis* and *Pristis zijsron*) or Endangered (*Pristis clavata* and *Anoxypristis cuspidata*).

Catches of sawfish species have been recorded during the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys since 2002, crew-member observer program since 2003 and the AFMA scientific observer program since 2005. Catches of sawfishes have also been recorded during most of the previous CSIRO scientific research and observer surveys in the NPF from 1990 to 2005.

'At risk' bycatch species

This group consists of elasmobranch (not including sawfishes), teleost and invertebrate bycatch species and were assessed as 'at risk' from semi-quantitative 'Ecological Risk Assessment for Effects of Fishing' (Griffiths et al 2006c) and quantitative 'Sustainability Assessment for Fishing Effects' (Zhou and Griffiths 2008; Zhou et al 2009a, Zhou 2011) approaches.

During the course of this project; there were some changes to the nominated 'at risk' bycatch species for monitoring. From the results of the ERAEF and SAFE approaches in 2006 and 2007, the 'at risk' species comprised three elasmobranch species: *Orectolobus ornatus*, *Taeniura meyeni* and *Urogymnus asperrimus*, and two teleost species: *Dendrochirus brachypterus* and *Scorpaenopsis venosa* (see Appendix A). Any interactions with these species were recorded from 2006 onwards for the elasmobranchs and 2007 onwards for the teleosts by the crew-member observers and during the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys.

In 2009, the NPF Bycatch Subcommittee working group held a meeting at CSIRO where a further two elasmobranch (*Carcharhinus albimarginatus* and *Squatina albipunctata*), seven teleost (*Parascolopsis tosensis*, *Hemiramphus robustus*, *Lutjanus rufolineatus*, *Onigocia spinosa*, *Benthosema pterotum*, *Scomberoides comersonnianus* and *Sphyraena jello*), three cephalopod (*Euprymna hoylei*, *Metasepia pfefferi* and *Photololigo* sp. 3 / 4) and three crustacean (*Solenocera australiana*, *Dictyosquilla tuberculata* and *Harpiosquilla stephensoni*) species were nominated as 'at risk' species (see Appendix A). These species were highlighted as 'at risk' from a re-run of the ERAEF V9.2 and SAFE approaches in 2009 (refer Griffiths et al 2006c; Zhou and Griffiths 2008; Zhou et al 2009a). The updated 'at risk' bycatch species list was then distributed to key biological researchers to provide expert opinion on the species in each of their research fields. The researchers provided detailed distribution and biological information and assessed the appropriateness of these species to be in the 'at risk' list (see Appendix A for details). This process removed three elasmobranch species (*Orectolobus ornatus*, *Carcharhinus albimarginatus* and *Squatina albipunctata*), seven teleost species (*Parascolopsis tosensis*, *Hemiramphus robustus*, *Lutjanus rufolineatus*, *Onigocia spinosa*, *Benthosema pterotum*, *Scomberoides comersonnianus* and *Sphyraena jello*) and three cephalopod species (*Euprymna hoylei*, *Metasepia pfefferi* and *Photololigo* sp. 3 / 4) (see Appendix A).

An updated SAFE assessment using more recent fishery data was requested by AFMA in 2010 due to the fishery experiencing significant changes in fleet structure, fishing patterns and fishery effort distribution. This assessment included 51 elasmobranch and 428 teleost species. There were five species of elasmobranchs (*Carcharhinus albimarginatus*, C*archarhinus leucas*, *Galeocerdo cuvier*, *Orectolobus ornatus*, and *Sphyrna mokarran*) where estimated fishing mortality was greater than their maximum sustainable mortality (Zhou 2011). However due to their wide distribution, likelihood of being excluded through the TED and rarity in prawn trawls, these species were not regarded as 'at risk' to trawling in the NPF (Zhou 2011). The updated assessment also showed one of the previously nominated species; *Taeniura meyeni*, has estimated fishing mortality smaller than its maximum sustainable mortality and its distribution mostly outside the current fishing area. Therefore, this species was also removed from the 'at risk' list in 2011. The other previously nominated elasmobranch, *Urogymnus asperrimus*, had its upper 90% CI limit of mean estimated fishing mortality slightly larger than the maximum sustainable mortality, therefore further monitoring was recommended (Zhou 2011).

For the teleosts, none of the 428 species were determined to be 'at risk' to trawling with estimated fishing mortalities lower than maximum sustainable mortalities (Zhou 2011). Although six species (*Ariosoma anago*, *Conger cinereus*, *Epinephelus malabaricus*, *Lepidotrigla* sp., *Leptojulis cyanopleura*, and *Sphyraena qenie*) did show upper 90% CI limit of estimated fishing mortality greater than the maximum sustainable mortality, this was due to high uncertainty in data. The two previously nominated teleosts; *Dendrochirus brachypterus* and *Scorpaenopsis venosa*, had estimated fishing mortality lower than their maximum sustainable mortality in this updated assessment so removed from the 'at risk' list (Zhou 2011). Furthermore, eight teleost species were assessed as having a 'Precautionary Medium Risk' score; *Pterygotrigla hemisticta*, *Lepidotrigla* sp C, *Lepidotrigla spiloptera*, *Lepidotrigla kishinoyi*, *Lepidotrigla* sp 2, *Lepidotrigla spinosa*, *Lepidotrigla argus*, *Lepidotrigla* sp A. These species were then assessed by key biological researchers using the expert opinion method and only two of these species (*Lepidotrigla spinosa* and *Lepidotrigla* sp A) were regarded as 'at risk' to trawling and subsequently included in the list for future monitoring. However due to their rarity, difficulty in identification and lack of suitable descriptive information for easy identification onboard vessels, these two *Lepidotrigla* species were only monitored during the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys and not during the crew-member observer or AFMA scientific observer programs (see Appendix A).

In 2012, the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) certification process for the NPF highlighted that one of the three current 'at risk' invertebrate species; *Solenocera australiana*, has a widespread distribution across northern Australia, including in offshore areas, where no NPF trawling is likely to occur (Fry et al 2009). Although this prawn species is consistently caught in the NPF, it was concluded that populations are not adversely susceptible to impacts from NPF trawling and removed from the 'at risk' priority list (MRAG 2012).

The current list of TEP and bycatch species identified to be 'at risk' is given in Table 5-1.

Table 5-1: List of Threatened, Endangered and Protected (TEP) and 'at risk' bycatch species from the NPF region which were identified in the ERAEF (2006) and SAFE (2008; 2009; 2011) approaches. List includes both currently and previously monitored TEP and bycatch species from the start of the crew-member observer program onwards.

Group	Family	CAAB	Species	Common Name	Source	Period	Status
Dolphin	Delphinidae	41116000	Delphinidae spp	Dolphin	TEP	2003-2016	Current
Marine Turtle	Cheloniidae	39020001	*Caretta caretta*	Loggerhead Turtle	TEP	2003-2016	Current
	Cheloniidae	39020002	*Chelonia mydas*	Green Turtle	TEP	2003-2016	Current
	Cheloniidae	39020003	*Eretmochelys imbricata*	Hawksbill Turtle	TEP	2003-2016	Current
	Cheloniidae	39020004	*Lepidochelys olivacea*	Olive Ridley Turtle	TEP	2003-2016	Current
	Cheloniidae	39020005	*Natator depressus*	Flatback Turtle	TEP	2003-2016	Current
Sea Snake	Hydrophiidae	39125001	*Acalyptophis peronii*	Horned Sea Snake	TEP	2003-2016	Current
	Hydrophiidae	39125003	*Aipysurus duboisii*	Dubois Sea Snake	TEP	2003-2016	Current
	Hydrophiidae	39125004	*Aipysurus mosaicus*	Stagger-banded Sea Snake	TEP	2003-2016	Current
	Hydrophiidae	39125007	*Aipysurus laevis*	Olive Sea Snake	TEP	2003-2016	Current
	Hydrophiidae	39125009	*Astrotia stokesii*	Stokes Sea Snake	TEP	2003-2016	Current
	Hydrophiidae	39125010	*Disteira kingii*	Spectacled Sea Snake	TEP	2003-2016	Current
	Hydrophiidae	39125011	*Disteira major*	Olive-headed Sea Snake	TEP	2003-2016	Current
	Hydrophiidae	39125013	*Enhydrina schistosa*	Beaked Sea Snake	TEP	2003-2016	Current
	Hydrophiidae	39125018	*Hydrophis caerulescens*	Dwarf Sea Snake	TEP	2003-2016	Current
	Hydrophiidae	39125021	*Hydrophis elegans*	Elegant Sea Snake	TEP	2003-2016	Current
	Hydrophiidae	39125025	*Hydrophis mcdowelli*	Small-headed Sea Snake	TEP	2003-2016	Current
	Hydrophiidae	39125028	*Hydrophis ornatus*	Ornate Sea Snake	TEP	2003-2016	Current
	Hydrophiidae	39125029	*Hydrophis pacificus*	Large-headed Sea Snake	TEP	2003-2016	Current
	Hydrophiidae	39125031	*Lapemis curtis*	Spine-bellied Sea Snake	TEP	2003-2016	Current
	Hydrophiidae	39125033	*Pelamis platurus*	Yellow-bellied Sea Snake	TEP	2003-2016	Current
Syngnathid	Syngnathidae	37282005	*Hippocampus histrix*	Thorny Seahorse	TEP	2006-2016	Current
	Syngnathidae	37282006	*Trachyrhamphus bicoarctata*	Double-ended Pipefish	TEP	2006-2016	Current
	Syngnathidae	37282007	*Haliichthys taeniophorus*	Ribboned Pipefish	TEP	2006-2016	Current
	Syngnathidae	37282030	*Halicampus grayi*	Grays Pipefish	TEP	2006-2016	Current

	Syngnathidae	37282033	*Hippocampus kuda*	Spotted Seahorse	TEP	2006-2016	Current
	Syngnathidae	37282042	*Choeroichthys brachysoma*	Pacific Short-bodied Pipefish	TEP	2006-2016	Current
	Syngnathidae	37282063	*Festucalex scalaris*	Ladder Pipefish	TEP	2006-2016	Current
	Syngnathidae	37282064	*Filicampus tigris*	Tiger Pipefish	TEP	2006-2016	Current
	Syngnathidae	37282080	*Hippocampus zebra*	Zebra Seahorse	TEP	2006-2016	Current
	Syngnathidae	37282100	*Syngnathoides biaculeatus*	Alligator Pipefish	TEP	2006-2016	Current
	Syngnathidae	37282101	*Trachyrhamphus longirostris*	Straightstick Pipefish	TEP	2006-2016	Current
	Syngnathidae	37282110	*Hippocampus queenslandicus*	Queensland Seahorse	TEP	2006-2016	Current
	Syngnathidae	37282998	*Trachyrhamphus* sp A	Pipefish	TEP	2006-2016	Current
	Syngnathidae	37282999	*Trachyrhamphus* Short-tailed sp	Pipefish	TEP	2006-2016	Current
Sawfish	Pristidae	37025001	*Pristis zijsron*	Green Sawfish	TEP	2003-2016	Current
	Pristidae	37025002	*Anoxypristis cuspidata*	Narrow Sawfish	TEP	2003-2016	Current
	Pristidae	37025003	*Pristis pristis*	Largetooth (Freshwater) Sawfish	TEP	2003-2016	Current
	Pristidae	37025004	*Pristis clavata*	Dwarf Sawfish	TEP	2003-2016	Current
Elasmobranch	Orectolobidae	37013001	*Orectolobus ornatus*	Banded Wobbegong	SAFE	2006-2009	Removed
	Dasyatidae	37035017	*Taeniura meyeni*	Blotched Fantail Ray	SAFE	2006-2011	Removed
	Dasyatidae	37035027	*Urogymnus asperrimus*	Porcupine Ray	SAFE	2006-2016	Current
Teleost	Pteroidae	37287010	*Dendrochirus brachypterus*	Dwarf Lionfish	SAFE	2007-2011	Removed
	Scorpaenidae	37287086	*Scorpaenopsis venosa*	Raggy Scorpionfish	SAFE	2007-2011	Removed
	Triglidae	37288028	*Lepidotrigla spinosa*	Shortfin Gurnard	SAFE	2011-2016	Current
	Triglidae	37288506	*Lepidotrigla* sp A	Gurnard	SAFE	2011-2016	Current
Invertebrate	Squillidae	28051030	*Dictyosquilla tuberculata*	Mantis Shrimp	SAFE	2009-2016	Current
	Squillidae	28051039	*Harpiosquilla stephensoni*	Mantis Shrimp	SAFE	2009-2016	Current
	Solenoceridae	28714011	*Solenocera australiana*	Coral Prawn	SAFE	2009-2013	Removed

Crew-member observer program; 2003 – 2016

The crew-member observer program began in 2003 as part of the long-term bycatch monitoring project (FRDC Project No. 2002/035) (see Brewer et al 2007). Each year crew members from a selection of NPF vessels volunteered to participate in annual training workshops. In the workshops run from 2003 to 2006, crew members were trained in the collection of reliable and accurate data for TEP species (turtles and sea snakes), sawfishes and other large elasmobranchs (Table 5-2). This included collecting and recording vessel and trawl information, species catch statistics and photographing these species for later identification by CSIRO staff. For the 2007 and 2008 training workshops, crew members were not required to record catches of all large elasmobranchs, instead, were trained in the identification and recording of three ‘at risk’ elasmobranch and two ‘at risk’ teleost bycatch species, as well as all TEP species. In the 2009 training workshop, crew members were also required to record data on three ‘at risk’ invertebrate species (see Table 5-1). From 2010 to 2016, the ‘at risk’ bycatch species monitored by crew-member observers was determined by re-running of the SAFE approach in 2009 and 2011 (see Table 5-1).

At the annual workshops, each crew-member observer was supplied with a sampling kit and disposable or digital cameras for recording catch data and taking photographs of the TEP species and ‘at risk’ bycatch species caught in trawls during the banana and tiger prawn seasons. For each trawl, the crew-member observer would inspect the total catch in all nets for the selected species and record on the datasheets provided if any TEP or ‘at risk’ bycatch species were caught in the nets. They would also take a photograph of the animal, including a scaled label with vessel name, date and shot number, and then release the animal back to the water. Due to the difficulty in species identification using only photographs for the teleost and invertebrate ‘at risk’ bycatch species, crew-member observers were requested to retain all specimens; label, freeze and send to the CSIRO Oceans and Atmosphere Laboratories, Dutton Park. These sample specimens were identified to species by scientific staff.

Completed data sheets and disposable cameras or digital camera memory cards were returned to either AFMA, Canberra (for the years 2003 to 2008) or from 2009 onwards, returned to the NPFI Projects Officer. The catch data was then entered into a MS Excel database and, if required, images were developed and digitized onto CD. These data were sent to CSIRO Oceans and Atmosphere, Dutton Park for further analysis. For each digital image of a TEP or ‘at risk’ species, identification was verified by CSIRO scientific staff and total length of the animal was measured using the 10 cm scale bar on the scaled label and the pixel measurement software program, ‘Image J’.

The catch data recorded by crew-member observers was matched with the NPF commercial logbook data to obtain trawl information; trawl duration and depth, latitude and longitude of trawl and gear specifications. The trawl sites from the crew-member observer program for the years 2003 to 2016 are shown in Figure 5-1.

AFMA scientific observers; 2005 – 2016

Catch data on TEP species, sawfish and ‘at risk’ bycatch species collected by AFMA scientific observers from 2005 to 2016 in the NPF were requested and sourced from the NPF Database Section at AFMA, Canberra (Table 5-2). Similar to the procedures used by NPF crew-member observers, the AFMA scientific observers collected and recorded the numbers of these species caught in each trawl and took photographs for species identification purposes and measurements of total length of animals.

The trawl sites from AFMA scientific observers onboard commercial vessels for the years 2005 to 2016 are shown in Figure 5-2.

NPF prawn population monitoring surveys; 2002 – 2016

Catch data on TEP and ‘at risk’ bycatch species were also obtained from research trawling between 2002 and 2016 in the Gulf of Carpentaria as part of the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys (Projects: MIRF R01/1144 [2002]; FRDC 2002/101 [2002]; FRDC 2003/075 [2003-04]; FRDC 2004/099 [2004-05]; AFMA R05/0599 [2005-06]; AFMA R05/1024 [2006-08]; AFMA R08/0827 [2008-10]; AFMA R2009/0863 [2009-10]; AFMA R2011/0811 [2011-2015]; AFMA R2015/0810 [2015-2018]) (Table 5-2).

Data collection and recording was similar to the procedures used by the crew-member observers where each trawl was inspected for TEP and ‘at risk’ bycatch species. Catch numbers were recorded for each trawl and photographs taken of the selected species for verification of species identification and measurement of total length of animal back at the CSIRO Oceans and Atmosphere Laboratory, Dutton Park.

The trawl sites from the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys for the years 2002 to 2016 are shown in Figure 5-3.

CSIRO scientific research and observer surveys; 1976 – 2005

An extensive data search was also carried out on all databases held by CSIRO. This search included all scientific trawl surveys and scientific observer fieldwork undertaken by CSIRO staff in the NPF region from 1976 to 2005 (Table 5-2). The objectives of these surveys varied between projects, but all involved a stratified random trawl survey design. As some of these surveys were conducted using trawl nets without TEDs installed (especially pre-2000), this data was also recorded for each trawl. Catches of all TEP and some ‘at risk’ bycatch species caught during these surveys were recorded to species, counted and weighed. However, not all of these surveys recorded catches of all of the ‘at risk’ species of bycatch. These data were included in the database for analysis.

The trawl sites from CSIRO scientific research and observer surveys for the years 1976 to 2005 are shown in Figure 5-4.

Museum Records; 1877 – 2006

All available museum records for sea snakes were sourced from the Australian, Queensland, Northern Territory and Western Australian Museums. These records, dating back to 1877 only serve as presence data for species distribution purposes and were not used in the catch rate trend analyses.

Table 5-2: Summary of data set name, collection method, date range, fishing season, number of vessels, number of prawn trawls and the TEP and 'at risk' bycatch groups recorded in each of the data sets. (TL: turtles; SF: sawfishes; SS: sea snakes; SY: syngnathids; EL: elasmobranchs; TT: teleosts; IN: invertebrates; CP: Coral Prawn; ALL: all current groups included).

Data Set	Data Collection	Date Range	Season	No. Vessels	No. Trawls	Groups Recorded
Crew-member Observer Program						
CMO_2003_1	CMO	Sep – Dec 03	Tiger	13	3377	TL/SF/SS
CMO_2004_1	CMO	Apr – May 04	Banana	4	310	TL/SF/SS
CMO_2004_2	CMO	Sep – Nov 04	Tiger	12	2610	TL/SF/SS
CMO_2005_1	CMO	Aug – Nov 05	Tiger	6	1317	TL/SF/SS
CMO_2006_1	CMO	Aug – Nov 06	Tiger	3	911	TL/SF/SS/SY/EL
CMO_2007_1	CMO	Jul – Nov 07	Tiger	6	1302	ALL (excl IN)
CMO_2008_1	CMO	Aug – Oct 08	Tiger	5	451	ALL (excl IN)
CMO_2009_1	CMO	Jul – Dec 09	Tiger	7	1370	ALL
CMO_2010_1	CMO	Aug – Nov 10	Tiger	5	1317	ALL
CMO_2011_1	CMO	Apr – Jun 11	Banana	1	66	ALL
CMO_2011_2	CMO	Aug – Nov 11	Tiger	11	2752	ALL
CMO_2012_1	CMO	Mar – Jun 12	Banana	4	640	ALL
CMO_2012_2	CMO	Aug – Nov 12	Tiger	11	2929	ALL
CMO_2013_1	CMO	Apr – Jun 13	Banana	1	126	ALL
CMO_2013_2	CMO	Aug – Nov 13	Tiger	11	3492	ALL
CMO_2014_1	CMO	Apr – Jun 14	Banana	1	187	ALL
CMO_2014_2	CMO	Aug – Nov 14	Tiger	9	2972	ALL
CMO_2015_1	CMO	Apr – Jun 15	Banana	3	529	ALL
CMO_2015_2	CMO	Aug – Dec 15	Tiger	8	3041	ALL
CMO_2016_1	CMO	Apr – Jun 16	Banana	2	185	ALL
CMO_2016_2	CMO	Aug – Nov 16	Tiger	10	2665	ALL
AFMA Scientific Observer						
AFMA Observer 2005_1	AFMA Scientific	Sep – Nov 05	Tiger	3	140	TL/SF/SS
AFMA Observer 2007_1	AFMA Scientific	Apr – Jun 07	Banana	3	98	TL/SF/SS/SY
AFMA Observer 2007_2	AFMA Scientific	Jul – Dec 07	Tiger	9	433	TL/SF/SS/SY
AFMA Observer 2008_1	AFMA Scientific	Apr – Jun 08	Banana	5	243	TL/SF/SS/SY
AFMA Observer 2008_2	AFMA Scientific	Aug – Nov 08	Tiger	5	328	TL/SF/SS/SY

AFMA Observer 2009_1	AFMA Scientific	Apr – May 09	Banana	2	65	TL/SF/SS/SY
AFMA Observer 2009_2	AFMA Scientific	Jul – Oct 09	Tiger	3	290	TL/SF/SS/SY
AFMA Observer 2010_1	AFMA Scientific	May – Jun 10	Banana	4	148	TL/SF/SS/SY
AFMA Observer 2010_2	AFMA Scientific	Aug – Sep 10	Tiger	7	319	ALL
AFMA Observer 2011_1	AFMA Scientific	Apr – Jun 11	Banana	4	127	ALL
AFMA Observer 2011_2	AFMA Scientific	Sep – Nov 11	Tiger	4	307	ALL
AFMA Observer 2012_1	AFMA Scientific	Apr – May 12	Banana	3	146	ALL
AFMA Observer 2012_2	AFMA Scientific	Aug – Oct 12	Tiger	6	249	ALL
AFMA Observer 2013_1	AFMA Scientific	Apr – Jun 13	Banana	4	245	ALL
AFMA Observer 2013_2	AFMA Scientific	Jul – Sep 13	Tiger	6	330	ALL
AFMA Observer 2014_1	AFMA Scientific	Apr – Jun 14	Banana	3	120	ALL
AFMA Observer 2014_2	AFMA Scientific	Aug – Nov 14	Tiger	6	317	ALL
AFMA Observer 2015_1	AFMA Scientific	Apr – Jun 15	Banana	4	117	ALL
AFMA Observer 2015_2	AFMA Scientific	Aug – Nov 15	Tiger	7	216	ALL
AFMA Observer 2016_1	AFMA Scientific	Apr – Jun 16	Banana	5	141	ALL
AFMA Observer 2016_2	AFMA Scientific	Aug – Nov 16	Tiger	7	368	ALL
NPF Prawn Population Monitoring Surveys						
NPF_2002_01	CSIRO Scientific	Aug 02	Tiger	2	169	TL/SF/SS/SY
NPF_2003_01	CSIRO Scientific	Jan – Feb 03	Banana	2	357	TL/SF/SS/SY
NPF_2003_02	CSIRO Scientific	Mar 03	Banana	1	158	TL/SF/SS/SY
NPF_2003_03	CSIRO Scientific	Jul – Aug 03	Tiger	2	298	TL/SF/SS/SY
NPF_2003_04	CSIRO Scientific	Sep – Oct 03	Tiger	1	30	TL/SF/SS/SY
NPF_2004_01	CSIRO Scientific	Jan 04	Banana	3	291	TL/SF/SS/SY
NPF_2004_02	CSIRO Scientific	Feb – Mar 04	Banana	1	168	TL/SF/SS/SY
NPF_2004_03	CSIRO Scientific	Jul – Aug 04	Tiger	3	316	TL/SF/SS/SY
NPF_2004_04	CSIRO Scientific	Oct 04	Tiger	1	40	TL/SF/SS/SY
NPF_2005_01	CSIRO Scientific	Feb 05	Banana	2	304	TL/SF/SS/SY
NPF_2005_02	CSIRO Scientific	Jul 05	Tiger	1	212	TL/SF/SS/SY
NPF_2006_01	CSIRO Scientific	Jan – Feb 06	Banana	2	301	TL/SF/SS/SY
NPF_2006_02	CSIRO Scientific	Jun – Jul 06	Tiger	1	210	TL/SF/SS/SY
NPF_2007_01	CSIRO Scientific	Feb 07	Banana	2	309	TL/SF/SS/SY
NPF_2007_02	CSIRO Scientific	Jun – Jul 07	Tiger	1	208	ALL (excl IN)
NPF_2008_01	CSIRO Scientific	Jan – Feb 08	Banana	2	300	ALL (excl IN)
NPF_2008_02	CSIRO Scientific	Jul 08	Tiger	1	209	ALL (excl IN)

NPF_2009_01	CSIRO Scientific	Feb – Mar 09	Banana	2	304	ALL (excl IN)
NPF_2009_02	CSIRO Scientific	Jun – Jul 09	Tiger	1	210	ALL
NPF_2010_01	CSIRO Scientific	Feb 10	Banana	2	303	ALL
NPF_2011_01	CSIRO Scientific	Jan – Feb 11	Banana	2	306	ALL
NPF_2011_02	CSIRO Scientific	Jun – Jul 11	Tiger	1	210	ALL
NPF_2012_01	CSIRO Scientific	Feb 12	Banana	2	308	ALL
NPF_2012_02	CSIRO Scientific	Jun – Jul 12	Tiger	1	193	ALL
NPF_2013_01	CSIRO Scientific	Feb 13	Banana	2	306	ALL
NPF_2013_02	CSIRO Scientific	Jun – Jul 13	Tiger	1	213	ALL
NPF_2014_01	CSIRO Scientific	Jan – Feb 14	Banana	2	301	ALL
NPF_2014_02	CSIRO Scientific	Jun – Jul 14	Tiger	1	214	ALL
NPF_2015_01	CSIRO Scientific	Feb 15	Banana	2	305	ALL
NPF_2016_01	CSIRO Scientific	Feb 16	Banana	2	305	ALL
NPF_2016_02	CSIRO Scientific	Jul 16	Tiger	1	214	ALL
CSIRO Scientific Research and Observer Data Sets						
SE Gulf Tropical Prawn	CSIRO Scientific	Apr 76 – Mar 79	–	–	3907	SS
Tropical Fish Ecology	CSIRO Scientific	Nov – Dec 90; Nov – Dec 91; Jan – Feb 93	–	–	518	ALL
Effects of Trawling	CSIRO Scientific	Aug – Nov 93; Mar – Nov 94; Feb – Mar 95; Oct – Nov 95; Feb – Mar 05	–	–	1049	ALL
Tropical Prawn Ecology	CSIRO Scientific	Jun 95	–	–	39	ALL
TED and BRD Design	CSIRO Scientific	Sep 96; May – Jun 97; Sep – Oct 97; Jun 98	–	–	225	ALL
TED and BRD Design	CMO	Aug – Oct 96; Aug – Oct 97; Mar 98	–	–	483	TL/SF/SS
Bycatch Sustainability	CSIRO Scientific	Feb – Mar 97; Oct – Nov 97; Sep – Oct 98	–	–	1144	ALL
Juvenile *Lutjanus* Survey	CSIRO Scientific	May 00; May 01; Jun 02	–	–	118	ALL
Total Bycatch Assessment	CSIRO Scientific	Aug – Nov 01	–	–	1636	TL/SF/SS
Bycatch Monitoring	CSIRO Scientific	Sep 03; Apr 04; Apr 05	–	–	148	TL/SF/SS
Bureau of Rural Science	BRS Scientific	Nov 90; Sep 96; Feb–Oct 97; Aug – Nov 98; Apr – Nov 99; Apr – Nov 00; Apr – Oct 01	–	–	7254	TL/SF/SS

Figure 5-1: Yearly map series of the trawl sites recorded for the crew-member observer program from 2003 to 2016 in the NPF.






2005
Crew-member Observer Program
Banana Season - 0 Trawls
Tiger Season - 1317 Trawls


2006
Crew-member Observer Program
Banana Season - 0 Trawls
Tiger Season - 911 Trawls


2007
Crew-member Observer Program
Banana Season - 0 Trawls
Tiger Season - 1302 Trawls


2008
Crew-member Observer Program
Banana Season - 0 Trawls
Tiger Season - 451 Trawls


2009
Crew-member Observer Program
Banana Season - 0 Trawls
Tiger Season - 1370 Trawls


2010
Crew-member Observer Program
Banana Season - 0 Trawls
Tiger Season - 1317 Trawls


2011
Crew-member Observer Program
Banana Season - 66 Trawls
Tiger Season - 2752 Trawls


2012
Crew-member Observer Program
Banana Season - 640 Trawls
Tiger Season - 2929 Trawls


2013
Crew-member Observer Program
Banana Season - 126 Trawls
Tiger Season - 3492 Trawls


2014
Crew-member Observer Program
Banana Season - 187 Trawls
Tiger Season - 2972 Trawls


2015
Crew-member Observer Program
Banana Season - 529 Trawls
Tiger Season - 3041 Trawls


2016
Crew-member Observer Program
Banana Season - 185 Trawls
Tiger Season - 2665 Trawls

Figure 5-2: Yearly map series of the trawl sites recorded by AFMA scientific observers onboard commercial vessels from 2005 to 2016 in the NPF.






2008
AFMA Scientific Observer Program
Banana Season - 243 Trawls
Tiger Season - 328 Trawls


2009
AFMA Scientific Observer Program
Banana Season - 65 Trawls
Tiger Season - 290 Trawls


2010
AFMA Scientific Observer Program
Banana Season - 148 Trawls
Tiger Season - 319 Trawls


2011
AFMA Scientific Observer Program
Banana Season - 127 Trawls
Tiger Season - 307 Trawls


2012
AFMA Scientific Observer Program
Banana Season - 146 Trawls
Tiger Season - 249 Trawls


2013
AFMA Scientific Observer Program
Banana Season - 245 Trawls
Tiger Season - 330 Trawls


2014
AFMA Scientific Observer Program
Banana Season - 120 Trawls
Tiger Season - 317 Trawls


2015
AFMA Scientific Observer Program
Banana Season - 117 Trawls
Tiger Season - 216 Trawls


2016
AFMA Scientific Observer Program
Banana Season - 141 Trawls
Tiger Season - 368 Trawls

Figure 5-3: Map of the trawl sites completed during the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys from 2002 to 2016 in the NPF.





Figure 5-4: Map of all trawl sites completed during CSIRO scientific research and observer surveys from 1976 to 2005 in the NPF.



Data analysis approach

Background

During the first project 'Assessing the sustainability of the NPF bycatch from annual monitoring data: 2008' project (R2008/826), catch per unit effort data on each of the TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species was presented at two internal workshops 23rd October 2008 and 20th May 2009) at CSIRO Marine and Atmospheric Research, Cleveland. These workshops were designed to examine the available data and decide on the best analytical approach to use in the Bycatch Sustainability Assessment for each species (Appendix B; C).

The first workshop was designed to present the data that was available and have discussions regarding possible approaches to data analysis. Following this workshop, CMIS staff were supplied with a copy of the data set and then given time to consider alternate approaches before the second workshop. This second workshop was attended by CMAR and CMIS staff and designed to present and discuss possible data analysis approaches which were dependent on the amount and length of time series of data available for each of the 'at risk' and TEP groups. The most appropriate statistical analyses were then agreed upon for the Bycatch Sustainability Assessment. However, it was also agreed that the rarer TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species, did not have sufficient data to apply standard analytical methods. The purpose of the analytical approach was to determine the trends in catch rates of TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species in the NPF.

As there were compatibility issues with the data – differing collection methods, fishing gears used and differing spatial and temporal scales – initial analysis was required to determine the potential use of each source of data, rather than immediately pooling the data. There were issues with the accuracy and reliability of data collected in the crew-member observer program for a number of years up until 2008. Although comparison between the four individual data sets did not reveal any major discrepancies between the overall catch rates of species aggregated to the family level, on a species level, there were large discrepancies in catch rates recorded between the crew-member observer program and the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys. The crew-member participation was low resulting in inadequate catch records for many of the TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species and many of these records were not accompanied by photographs for later identification purposes so a much greater occurrence of records of unidentified individuals were assigned to the family groups. This means that calculations of absolute estimates of bycatch at the species level based on all data sets combined would be an underestimate.

As a consequence, in the first 2009 Bycatch Sustainability Assessment the crew-member observer data set was not combined with the AFMA scientific observer, NPF prawn population monitoring survey and CSIRO scientific research and observer data sets for catch rate trend analysis. It was also recommended in that Bycatch Sustainability Assessment that greater effort be required in recording catches to species via photographic records and greater crew-member participants to boost the spatial and temporal coverage of the program to allow sustainability assessments for more species in future assessments (see Fry et al 2009).

In the following 2014 Bycatch Sustainability Assessment, the three data sets; crew-member observer, AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring data sets, were again initially assessed to determine their potential for use in the catch rate trend analysis and inclusion in a pooled data set. With the continual developments and improvements of the crew-member observer program over the years, this data set showed to be now comparable to the AFMA scientific observer and CSIRO scientific research and observer data and therefore the data sets pooled for catch trend analysis.

For this current 2017 Bycatch Sustainability Assessment, the three data sets were assessed for use in a pooled data set for catch trend analysis. There are 10 statistical ‘Regions’ for banana prawns in the NPF (see Dichmont et al 2001; Figure 5-5). For each data set, latitude and longitude were used to assign ‘Region’ to trawl records to identify any patterns in the distribution of the TEP and ‘at risk’ bycatch species. Mean catch rate per trawl was calculated for each of the species for each ‘Region’ to determine whether the species were caught across the entire NPF or some species were solely caught in particular 'Regions'. The analyses performed on each data set are described below.

Crew-member observer program

This data set has been collected 'in season' from 2003 to 2016 by fishery crew members and may be unbalanced or inconsistent with respect to its spatial effort coverage (Table 5-2). The variables available in the data include operation number, vessel, date of trawl, latitude, longitude, depth and various gear attributes. Swept area (km^2 trawled) was derived and used throughout the analysis as a measure of effort. The crew-member observer program has had a wide effort coverage across all of the 10 ‘Regions’ of the NPF (Table 5-3; Table 5-4). About 99% of the trawls were recorded using a prawn trawl net with the remaining trawls using a try net. Approximately 1.5% of the records were missing the value for depth and therefore removed from the analysis.

For those species with sufficient data, generalized linear models (GLMs) were used to analyse the trend in catch rates through time (McCullagh and Nelder 1989). The TEP and ‘at risk’ bycatch species data are zero-inflated; meaning that a large proportion of the trawls did not catch any of these species. The data contained more instances of zero counts than would be predicted using a standard Poisson log-linear GLM, which would usually be applied to count data such as this. An appropriate modelling technique often used with this type of data is the Delta approach, which involves modelling the presence-absence of the species in the sample and the number caught separately (Welsh et al 1996). A combined prediction is then calculated from these two models by multiplying the predictions from each model, giving an estimate of the number caught per km^2. The models were fitted using the *glm* function in the MASS package in R, with a non-standard truncated Poisson family function. Explanatory variables included ‘Region’, ‘Depth’, ‘Year’ (4 or 11 level factor variable) and an offset term for effort which was known for each trawl. Although it would have been valuable to include a ‘Month’ variable to determine any seasonal effects, this was not possible due to the limited amount of data available.

The uncertainty around the index was calculated using a parametric bootstrap. For each bootstrap sample, each model stage was fitted and predictions calculated for each ‘Year’. The two sets of simulated predictions were multiplied together for each bootstrap sample to give the predicted catch rates. A 95% confidence interval was then calculated for each ‘Year’ by taking the 0.025% and the 0.975% percentiles from the bootstrap distribution for each ‘Year’.

AFMA scientific observer program

This data set has also been collected 'in season' from 2005 to 2016 by AFMA scientific observers onboard NPF commercial vessels while operating during the season (Table 5-2). The aim of the AFMA scientific observer program is to obtain a representative coverage across the NPF both spatially and temporally. However it also may be unbalanced or inconsistent with respect to its spatial and temporal coverage. The variables available in the data include operation number, vessel, date of trawl, latitude, longitude, depth and various gear attributes. Swept area (km^2 trawled) was derived and used throughout the analysis as a measure of effort.

The effort distribution for the AFMA scientific observer program between 2005 and 2016 was similar to the crew-member observer program with trawls within all ‘Regions’ with greatest effort in ‘Regions’ 1, 2, 4, 6 – 8 and 10 (Table 5-3; Table 5-4). However, trawl effort per year is much lower than the crew-member observer program. This data set was used to validate the crew-member observer data set with respect to catch rates and species identifications.

As with the crew-member observer data, the same species were modelled (using the Delta approach outlined previously) and comparisons made with the crew-member observer analysis, to check for consistency and validation of data quality of the crew-member observer collection. As only a small percentage of TEP and ‘at risk’ bycatch species had sufficient data to model the AFMA scientific observer data, more basic summary statistics were also compared across the two data sets to gauge consistency. These statistics included the proportion of trawls where the species was not found and the maximum count of the species in a given trawl. In addition the nominal catch rates by ‘Region’ and by ‘Year’ for 2005 to 2013 were calculated and compared.

NPF prawn population monitoring surveys

This fishery-independent data set was consistently collected using the same methods and in the same areas and times each year (2002 – 2016) (Table 5-2). It is the most robust and reliable data set in terms of fishing gear consistency, data collection methods, temporal and spatial influences that may otherwise impact on the catch rates of species. Although, as with the AFMA scientific observer data set, trawl effort per year is much lower than the crew-member observer program. The variables available in the NPF prawn population monitoring data include operation number, vessel, trawl date, trawl latitude and longitude, trawl depth and vessel speed. Swept area (km^2 trawled) was derived and used throughout the analysis as a measure of effort.

This data set only covers some of the 10 ‘Regions’ and was therefore matched to the crew-member observer data set spatially at the banana prawn stock region level i.e. ‘Regions’ 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 10 to form a subset of crew-member observer data corresponding as closely as possible to the same spatial coverage as the NPF prawn population monitoring data (Table 5-3; Table 5-4). Statistical ‘Regions’ 1 to 3 and ‘Region’ 9 were not included in the tabulation as four or less trawl records were present for these 'Regions' across the 11 years of data collection. This data set was then used to validate the crew-member observer data set with respect to catch rates and species identifications. It should be noted that this data is collected 'out of season' but it is not anticipated that this should have a large effect on the species under consideration.

Catch rates were modelled (using the Delta approach outlined previously) and comparisons made for the same species modelled using the crew-member observer data analysis, to check for consistency and validation of data quality of the crew-member observer data. As only a percentage of TEP and ‘at risk’ bycatch species had sufficient data to model the NPF prawn population monitoring data, more basic summary statistics were also compared across the two data sets to gauge consistency. These statistics included the proportion of trawls where the species was not found and the maximum count of the species in a given trawl. In addition the nominal catch rates by ‘Region’ and by ‘Year’ for ‘Regions’ 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 10 for 2003 to 2016 were calculated and compared.

CSIRO scientific research and observer surveys

As most of this data was collected ‘out of season’ and generally not spatially comparable with the current NPF commercial fishery effort distribution, this data set was not used in modelling trends in catch rates for the TEP and ‘at risk’ bycatch species. Furthermore, the majority of the data was collected before the crew-member observer, AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring programs began (pre-2002). This data set was only used in species distribution and raw catch rate descriptions in Section 6 (Table 5-2).

Table 5-3: Summary of the total number of trawls for each of the data sources across the 10 banana prawn regions of the NPF between 1976 and 2016.

Trawls	Year	Region 1	Region 2	Region 3	Region 4	Region 5	Region 6	Region 7	Region 8	Region 9	Region 10	*Total Trawls*
Crew-member Observer	2003	258	95	0	534	485	1485	461	59	0	0	3377
	2004	102	155	22	723	299	959	552	10	66	32	2920
	2005	210	106	48	161	53	365	374	0	0	0	1317
	2006	129	48	9	199	34	182	309	1	0	0	911
	2007	4	0	62	386	113	524	187	26	0	0	1302
	2008	0	241	35	75	53	35	12	0	0	0	451
	2009	27	62	14	150	68	482	321	177	6	63	1370
	2010	0	0	0	317	172	379	362	87	0	0	1317
	2011	159	172	327	906	307	455	198	85	33	176	2818
	2012	26	213	226	1087	307	585	411	136	258	310	3559
	2013	141	227	67	1475	299	789	201	206	0	213	3618
	2014	314	271	51	721	356	322	376	291	60	397	3159
	2015	19	577	148	1207	371	733	248	84	76	107	3570
	2016	21	686	75	692	416	364	206	327	55	8	2850
	Total	***1410***	***2853***	***1084***	***8633***	***3333***	***7659***	***4218***	***1489***	***554***	***1306***	***32539***
AFMA Scientific Observer	2005	0	0	21	53	20	43	3	0	0	0	140
	2007	75	19	7	153	39	106	108	4	11	9	531
	2008	78	304	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	179	571
	2009	0	0	9	66	15	46	122	78	19	0	355
	2010	72	98	5	43	44	103	65	33	4	0	467
	2011	17	30	19	19	9	149	84	37	8	62	434
	2012	5	41	9	75	22	1	16	137	16	73	395

	2013	140	83	27	152	3	80	0	83	7	0	575
	2014	173	60	0	0	0	3	1	183	17	0	437
	2015	17	112	4	95	0	24	28	45	6	2	333
	2016	125	114	22	13	30	104	52	22	25	3	510
	Total	***702***	***861***	***133***	***669***	***182***	***659***	***479***	***622***	***113***	***328***	***4748***
NPF Prawn Monitoring	2002	0	0	0	37	19	37	37	39	0	0	169
	2003	0	0	0	102	50	116	97	332	4	142	843
	2004	0	0	0	89	51	109	88	315	0	163	815
	2005	0	0	0	82	52	109	73	160	0	40	516
	2006	0	0	0	82	49	111	72	156	0	41	511
	2007	0	0	0	81	51	110	73	161	0	41	517
	2008	0	0	0	80	52	110	70	156	0	41	509
	2009	0	0	0	81	51	110	71	160	0	41	514
	2010	0	0	0	41	30	57	29	105	0	41	303
	2011	0	0	0	82	50	110	72	161	0	41	516
	2012	0	0	0	64	53	106	77	160	0	41	501
	2013	0	0	0	81	51	112	73	161	0	41	519
	2014	0	0	0	81	51	108	73	161	0	41	515
	2015	0	0	0	42	29	57	30	106	0	41	305
	2016	0	0	0	82	50	111	73	162	0	41	519
	Total	***0***	***0***	***0***	***1107***	***689***	***1473***	***1008***	***2495***	***4***	***796***	***7572***
CSIRO Scientific Survey	1976	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	93	107	266
	1977	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	693	271	249	1213
	1978	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1040	264	252	1556

1979	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	872	0	0	872
1990	0	0	42	49	4	14	11	19	36	61	236
1991	0	0	48	20	0	0	0	0	0	56	124
1993	0	0	21	14	0	0	0	0	0	429	464
1994	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	24
1995	0	0	0	37	4	24	20	48	8	511	652
1996	7	3	1	98	4	62	23	16	0	20	234
1997	0	95	0	136	187	101	88	269	0	147	1023
1998	93	205	339	911	753	954	824	244	6	152	4481
1999	41	5	95	275	236	675	449	168	11	6	1961
2000	33	0	24	339	76	320	128	60	17	4	1001
2001	0	0	97	670	249	458	265	123	20	47	1929
2002	0	0	26	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
2003	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
2004	0	4	5	0	0	5	4	35	17	0	70
2005	0	7	1	92	0	37	56	123	25	1	342
Total	***201***	***319***	***699***	***2661***	***1513***	***2650***	***1868***	***3776***	***768***	***2066***	***16521***

Table 5-4: Summary of the total swept area (km^2) trawled for each of the data sources across the 10 banana prawn regions of the NPF between 1976 and 2016.

Data Source	Region 1	Region 2	Region 3	Region 4	Region 5	Region 6	Region 7	Region 8	Region 9	Region 10	Total (km^2)
Crew-member Observer	837.3	2003.1	785.7	6349.3	2456.7	5329.9	2751.9	1022.5	162.8	960.0	22659.2
AFMA Scientific Observer	360.9	460.5	63.7	541.1	140.0	527.2	302.7	296.5	20.1	226.4	2939.2
NPF Prawn Monitoring	0.0	0.0	0.0	96.8	60.1	128.8	88.7	221.0	0.3	67.2	663.0
CSIRO Scientific Survey	93.9	152.8	374.6	1432.2	752.1	1601.6	1067.0	588.5	76.0	340.3	6478.8

Combined analysis

Comparisons of catches between these three data sets were made to check for consistency and validation of the crew-member observer data. In the present assessment, the comparison between the crew-member observer and NPF prawn population monitoring data sets did show some differences in the catch rates for some species. However, the catch rate trends across ‘Years’ showed similar patterns especially for the more recent years where the crew-member observer program has continually improved in both the number of participating crew-member observers and the quality of data collected. The AFMA scientific observer data set showed quite large discrepancies when compared to the crew-member observer data set in some ‘Regions’ but not others. This was due to smaller numbers of catch records across a larger number of ’Regions’ than the NPF prawn population monitoring survey. The crew-member observer data was therefore initially modelled separately. The AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring data sets were then combined and statistically compared with the crew-member observer data for catch rate trend analysis for the TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species where sufficient catch data was available.

There was a large amount of confounding between the data set variables, ‘Gear Type’ and ‘Year’, which caused model fitting problems. To ensure that appropriate models could be fitted, the data was reduced to a single ‘Gear Type’ (prawn trawl which represented more than 95% of the total data). Data recorded prior to 2002 was discarded as the data was collected across a small number of ‘Regions’ which changed through time.

For those species with sufficient data, the Delta approach was used to analyse the trend in catch rates through time. Explanatory variables included ‘Region’, ‘Depth’, ‘Year’ and an offset term for fishing effort (which was known for each trawl). The uncertainty around the index was calculated using a parametric bootstrap.

For the rarest species, the above analysis procedures were not suitable. For these species, unmodelled catch rate data were plotted on a spatial and temporal scale to describe trends in catches.



Figure 5-5: Map of the Northern Prawn Fishery boundary in northern Australia showing the 10 banana prawn fishing 'Regions'.

Data verification of crew-member observer program

The crew-member observer program was designed and implemented to collect data on the TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species interacted with in the NPF. This necessitates the collection of a large volume of species-specific catch data on a range of species that are usually rare in trawls. An important part of the program is to demonstrate the data being collected is of high quality that can be used for scientific catch analysis. The AFMA scientific observer program and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys were used as benchmark data sets to compare to the crew-member observer data for species-specific catch rates over the years 2003 to 2016.

Initially the crew-member observer, AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring data was modelled separately for catch rate trend analysis to determine the number of TEP and 'at risk' species with sufficient data to fit the specified model. The AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring data sets were then combined and modelled for catch rate trends to determine the species that fit the same model type (different parameter estimates). This would determine the similarities of the catch data sets and give an indication of the accuracy of the crew-member observer data set.

6. RESULTS

Crew-member observer program

The summary of catch frequency data for the TEP and ‘at risk’ bycatch species for the crew-member observer data set, using only ‘Region’ (4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 10) data comparable with the NPF prawn population monitoring data, is shown in Table 6-1. The mean catch rate (number per km^2 swept area) was also calculated for each of the TEP and ‘at risk’ bycatch species in each ‘Region’ and is shown in Table 6-2. The incidence of catching TEP or ‘at risk’ bycatch species was relatively low for most species, only being recorded in a small number of the total 32539 trawls assessed during the crew-member observer program from 2003 to 2016.

For the marine turtle group, the incidence of being caught was very low with none of the five species being recorded in more than 0.3% of trawls from 2003 to 2016. The Flatback Turtle (*Natator depressus*) was the most common species recorded from the crew-member observer program, although at less than one individual every 300 trawls (Table 6-1). There was also 98 trawls that caught a turtle that was not able to be identified to species. This is due to their large size and interaction with TEDs whereby individuals usually drop out of the net on winch-up so many of the turtles caught were not photographed. The catches of marine turtles were widespread, being recorded from all of the ‘Regions’ within the NPF. Although catches were generally low, less than one individual per 50 km^2 (Table 6-2).

The sea snake group showed higher incidences of being caught in trawls; with at least half of the 14 sea snake species being recorded in at least 2% of trawls during the crew-member observer program from 2003 to 2016 (Table 6-1). The most commonly caught species of sea snakes were *Lapemis curtis*, *Disteira major* and *Hydrophis elegans*; each being recorded in about 5 to 10% of trawls (Table 6-1). There was also 7.5% of the total number of trawls that recorded sea snakes where individuals were not identified to species. The maximum number of sea snakes of one species caught in a single trawl was 14 *Lapemis curtis*. Sea snakes, as a group, were caught across all ‘Regions’ of the NPF. One of the most common sea snake species; *Hydrophis elegans*, showed catches of one individual per 5 – 10 km^2 across most of the NPF coastal regions. Highest catches of this species, one individual per 2 – 3 km^2, was seen along the west and east sides of the Gulf of Carpentaria (‘Regions’ 4 and 9) (Table 6-2). Several other sea snake species showed highest catches within these western and eastern ‘Regions’; *Acalyptophis peronii*, *Aipysurus mosaicus*, *Disteira major* and *Lapemis curtis*. *Lapemis curtis* also showed the highest catches of any sea snake species, around one individual per km^2 within the Weipa and the Mitchell – Edward River ‘Regions’ (Table 6-2).

There were four species of syngnathids recorded by the crew-member observers; *Trachyrhamphus longirostris*, *Hippocampus zebra*, *Trachyrhamphus* sp A and *Trachyrhamphus* sp Short-tailed (Table 6-1). The most common species was *Trachyrhamphus longirostris*, occurring in about 3.5% of trawls since 2006. However, another 177 trawls recorded catches of syngnathids where individuals were not identified to species as they were released immediately after capture (requirements for interactions with TEP species) and the difficulty in identifying syngnathids only from photographs. The most common species of syngnathid, *Trachyrhamphus longirostris*, was caught across all ‘Regions’ with highest mean catches of one individual per 5 – 10 km^2 around Gove, Groote Eylandt and Mornington Island (‘Region’ 3 – 5 and 8).

There were four species of sawfish recorded in the crew-member observer program from 2003 to 2016 with one species dominating the catches, the Narrow Sawfish (*Anoxypristis cuspidata*) (Table 6-1). This species was caught in at least 365 of the 32,539 trawls (around one individual every 70 trawls) recorded by crew-member observers with up to five in a single trawl. The Green Sawfish was recorded in at least 17 trawls while the Largetooth Sawfish and Dwarf Sawfish were recorded in seven and one trawl, respectively, during the crew-member observer program. Sawfishes were generally caught across most ‘Regions’. However, catches were variable with *Anoxypristis cuspidata* showing highest mean catches around the Joseph Bonaparte Gulf and Tiwi Islands to Gove (‘Region' 1 – 3) and along the eastern Gulf of Carpentaria (‘Region' 9), ranging from one individual per 6 – 10 km^2 and one individual per 3 km^2, respectively (Table 6-2).

Crew-member observers recorded three Porcupine Rays (*Urogymnus asperrimus*) from trawls since 2006, with all three of these being caught in the Try Gear around the Tiwi Islands, Gove and north Groote Eylandt.

The Squillidae group showed the highest incidence of being caught in trawls; in about 20% of all trawls or more than 3000 trawls since 2009 (Table 6-1). The most common species recorded was the Brown-striped Mantis Shrimp (*Dictyosquilla tuberculata*) with up to 460 individuals caught in a single trawl. This number was estimated from average weights of individuals and an estimated catch weight for a shot. The Brown-striped Mantis Shrimp showed highest mean catches of one to six individuals per km^2 around the Tiwi Islands to Groote Eylandt (‘Regions’ 2 – 5) while Stephenson’s Mantis Shrimp, *Harpiosquilla stephensoni*, was caught more often (one individual per 2 – 6 km^2) around Joseph Bonaparte Gulf to Tiwi Islands (‘Regions’ 1 – 3) and on the eastern side of the Gulf of Carpentaria (‘Region’ 9) (Table 6-2).

Table 6-1: The proportion of trawls with no catch, number of trawls where at least one individual was caught and the maximum number of individuals in a single trawl for the TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species recorded during the 2003 – 2016 crew-member observer program.

Group	CAAB	Species	Proportion of Zeros	Trawls Present	Maximum Number
Marine Turtle	39020000	Cheloniidae	0.996	98	3
	39020001	*Caretta caretta*	0.999	15	1
	39020002	*Chelonia mydas*	0.999	15	2
	39020003	*Eretmochelys imbricata*	>0.999	3	1
	39020004	*Lepidochelys olivacea*	0.999	34	1
	39020005	*Natator depressus*	0.997	91	1
Sea Snake	39125000	Hydrophiidae	0.925	2012	11
	39125001	*Acalyptophis peronii*	0.989	283	4
	39125003	*Aipysurus duboisii*	0.996	107	3
	39125004	*Aipysurus mosaicus*	0.978	595	4
	39125007	*Aipysurus laevis*	0.974	696	4
	39125009	*Astrotia stokesii*	0.97	812	3
	39125010	*Disteira kingii*	0.998	46	2
	39125011	*Disteira major*	0.947	1415	4
	39125013	*Enhydrina schistosa*	>0.999	8	5
	39125018	*Hydrophis caerulescens*	1	0	0
	39125021	*Hydrophis elegans*	0.886	3079	8
	39125025	*Hydrophis mcdowelli*	0.999	29	1
	39125028	*Hydrophis ornatus*	0.981	500	8
	39125029	*Hydrophis pacificus*	0.988	321	2
	39125031	*Lapemis curtis*	0.952	1298	14
	39125033	*Pelamis platurus*	0.999	28	2
Syngnathid	37282000	Syngnathidae	0.991	177	6
	37282005	*Hippocampus histrix*	1	0	0
	37282006	*Trachyrhamphus bicoarctata*	1	0	0
	37282007	*Haliichthys taeniophorus*	1	0	0
	37282030	*Halicampus grayi*	1	0	0
	37282033	*Hippocampus kuda*	1	0	0
	37282042	*Choeroichthys brachysoma*	1	0	0
	37282063	*Festucalex scalaris*	1	0	0
	37282064	*Filicampus tigris*	1	0	0
	37282080	*Hippocampus zebra*	>0.999	1	1
	37282100	*Syngnathoides biaculeatus*	1	0	0
	37282101	*Trachyrhamphus longirostris*	0.965	703	15
	37282110	*Hippocampus queenslandicus*	1	0	0
	37282998	*Trachyrhamphus* sp A	>0.999	2	1
	37282999	*Trachyrhamphus* sp Short-tailed	>0.999	10	2
Sawfish	37025000	Pristidae	0.996	115	3
	37025001	*Pristis zijsron*	0.999	17	1

	37025002	*Anoxypristis cuspidata*	0.986	365	5
	37025003	*Pristis pristis*	>0.999	7	1
	37025004	*Pristis clavata*	>0.999	1	1
Elasmobranch	37035027	*Urogymnus asperrimus*	>0.999	3	1
Invertebrate	28051030	*Dictyosquilla tuberculata*	0.82	3042	460
	28051039	*Harpiosquilla stephensoni*	0.997	50	5

Table 6-2: Mean catch rates (number per km²) of the TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species for each of the banana prawn fishing regions for the crew-member observer program from 2003 to 2016. Only TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species (or groups where individuals were not identified to species) that were recorded at least once during the program are shown.

Group	CAAB	Species	Region 1 (1410)	Region 2 (2853)	Region 3 (1084)	Region 4 (8633)	Region 5 (3333)	Region 6 (7659)	Region 7 (4218)	Region 8 (1489)	Region 9 (554)	Region 10 (1306)
Dolphin	41116000	Delphinidae	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Marine Turtle	39020000	Cheloniidae	<0.01	0.03	<0.01	0.02	<0.01	0.02	0.01	0.04	0.09	0.01
	39020001	*Caretta caretta*	<0.01	<0.01	0.00	<0.01	<0.01	0.01	0.01	<0.01	0.00	<0.01
	39020002	*Chelonia mydas*	<0.01	<0.01	0.02	<0.01	0.00	<0.01	0.01	0.06	0.00	0.02
	39020003	*Eretmochelys imbricata*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	<0.01	0.00	<0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
	39020004	*Lepidochelys olivacea*	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.01	0.00	0.00
	39020005	*Natator depressus*	<0.01	0.02	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.03	0.02	<0.01	0.00	0.05
Sea Snake	39125000	Hydrophiidae	0.20	0.16	0.05	0.17	0.39	0.22	0.13	0.42	0.27	0.13
	39125001	*Acalyptophis peronii*	<0.01	<0.01	0.00	<0.01	0.06	0.03	<0.01	0.02	0.05	0.02
	39125003	*Aipysurus duboisii*	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	0.01	<0.01	0.01	0.01	<0.01	0.00	0.00
	39125004	*Aipysurus mosaicus*	<0.01	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.17	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.48	<0.01
	39125007	*Aipysurus laevis*	0.01	<0.01	<0.01	0.01	0.11	0.07	0.07	0.02	0.01	0.02
	39125009	*Astrotia stokesii*	0.02	0.05	0.03	0.07	0.08	0.05	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.03
	39125010	*Disteira kingii*	<0.01	0.03	0.00	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	0.03	0.17	0.03
	39125011	*Disteira major*	0.11	0.06	0.03	0.05	0.21	0.17	0.05	0.04	0.19	0.04
	39125013	*Enhydrina schistosa*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	<0.01	<0.01	0.34	0.04
	39125021	*Hydrophis elegans*	0.17	0.31	0.19	0.38	0.15	0.18	0.13	0.16	0.75	0.27
	39125025	*Hydrophis mcdowelli*	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	0.01	0.01
	39125028	*Hydrophis ornatus*	0.01	0.01	0.01	<0.01	0.05	0.05	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.22
	39125029	*Hydrophis pacificus*	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.04	0.01	0.03	0.01
	39125031	*Lapemis curtis*	0.17	0.51	0.01	0.01	0.33	0.04	0.01	0.54	0.84	1.06
	39125033	*Pelamis platurus*	0.00	0.00	0.00	<0.01	<0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.02

Syngnathid	37282000	Syngnathidae	0.01	0.01	0.05	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.12	0.03	0.01
	37282080	*Hippocampus zebra*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	<0.01
	37282101	*Trachyrhamphus longirostris*	0.02	0.05	0.08	0.12	0.09	0.06	0.03	0.16	0.03	0.03
	37282998	*Trachyrhamphus* sp A	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	<0.01	0.00	<0.01	0.00	0.00
	37282999	*Trachyrhamphus* sp Short Tailed	0.00	<0.01	0.00	<0.01	0.00	0.00	<0.01	0.01	0.00	<0.01
Sawfish	37025000	Pristidae	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	<0.01
	37025001	*Pristis zijsron*	0.01	0.01	0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	0.00	<0.01
	37025002	*Anoxypristis cuspidata*	0.09	0.16	0.10	0.04	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.31	0.06
	37025003	*Pristis pristis*	0.01	0.01	<0.01	<0.01	0.00	<0.01	0.00	<0.01	0.00	<0.01
	37025004	*Pristis clavata*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	<0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Elasmobranch	37035027	*Urogymnus asperrimus*	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Invertebrate	28051030	*Dictyosquilla tuberculata*	0.11	1.20	1.88	5.69	1.45	0.23	<0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00
	28051039	*Harpiosquilla stephensoni*	0.24	0.55	0.17	0.01	0.04	<0.01	<0.01	0.03	0.30	<0.01

AFMA scientific observer

The summary of catch frequency data for the TEP and ‘at risk’ bycatch species for the AFMA scientific observer data set is shown in Table 6-3. Of the 4748 trawls surveyed by AMFA scientific observers between 2005 and 2016, most TEP species (sea snakes, syngnathids, marine turtles, syngnathids and sawfishes) and ‘at risk’ bycatch species were recorded in less than 5% of all trawls. The mean catch rate (number per km^2 swept area) was also calculated for each of the TEP and ‘at risk’ bycatch species in each ‘Region’ and is shown in Table 6-4.

Marine turtles were recorded in a total of 19 trawls surveyed by AFMA scientific observers with the Flatback Turtle (*Natator depressus*) being the most common species caught with less than one individual every 300 trawls (Table 6-3). This species was caught mostly around the Tiwi Islands (‘Region’ 2), southern Gulf of Carpentaria ('Regions' 6 and 7) and Weipa (‘Region’ 10). Mean catches for this species was one individual per 20 to 30 km^2 (Table 6-4). The Green Turtle (*Chelonia mydas*) and Olive Ridley Turtle (*Lepidochelys olivacea*) were also caught at about one individual per 25 – 30 km^2 however these two species were more restricted to around the southern Gulf of Carpentaria ('Regions' 8 and 6, respectively).

The sea snakes were the most common TEP group surveyed by AFMA scientific observers in the NPF. Two species; *Hydrophis elegans* and *Lapemis curtis*, were each recorded in more than 420 trawls (greater than 10% of all trawls). There were also 13 individuals of *Hydrophis elegans* caught in a single trawl (Table 6-3). Highest mean catches (nearly two individuals per km^2) for this species were around the south eastern and eastern Gulf of Carpentaria ('Region' 8 and 9) (Table 6-4). *Lapemis curtis* also showed highest catches (2 – 3 individuals per km^2) around the south eastern Gulf of Carpentaria and 1 – 2 individuals per km^2 around southern Groote Eylandt ('Region' 5). The remaining sea snake species were recorded in only 4% or less of trawls. However, most of these species also showed highest mean catches in the southern Groote Eylandt region (*Aipysurus mosaicus*, *Aipysurus laevis*, *Astrotia stokesii* and *Disteira major*) and south eastern Gulf of Carpentaria (*Disteira kingii*, *Enhydrina schistosa*, *Hydrophis ornatus* and *Hydrophis pacificus*) with catches up to one individual per 2 km^2 (Table 6-4).

The pipefish, *Trachyrhamphus longirostris*, was recorded in 85 of the 4748 trawls (2% of all trawls) by AFMA scientific observers (Table 6-3). Similar to the crew-member observer program, this species showed highest mean catches of one individual per 3 – 5 km^2 around the south eastern Gulf of Carpentaria ('Regions' 8 and 9) and one individual per 10 km^2 around Gove (‘Region’ 3). This was the most common syngnathid recorded with at least three other species recorded; *Trachyrhamphus bicoarctata* (in 14 trawls), *Choeroichthys brachysoma* (in two trawls) and *Filicampus tigris* (in 5 trawls). However, there were also 64 more trawls, with up to 36 individuals caught in a single trawl, where syngnathids were caught but not identified (due to difficulty in species identifications of this group).

The majority of sawfish recorded by AFMA scientific observers in the NPF were identified as the Narrow Sawfish (*Anoxypristis cuspidata*) (Table 6-3). This species accounted for 161 out of the 197 trawls that caught sawfish and being recorded around 4% of all trawls (one individual every 27 trawls). Highest mean catches for this species, around one individual per km^2, were in the southeastern Gulf of Carpentaria ('Region' 8 and 9) and one individual per 3 – 5 km^2 in the western region of the NPF, from Joseph Bonaparte Gulf to Gove ('Region' 1 – 3) (Table 6-4). There were 25 Green Sawfish (*Pristis zijsron*), two Largetooth Sawfish (*Pristis pristis*) and one Dwarf Sawfish

(*Pristis clavata*) recorded by AFMA scientific observers. Only eight sawfish were not unidentified to species during the AFMA scientific observer program from 2005 to 2016.

None of the 'at risk' elasmobranch or teleost bycatch species were recorded by AFMA scientific observers between 2005 and 2016 (Table 6-3). The two Squillidae ‘at risk’ species; *Dictyosquilla tuberculata* and *Harpiosquilla stephensoni*, were recorded in about 3% and 1%, respectively of all trawls (Table 6-3). The Brown-striped Mantis Shrimp, *Dictyosquilla tuberculata*, showed highest mean catches of one individual per 2 – 4 km^2 across a wide coastal area from the Joseph Bonaparte Gulf to south Groote Eylandt (‘Region’ 1 – 5). This species was also found within the southeastern Gulf of Carpentaria region (‘Region’ 8 and 9) with mean catches of one individual per 7 – 100 km^2 (Table 6-4).

Table 6-3: The proportion of trawls with no catch, number of trawls where at least one individual was caught and the maximum number of individuals in a single trawl for the TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species recorded during the AFMA scientific observer program; 2005 – 2016.

Group	CAAB	Species	Proportion of Zeros	Trawls Present	Maximum Number
Marine Turtle	39020000	Cheloniidae	0.999	4	2
	39020001	*Caretta caretta*	1	0	0
	39020002	*Chelonia mydas*	>0.999	2	1
	39020003	*Eretmochelys imbricata*	1	0	0
	39020004	*Lepidochelys olivacea*	>0.999	2	1
	39020005	*Natator depressus*	0.997	11	1
Sea Snake	39125000	Hydrophiidae	0.997	13	2
	39125001	*Acalyptophis peronii*	0.994	27	2
	39125003	*Aipysurus duboisii*	0.999	6	1
	39125004	*Aipysurus mosaicus*	0.988	50	4
	39125007	*Aipysurus laevis*	0.987	54	3
	39125009	*Astrotia stokesii*	0.973	114	5
	39125010	*Disteira kingii*	0.997	15	1
	39125011	*Disteira major*	0.961	167	4
	39125013	*Enhydrina schistosa*	0.998	7	2
	39125018	*Hydrophis caerulescens*	1	0	0
	39125021	*Hydrophis elegans*	0.897	444	13
	39125025	*Hydrophis mcdowelli*	0.997	13	1
	39125028	*Hydrophis ornatus*	0.974	110	10
	39125029	*Hydrophis pacificus*	0.993	29	2
	39125031	*Lapemis curtis*	0.898	438	8
	39125033	*Pelamis platurus*	0.997	11	2
Syngnathid	37282000	Syngnathidae	0.985	64	36
	37282005	*Hippocampus histrix*	1	0	0
	37282006	*Trachyrhamphus bicoarctata*	0.997	14	1
	37282007	*Haliichthys taeniophorus*	1	0	0
	37282030	*Halicampus grayi*	1	0	0
	37282033	*Hippocampus kuda*	1	0	0
	37282042	*Choeroichthys brachysoma*	>0.999	2	28
	37282063	*Festucalex scalaris*	1	0	0
	37282064	*Filicampus tigris*	0.999	5	1
	37282080	*Hippocampus zebra*	1	0	0
	37282100	*Syngnathoides biaculeatus*	1	0	0
	37282101	*Trachyrhamphus longirostris*	0.98	85	4
	37282110	*Hippocampus queenslandicus*	1	0	0
	37282998	*Trachyrhamphus* sp A	1	0	0
	37282999	*Trachyrhamphus* sp Short-tailed	1	0	0
Sawfish	37025000	Pristidae	0.998	8	2

	37025001	*Pristis zijsron*	0.994	25	1
	37025002	*Anoxypristis cuspidata*	0.963	161	4
	37025003	*Pristis pristis*	>0.999	2	1
	37025004	*Pristis clavata*	>0.999	1	1
Elasmobranch	37035027	*Urogymnus asperrimus*	1	0	0
Invertebrate	28051030	*Dictyosquilla tuberculata*	0.971	77	7
	28051039	*Harpiosquilla stephensoni*	0.992	21	4

Table 6-4: Mean catch rates (number per km^2) of the TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species for each of the banana prawn fishing regions for the AFMA scientific observer program from 2005 to 2016. Only TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species (or groups where individuals were not identified to species) that were recorded at least once during the surveys are shown. Number of trawls shown in parenthesis.

Group	CAAB	Species	Region 1 (702)	Region 2 (861)	Region 3 (133)	Region 4 (669)	Region 5 (182)	Region 6 (659)	Region 7 (479)	Region 8 (622)	Region 9 (113)	Region 10 (328)
Marine Turtle	39020000	Cheloniidae	<0.01	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.14	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.00
	39020002	*Chelonia mydas*	0.00	<0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	<0.01	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.00
	39020004	*Lepidochelys olivacea*	0.00	<0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	39020005	*Natator depressus*	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.03	0.05	0.02	0.00	0.05
Sea Snake	39125000	Hydrophiidae	0.03	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	<0.01	<0.01	0.01	0.05	0.00
	39125001	*Acalyptophis peronii*	0.00	<0.01	0.14	0.01	0.08	0.02	<0.01	<0.01	0.06	0.03
	39125003	*Aipysurus duboisii*	<0.01	0.00	0.00	<0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01
	39125004	*Aipysurus mosaicus*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.51	0.03	<0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01
	39125007	*Aipysurus laevis*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.14	0.19	0.05	0.04	<0.01	0.04	<0.01
	39125009	*Astrotia stokesii*	0.07	0.06	0.07	0.08	0.21	0.04	0.01	0.02	0.05	0.06
	39125010	*Disteira kingii*	<0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	<0.01	0.05	0.23	0.03
	39125011	*Disteira major*	0.10	0.05	0.12	0.04	0.42	0.09	0.04	0.12	0.28	0.02
	39125013	*Enhydrina schistosa*	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.23	0.00
	39125021	*Hydrophis elegans*	0.26	0.22	0.13	0.39	0.22	0.12	0.12	0.72	1.69	0.34
	39125025	*Hydrophis mcdowelli*	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	<0.01	0.00	0.01	0.20	<0.01
	39125028	*Hydrophis ornatus*	<0.01	0.03	0.01	<0.01	0.06	0.04	0.03	0.70	1.42	0.31
	39125029	*Hydrophis pacificus*	0.01	<0.01	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.11	0.01
	39125031	*Lapemis curtis*	0.12	0.26	0.03	<0.01	1.25	0.07	0.12	1.79	2.51	0.61
	39125033	*Pelamis platurus*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.13	0.05	0.00
Syngnathid	37282000	Syngnathidae	<0.01	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.38	0.03	0.02	1.12	11.14	0.01
	37282006	*Trachyrhamphus bicoarctata*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00
	37282007	*Haliichthys taeniophorus*	0.00	<0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

	37282042	*Choeroichthys brachysoma*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.14
	37282064	*Filicampus tigris*	<0.01	0.00	0.00	<0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.35	0.01
	37282101	*Trachyrhamphus longirostris*	0.00	0.01	0.11	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.05	0.20	0.33	<0.01
Sawfish	37025000	Pristidae	<0.01	0.01	0.00	<0.01	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	37025001	*Pristis zijsron*	0.04	0.01	0.02	<0.01	0.00	<0.01	0.01	0.07	0.00	0.00
	37025002	*Anoxypristis cuspidata*	0.17	0.30	0.18	0.07	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.80	1.43	0.05
	37025003	*Pristis pristis*	<0.01	<0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	37025004	*Pristis clavata*	<0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Invertebrate	28051030	*Dictyosquilla tuberculata*	0.28	0.41	0.75	0.22	0.57	0.02	0.01	0.09	0.15	0.00
	28051039	*Harpiosquilla stephensoni*	0.03	0.04	0.52	0.00	0.00	<0.01	0.02	0.15	0.08	0.00

NPF prawn population monitoring surveys

The summary of catch frequency data for the TEP and ‘at risk’ bycatch species for the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys is shown in Table 6-5. Of the 7572 trawls carried out during these surveys, only a small number of trawls recorded any of the TEP and ‘at risk’ bycatch species. Most of the TEP species (sea snakes, syngnathids, marine turtles, syngnathids and sawfishes) and ‘at risk’ bycatch species were recorded in less than 2% of all trawls. The mean catch rate (number per km^2 swept area) was also calculated for each of the TEP and ‘at risk’ bycatch species and is shown in Table 6-6. Most TEP and ‘at risk’ bycatch species were caught across the majority of 'Regions' sampled (‘Region’ 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 10).

Four of the five marine turtle species were only recorded once in the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys between 2002 and 2016 (Table 6-5). The Flatback Turtle (*Natator depressus*) was recorded in six trawls with another 14 trawls catching turtles that were not able to be unidentified. Marine turtles were more commonly caught along the eastern side of the Gulf of Carpentaria, around Karumba and Weipa (‘Region’ 8 and 10) with a mean catches of one individual per 16 – 30 km^2 (Table 6-6).

The most commonly caught sea snake species were *Lapemis curtis* and *Hydrophis elegans*, and these were caught in less than 7% of trawls (Table 6-5). These two species were recorded around one individual every 15 trawls and also had the highest maximum numbers of individuals caught in any one trawl; 4 and 9 individuals, respectively. The other 12 species of sea snakes recorded in the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys were caught at less than one individual every 75 trawls. Most of the sea snakes species were recorded from across all ‘Regions’. However highest mean catches were recorded around south Groote Eylandt (‘Region’ 5) and along the eastern Gulf of Carpentaria coast (‘Region’ 8 and 10) for a number of species; *Acalyptophis peronii* (one individual per 6 – 12 km^2), *Astrotia* stokesii (one individual per 10 km^2), *Disteira major* (one individual per 4 – 6 km^2) and *Lapemis curtis* (two to three individuals per km^2). *Hydrophis elegans* showed the most widespread catches from north and south Groote Eylandt (one individual per 2 km^2) in the west to the southern Gulf of Carpentaria (one individual per 2 – 4 km^2) and along the eastern Gulf of Carpentaria coast with one individual per km^2 (Table 6-6).

Only two species of syngnathids were recorded more than once in catches during these surveys. The Straightstick Pipefish, *Trachyrhamphus longirostris*, was the most commonly caught species (in 87 trawls) with only four other species being recorded during the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys. However, most syngnathids caught, in 38 other trawls, were not able to be identified to species due to the difficulty in positive identification from photographs. The syngnathids, as a group, were caught across most ‘Regions’ (Table 6-6). *Trachyrhamphus longirostris* showed higher mean catches around north Groote Eylandt (‘Region’ 4) and Vanderlins to Mornington Island (‘Region’ 6 – 8) with one individual per 4 – 10 km^2 recorded.

Four species of sawfish were recorded from 2002 to 2016 during the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys (Table 6-5). The most common species; *Anoxypristis cuspidata*, was caught in 88 trawls (one individual every 83 trawls). The other three sawfish species were relatively uncommon, each species only being caught in one or two trawls from 2002 to 2016. *Anoxypristis cuspidata* was also caught in all ‘Regions’ with highest mean catches (one individual per 3 per km^2) recorded around Weipa (‘Region’ 10) and one individual per 6 – 8 km^2 recorded along the western to southern coast of the Gulf of Carpentaria (‘Region’ 4 – 7) (Table 6-6). The two sawfish species; *Pristis pristis* and *Pristis clavata*, were only recorded in ‘Region’ 8 and 10 while *Pristis zijsron* was only caught in ‘Region’ 6.

None of the ‘at risk’ elasmobranch or teleost bycatch species were recorded during the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys.

The two ‘at risk’ Squillidae species were relatively common in trawls, occurring in 26 to 37 trawls from 2009 to 2016, with a maximum of 13 *Dictyosquilla tuberculata* individuals in a single trawl (Table 6-5). This group also showed distinct differences in mean catches between ‘Regions’. The Brown-striped Mantis Shrimp (*Dictyosquilla tuberculata*) was more common around south Groote Eylandt (‘Region’ 5) and Mornington Island and Karumba (‘Region’ 8) with catches of about one individual per 2 km^2 (Table 6-6). The Stephenson’s Mantis Shrimp; *Harpiosquilla stephensoni*, had similar mean catches of one individual per 2 km^2 and was most common around Mornington Island and Karumba (‘Region’ 8).

Table 6-5: The proportion of trawls with no catch, number of trawls where at least one individual was caught and the maximum number of individuals in a single trawl for the TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species recorded during the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys; 2002 – 2016.

Group	CAAB	Species	Proportion of Zeros	Trawls Present	Maximum Number
Marine Turtle	39020000	Cheloniidae	0.998	14	1
	39020001	*Caretta caretta*	>0.999	1	1
	39020002	*Chelonia mydas*	>0.999	1	1
	39020003	*Eretmochelys imbricata*	>0.999	1	1
	39020004	*Lepidochelys olivacea*	>0.999	1	1
	39020005	*Natator depressus*	0.999	6	1
Sea Snake	39125000	Hydrophiidae	0.997	26	3
	39125001	*Acalyptophis peronii*	0.995	37	2
	39125003	*Aipysurus duboisii*	0.999	5	1
	39125004	*Aipysurus mosaicus*	0.995	41	2
	39125007	*Aipysurus laevis*	0.992	57	2
	39125009	*Astrotia stokesii*	0.994	47	2
	39125010	*Disteira kingii*	0.997	19	1
	39125011	*Disteira major*	0.987	96	2
	39125013	*Enhydrina schistosa*	0.999	6	2
	39125018	*Hydrophis caerulescens*	1	0	0
	39125021	*Hydrophis elegans*	0.943	435	4
	39125025	*Hydrophis mcdowelli*	>0.999	3	1
	39125028	*Hydrophis ornatus*	0.996	34	1
	39125029	*Hydrophis pacificus*	0.992	62	2
	39125031	*Lapemis curtis*	0.935	491	9
	39125033	*Pelamis platurus*	0.998	15	2
Syngnathid	37282000	Syngnathidae	0.995	38	3
	37282005	*Hippocampus histrix*	1	0	0
	37282006	*Trachyrhamphus bicoarctata*	1	0	0
	37282007	*Haliichthys taeniophorus*	>0.999	1	1
	37282030	*Halicampus grayi*	0.999	4	1
	37282033	*Hippocampus kuda*	1	0	0
	37282042	*Choeroichthys brachysoma*	1	0	0
	37282063	*Festucalex scalaris*	1	0	0
	37282064	*Filicampus tigris*	1	1	1
	37282080	*Hippocampus zebra*	1	0	0
	37282100	*Syngnathoides biaculeatus*	1	0	0
	37282101	*Trachyrhamphus longirostris*	0.989	87	3
	37282110	*Hippocampus queenslandicus*	>0.999	1	1
	37282998	*Trachyrhamphus* sp A	1	0	0
	37282999	*Trachyrhamphus* sp Short-tailed	1	0	0
Sawfish	37025000	Pristidae	>0.999	1	1

	37025001	*Pristis zijsron*	>0.999	1	1
	37025002	*Anoxypristis cuspidata*	0.988	88	3
	37025003	*Pristis pristis*	>0.999	2	1
	37025004	*Pristis clavata*	>0.999	2	1
Elasmobranch	37035027	*Urogymnus asperrimus*	1	0	0
Invertebrate	28051030	*Dictyosquilla tuberculata*	0.992	26	13
	28051039	*Harpiosquilla stephensoni*	0.988	37	4

Table 6-6: Mean catch rates (number per km^2) of the TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species for each of the banana prawn fishing regions for the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys from 2002 to 2016. Only TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species (or groups where individuals were not identified to species) that were recorded at least once during the surveys are shown. Number of trawls shown in parenthesis.

Group	CAAB	Species	Region 4 (1107)	Region 5 (689)	Region 6 (1473)	Region 7 (1008)	Region 8 (2495)	Region 10 (796)
Marine Turtle	39020000	Cheloniidae	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.03	0.06
	39020001	*Caretta caretta*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01
	39020002	*Chelonia mydas*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	<0.01	0.00
	39020003	*Eretmochelys imbricata*	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	39020004	*Lepidochelys olivacea*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01
	39020005	*Natator depressus*	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.03
Sea Snake	39125000	Hydrophiidae	0.02	0.07	0.02	0.02	0.08	0.07
	39125001	*Acalyptophis peronii*	0.01	0.10	0.02	0.03	0.08	0.16
	39125003	*Aipysurus duboisii*	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.03	<0.01	0.00
	39125004	*Aipysurus mosaicus*	0.08	0.26	0.03	0.00	0.06	0.03
	39125007	*Aipysurus laevis*	0.00	0.10	0.08	0.16	0.10	0.11
	39125009	*Astrotia stokesii*	0.07	0.10	0.05	0.06	0.09	0.06
	39125010	*Disteira kingii*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.05	0.10
	39125011	*Disteira major*	0.06	0.23	0.17	0.06	0.20	0.15
	39125013	*Enhydrina schistosa*	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	<0.01	0.07
	39125021	*Hydrophis elegans*	0.76	0.41	0.26	0.44	1.07	1.14
	39125025	*Hydrophis mcdowelli*	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00
	39125028	*Hydrophis ornatus*	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.08	0.13
	39125029	*Hydrophis pacificus*	0.00	0.03	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.19
	39125031	*Lapemis curtis*	0.03	0.64	0.07	0.13	2.64	2.13
	39125033	*Pelamis platurus*	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.10
Syngnathid	37282000	Syngnathidae	0.00	0.09	0.05	0.02	0.09	0.14

	37282007	*Haliichthys taeniophorus*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	<0.01	0.00
	37282030	*Halicampus grayi*	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.00	<0.01	0.00
	37282064	*Filicampus tigris*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01
	37282101	*Trachyrhamphus longirostris*	0.24	0.07	0.11	0.13	0.18	0.04
	37282110	*Hippocampus queenslandicus*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01
Sawfish	37025000	Pristidae	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
	37025001	*Pristis zijsron*	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
	37025002	*Anoxypristis cuspidata*	0.12	0.15	0.13	0.13	0.07	0.40
	37025003	*Pristis pristis*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03
	37025004	*Pristis clavata*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	<0.01	0.01
Invertebrate	28051030	*Dictyosquilla tuberculata*	0.14	0.44	0.00	0.00	0.47	0.00
	28051039	*Harpiosquilla stephensoni*	0.00	0.04	0.02	0.00	0.57	0.00

CSIRO scientific research and observer surveys

Most of the TEP and ‘at risk’ bycatch species have been recorded at least once within the NPF during previous CSIRO scientific research and observer surveys from 1976 to 2005 (Table 6-7). However, similar to the other three data sets the proportion of the total number of trawls (16,521 trawls) where TEP and ‘at risk’ bycatch species were recorded was also very low, in less than 6% of all trawls. The mean catch rate (number per km^2 swept area) was also calculated for each of the TEP and ‘at risk’ bycatch species and is shown in Table 6-8.

Of the five species of marine turtles caught, *Natator depressus* was the most commonly caught; in 51 trawls. This species was also caught more often across the top of the Gulf of Carpentaria with mean catches of one individual per 5 to 10 km^2 (‘Regions’ 3 and 10) (Table 6-8). Two other species, *Lepidochelys olivacea* and *Caretta caretta* also showed highest mean catches in these ‘Regions’ respectively, at one individual per 33 km^2.

The sea snake group was the most commonly caught group with *Hydrophis elegans* and *Lapemis curtis* being the two species caught in the most trawls; 473 and 475 trawls (6% of trawls), respectively. These two species and *Acalyptophis peronii* also had the greatest number of individuals caught in one trawl; up to 15 *Hydrophis elegans*, 15 *Acalyptophis peronii* and 12 *Lapemis curtis* from a single trawl. *Aipysurus mosaicus*, *Astrotia stokesii*, *Disteira major* and *Hydrophis ornatus* were also relatively common; caught in about 1 – 2% of the total number of trawls. The sea snakes were also caught across all ‘Regions’. The two species caught in the largest numbers; *Hydrophis elegans* and *Lapemis curtis*, both had highest mean catches (1 – 2 individuals per km^2 and 2 – 4 individuals per km^2) along the eastern side of the Gulf of Carpentaria (‘Regions’ 8 – 10) (Table 6-8). Most of the species of sea snake recorded during the CSIRO scientific research and observer surveys (*Acalyptophis peronii, Aipysurus mosaicus*, *Aipysurus laevis*, *Astrotia stokesii*, *Disteira kingii*, *Disteira major*, *Enhydrina schistosa*, *Hydrophis mcdowelli* and *Hydrophis ornatus*) also showed highest mean catches in the south eastern Gulf of Carpentaria (‘Regions’ 8 – 10).

Most species of syngnathids were only caught in a few of the total number of trawls during the CSIRO scientific research and observer surveys (Table 6-7). The Thorny Seahorse, *Hippocampus histrix* and the Straightstick Pipefish, *Trachyrhamphus longirostris* were the two species caught most often, in 13 and 14 trawls, respectively. As there was very low numbers of most species of syngnathids caught during the CSIRO scientific research and observer surveys, it is difficult to determine any regional pattern in catch rates. The syngnathids as a group tended to show highest mean catches around Groote Eylandt (‘Region’ 4 and 5) and in the southeastern region of the Gulf of Carpentaria, Mornington to Karumba (‘Region’ 8) (Table 6-8). The two most commonly caught species, *Hippocampus histrix* and *Trachyrhamphus longirostris* showed catches of one individual per 2 – 4 km^2 in the southern Gulf of Carpentaria (‘Region’ 7).

The most common species of sawfish; *Anoxypristis cuspidata*, was caught in a total of 172 trawls (2.6%) from the CSIRO scientific research and observer surveys. The only other sawfish species recorded was the Green Sawfish (*Pristis zijsron*) and was caught in 13 trawls from these surveys between 1990 and 2005. This species was rarely recorded during the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys however during the crew-member observer program and AFMA scientific observer program it was also recorded in 17 and 25 trawls, respectively. The Narrow Sawfish, *Anoxypristis cuspidata*, was caught across all ‘Regions’ of the NPF, with highest mean catches of 4 individuals per km^2 along the eastern coast of the Gulf of Carpentaria (‘Region’ 9) (Table 6-8). Catches of one individual per 3 – 8 km^2 were also seen in western regions of the NPF (‘Region’ 1 – 3). *Pristis zijsron* and *Pristis pristis* showed highest mean catches of one individual per 20 km^2 around the southern Gulf of Carpentaria and Gove (‘Region’ 7 and 3, respectively).

There were only six trawls during all of the CSIRO scientific research and observer surveys between 1990 and 2005 where the ‘at risk’ elasmobranch species, the Porcupine Ray (*Urogymnus asperrimus*) was recorded, however these were widespread across the Gulf of Carpentaria from Gove in the west (‘Region’ 3) to Weipa in the east (‘Region’ 10) (Table 6-8).

The two ‘at risk’ teleost species, *Lepidotrigla spinosa and Lepidotrigla* sp A were recorded in 35 and 2 trawls respectively during the CSIRO scientific research and observer surveys from 1990 to 2005. Both of these species were recorded in low numbers, less than one individual per 100 km^2 with *Lepidotrigla spinosa* only recorded around Weipa (‘Region’ 10) and *Lepidotrigla* sp A recorded in the western and southern Gulf of Carpentaria (‘Region’ 4, 6 and 7) (Table 6-8).

Neither of the two Squillidae species were recorded in any of the CSIRO scientific research and observer surveys.

Table 6-7: The proportion of trawls with no catch, number of trawls where at least one individual was caught and the maximum number of individuals in a single trawl for the TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species recorded during the CSIRO scientific research and observer surveys.

Group	CAAB	Species	Proportion of zeros	Trawls Present	Maximum number
Marine Turtle	39020000	Cheloniidae	0.995	31	3
	39020001	*Caretta caretta*	0.999	7	2
	39020002	*Chelonia mydas*	>0.999	1	2
	39020003	*Eretmochelys imbricata*	>0.999	3	1
	39020004	*Lepidochelys olivacea*	0.995	34	1
	39020005	*Natator depressus*	0.992	51	2
Sea Snake	39125000	Hydrophiidae	0.983	145	12
	39125001	*Acalyptophis peronii*	0.995	45	15
	39125003	*Aipysurus duboisii*	0.998	14	1
	39125004	*Aipysurus mosaicus*	0.989	93	2
	39125007	*Aipysurus laevis*	0.992	67	2
	39125009	*Astrotia stokesii*	0.989	95	2
	39125010	*Disteira kingii*	0.995	45	2
	39125011	*Disteira major*	0.981	160	3
	39125013	*Enhydrina schistosa*	0.994	53	2
	39125018	*Hydrophis caerulescens*	>0.999	3	1
	39125021	*Hydrophis elegans*	0.944	473	15
	39125025	*Hydrophis mcdowelli*	0.999	8	1
	39125028	*Hydrophis ornatus*	0.988	99	8
	39125029	*Hydrophis pacificus*	0.996	31	2
	39125031	*Lapemis curtis*	0.944	475	12
	39125033	*Pelamis platurus*	1	0	0
Syngnathid	37282000	Syngnathidae	0.999	5	7
	37282005	*Hippocampus histrix*	0.997	13	4
	37282006	*Trachyrhamphus bicoarctata*	>0.999	1	73
	37282007	*Haliichthys taeniophorus*	0.998	6	5
	37282030	*Halicampus grayi*	>0.999	1	1
	37282033	*Hippocampus kuda*	0.999	3	1
	37282042	*Choeroichthys brachysoma*	1	0	0
	37282063	*Festucalex scalaris*	0.999	2	1
	37282064	*Filicampus tigris*	>0.999	1	1
	37282080	*Hippocampus zebra*	1	0	0
	37282100	*Syngnathoides biaculeatus*	>0.999	1	2
	37282101	*Trachyrhamphus longirostris*	0.996	14	26
	37282110	*Hippocampus queenslandicus*	1	0	0
	37282998	*Trachyrhamphus* sp A	1	0	0
	37282999	*Trachyrhamphus* sp Short-tailed	1	0	0
Sawfish	37025000	Pristidae	0.995	31	3
	37025001	*Pristis zijsron*	0.998	13	2

	37025002	*Anoxypristis cuspidata*	0.974	172	4
	37025003	*Pristis pristis*	1	0	0
	37025004	*Pristis clavata*	1	0	0
Elasmobranch	37035027	*Urogymnus asperrimus*	0.999	6	1
Teleost	37288028	*Lepidotrigla spinosa*	0.999	2	1
	37288506	*Lepidotrigla* sp A	0.995	35	11
Invertebrate	28051030	*Dictyosquilla tuberculata*	1	0	0
	28051039	*Harpiosquilla stephensoni*	1	0	0

Table 6-8: Mean catch rates (number per km^2) of the TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species for each of the banana prawn fishing regions for the CSIRO scientific research and observer surveys from 1976 to 2005. Only TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species (or groups where individuals were not identified to species) that were recorded at least once during the surveys or trips are shown.

Group	CAAB	Species	Region 1 (201)	Region 2 (319)	Region 3 (699)	Region 4 (2661)	Region 5 (1513)	Region 6 (2650)	Region 7 (1868)	Region 8 (3776)	Region 9 (768)	Region 10 (2066)
Marine Turtle	39020000	Cheloniidae	0	0	0.02	0.02	<0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01
	39020001	*Caretta caretta*	0	0	0.00	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	0.00	0.03
	39020002	*Chelonia mydas*	0	0	0.00	0.00	<0.01	0.00	<0.01	<0.01	0.00	<0.01
	39020003	*Eretmochelys imbricata*	0	0	0.00	<0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.00	<0.01
	39020004	*Lepidochelys olivacea*	0	0	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
	39020005	*Natator depressus*	0	0	0.11	0.02	0.07	0.01	0.01	0.06	0.03	0.19
Sea Snake	39125000	Hydrophiidae	0.03	0.01	0.04	0.06	0.14	0.10	0.06	0.02	0.11	0.26
	39125001	*Acalyptophis peronii*	0.00	0.00	0.00	<0.01	0.02	0.03	0.10	0.09	0.05	0.26
	39125003	*Aipysurus duboisii*	0.00	0.00	0.00	<0.01	<0.01	0.04	<0.01	<0.01	0.11	0.02
	39125004	*Aipysurus mosaicus*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.18	0.01	<0.01	0.59	0.63	0.09
	39125007	*Aipysurus laevis*	0.00	0.00	0.00	<0.01	0.15	0.09	0.04	0.04	0.26	0.11
	39125009	*Astrotia stokesii*	0.00	0.11	0.10	0.02	0.15	0.08	0.05	0.15	1.04	0.08
	39125010	*Disteira kingii*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	<0.01	0.00	0.02	0.28	0.10	0.07
	39125011	*Disteira major*	0.10	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.13	0.13	0.08	0.16	0.29	0.07
	39125013	*Enhydrina schistosa*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.84	1.26	0.04
	39125018	*Hydrophis caerulescens*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.21	0.00
	39125021	*Hydrophis elegans*	0.15	0.00	0.21	0.27	0.18	0.16	0.24	1.65	1.45	1.49
	39125025	*Hydrophis mcdowelli*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	<0.01	0.06	0.10	0.00
	39125028	*Hydrophis ornatus*	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.10	0.09	0.15	0.23	0.06	0.06	0.23
	39125029	*Hydrophis pacificus*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.04	<0.01	0.00	0.00
	39125031	*Lapemis curtis*	0.02	0.13	0.00	0.00	0.45	0.00	0.00	4.42	2.95	1.59
	39125033	*Pelamis platurus*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.00

Syngnathid	37282000	Syngnathidae	7.46	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.16	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.03
	37282005	*Hippocampus histrix*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.27	0.00	0.00	0.51	0.00	0.34
	37282006	*Trachyrhamphus bicoarctata*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	37282007	*Haliichthys taeniophorus*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.25
	37282030	*Halicampus grayi*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02
	37282033	*Hippocampus kuda*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03
	37282063	*Festucalex scalaris*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03
	37282064	*Filicampus tigris*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01
	37282100	*Syngnathoides biaculeatus*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.04
	37282101	*Trachyrhamphus longirostris*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.22	0.18	0.00	0.00	0.52	0.00	0.04
Sawfish	37025000	Pristidae	<0.01	0.00	0.01	<0.01	<0.01	0.01	<0.01	<0.01	0.08	<0.01
	37025001	*Pristis zijsron*	0.00	<0.01	<0.01	0.01	0.02	<0.01	0.05	0.02	0.00	<0.01
	37025002	*Anoxypristis cuspidata*	0.14	0.35	0.12	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.09	4.02	0.07
	37025003	*Pristis pristis*	0.01	0.00	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	37025004	*Pristis clavata*	0.02	<0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Elasmobranch	37035027	*Urogymnus asperrimus*	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.12	0.00	<0.01	0.00	<0.01
Teleost	37288028	*Lepidotrigla spinosa*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	<0.01
	37288506	*Lepidotrigla* sp A	0.00	0.00	0.00	<0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00

Distribution and abundance

The commercial fishing effort distribution (boat days per six nautical mile grid) for the banana and tiger prawn seasons for the years 2005 – 07, 2008 – 10, 2011 – 13 and 2014 – 16 are shown in Figure 6-1 and Figure 6-2. Commercial fishing effort in the NPF extended from the Joseph Bonaparte Gulf in the west to Weipa in the east for both banana and tiger seasons. The banana prawn seasons showed similar fishing effort distribution from 2005 to 2016 with most of the effort concentrated in the shallow coastal band around the Tiwi Islands, Coburg Peninsula, Gove and along the south-east to east Gulf of Carpentaria coastline between Mornington and Weipa, except for a lack of effort in the Joseph Bonaparte Gulf in 2008 – 10 (Figure 6-1). In the last three years, there was a marked clustering of effort in the Gulf of Carpentaria around Weipa, Edward – Mitchell River, Karumba, east and west Mornington Island. There has been little change in fishing effort distribution for the tiger prawn fishery between 2005 and 2016, with most of the effort along the offshore coastal regions of west and south of the Gulf of Carpentaria (Figure 6-2). There was also some effort in the western Joseph Bonaparte Gulf, Tiwi Islands and off Weipa in the east. In the last three years, there was highest effort in the north Groote Eylandt region.

For each of the TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species, as well as the unidentified individuals of each group, all available distribution data (crew-member observer, AFMA scientific observer, NPF prawn population monitoring, CSIRO scientific research and observer and Museum data sets) were pooled to show the geographical distribution for each species (grey circles represent a position where a species was recorded) (Figure 6-3 – Figure 6-10). Using the crew-member observer, AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring data sets from 2002 to 2016, catch records were standardised to catch rates (in number per km^2), averaged to a six nautical mile grid and plotted across the NPF region for both the banana prawn and tiger prawn seasons separately (Figure 6-3 – Figure 6-10). Although these plots are used to identify areas of highest catches, it is important to note that in some instances where one or more individuals were caught in a short trawl in a six nautical mile grid that had low effort distribution, such as only one or a few trawls being recorded in that grid, the mean catch rate for that grid will be high.

Dolphins

During the 2013 tiger prawn season, one dolphin was caught in a trawl within the Joseph Bonaparte Gulf region (Figure 6-3). The dolphin was not identified to species and it was released alive.

Marine turtles

The marine turtles were recorded throughout the coastal region of the NPF from the Joseph Bonaparte Gulf in the west to Weipa in the east and caught during both the banana prawn and tiger prawn seasons (Figure 6-4 a). Catch rates of marine turtles were higher around Weipa and Tiwi Islands during the banana prawn season and around Groote Eylandt and west Mornington Island in the tiger prawn season.

The catches of ‘Unidentified Cheloniidae’ were highest during the banana prawn season, up to 11 individuals per km^2 (Tiwi Islands) however most catches along the eastern side of the Gulf of Carpentaria were less than 2 individuals per km^2 (Figure 6-4 b). Lower catches were recorded during the tiger prawn season, less than one individual per km^2, with the majority of catches along the west and south coastal regions of the Gulf of Carpentaria. Although this is likely to be a result of the differences in fishery effort distribution between seasons. Each of the five species of marine turtles recorded in the NPF between 2002 and 2016 were caught during both the banana and tiger prawn seasons (Figure 6-4 c – g).

The recorded distribution for most of the marine turtle species were widespread, from the Joseph Bonaparte Gulf to Weipa, however the Hawksbill Turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricata*) showed a more restricted catch distribution of only within the Gulf of Carpentaria (Figure 6-4 c – g). The most common species of turtles recorded were the Flatback Turtle (*Natator depressus*) and the Olive Ridley Turtle (*Lepidochelys olivacea*). All of the five species showed highest catch rates around Mornington Island, Vanderlins and Groote Eylandt. Catch rates varied between species with the Green Turtle (*Chelonia mydas*) and Hawksbill Turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricata*) recorded at up to one individual per km^2 while the Loggerhead Turtle (*Caretta caretta*), Olive Ridley Turtle (*Lepidochelys olivacea*) and Flatback Turtle (*Natator depressus*) up to 3 – 4 individuals per km^2 around the west and south Gulf of Carpentaria regions. The Olive Ridley Turtle showed highest catches of up to 17 individuals per km^2 around the Tiwi Islands.

Sea snakes

The sea snakes, as a group, were recorded across almost the entire coastal and offshore region of the NPF (Figure 6-5 a). While catches between the banana prawn and tiger prawn seasons were temporally different due to the changes in fishing effort distribution between the seasons, highest catches of sea snakes were recorded around the southeastern and eastern Gulf of Carpentaria, up to 72 individuals per km^2 during the banana prawn season and up to 26 individuals per km^2 during the tiger prawn season.

Catches of 'Unidentified Hydrophiidae' were comparable within both the banana prawn and tiger prawn seasons across the Gulf of Carpentaria. Catch rates of up to 11 individuals per km^2 were recorded in the Joseph Bonaparte Gulf, Tiwi Islands and along the entire coast of the Gulf of Carpentaria (Figure 6-5 b) however catch rates of up to one individual per 2 km^2 were more common. Most of the species of sea snakes were also widely distributed throughout the coastal region of the NPF; from the Joseph Bonaparte Gulf in the west to the Weipa region in the east (Figure 6-5 c – p).

Several species of sea snakes were also caught in relatively high numbers across the NPF region; *Hydrophis elegans*, *Hydrophis ornatus* and *Lapemis curtis*, with catch rates of up to 25 – 45 individuals per km^2, in the south and southeastern Gulf of Carpentaria region (Figure 6-5 k,m,o). *Hydrophis elegans* and *Lapemis curtis*, as well as *Astrotia stokesii* and *Disteira major*, showed similar catch rates between the banana prawn and tiger prawn seasons and across most of the NPF coastal region (Figure 6-5 g,i,k,o).

Most of the other sea snake species showed similar widespread distributions across the NPF coastline however were much less abundant, with highest catch rates restricted to smaller regions. Highest catch rates of up to 12 – 18 individuals per km^2 were seen for *Acalyptophis peronii*, *Aipysurus mosaicus* and *Disteira kingii* along the mid eastern coastline of the Gulf of Carpentaria (Figure 6-5 c,e,h). Up to 3 – 5 individuals per km^2 were recorded for *Aipysurus laevis*, *Hydrophis pacificus* and E*nhydrina schistosa* and along the southern, southeastern and eastern coastline of the Gulf of Carpentaria, respectively (Figure 6-5 f,n,j). There was a marked seasonal difference in *Enhydrina schistosa* catches with nearly all recorded during the banana prawn season and the close inshore coastal region around Weipa and Edward River. *Aipysurus duboisii* and *Hydrophis mcdowelli* were caught in the lowest numbers, up to only 1 – 2 individuals per km^2, and although these two species occur across the NPF, the majority of catches were restricted to the southern Gulf of Carpentaria for *Aipysurus duboisii* and southeastern Gulf of Carpentaria and Joseph Bonaparte Gulf for *Hydrophis mcdowelli* (Figure 6-5 d,l). One species of sea snake, *Pelamis platurus*, showed a very restricted distribution in reported observations, being recorded nearly always within the Gulf of Carpentaria and most commonly during the banana prawn season (Figure 6-5 p).

There were several species of sea snakes that were not recorded by the crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program or NPF prawn population monitoring surveys between 2002 and 2016 but are known to occur within the NPF from previous Museum records and CSIRO scientific research and observer surveys. From the distribution records available, these species (*Hydrelaps darwiniensis*, *Hydrophis atriceps*, *Hydrophis caerulescens*, *Hydrophis fasciatus*, *Hydrophis inornatus* and *Parahydrophis mertoni*) appear to have a more inshore estuarine habitat preference and are therefore unlikely to be recorded in NPF prawn trawls (Figure 6-5 q – v).

Syngnathids

The syngnathid group appears to have a wide distribution within the NPF; from the Joseph Bonaparte Gulf in the west to Torres Strait in the east (Figure 6-6 a). However, a high proportion of syngnathids caught were not identified to species due to species identification difficulties therefore the catch rates of individual species may not reflect accurate levels. A few trawl catches recorded or estimated (as a result of subsampling) very high numbers of syngnathids during the banana prawn season, up to 185 individuals per km^2 around the Edward River to Mitchell River region. Most syngnathids were caught at less than 10 individuals per km^2 during both the banana prawn and tiger prawn seasons.

Most of the 'Unidentified Syngnathidae' were caught along the coastal region from Gove to Weipa during both the banana and tiger prawn seasons (Figure 6-6 b). Catch rates were also similar between the seasons, up to 6 individuals per km^2, excluding the few inflated mean catch rates in a few grids along the eastern side of the Gulf of Carpentaria.

There were ten syngnathid species recorded during the crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys from 2002 to 2016. All except one species, the Straightstick Pipefish (*Trachyrhamphus longirostris*), were recorded in only a few trawls in low numbers and having restricted distributions across the NPF. There was less than 1 individual per 100 km^2 recorded for *Hippocampus zebra*, *Choeroichthys brachysoma*, *Trachyrhamphus* sp A and *Trachyrhamphus* sp Short-tailed within restricted regions around Weipa, Mornington Island, Vanderlins and Groote Eylandt (Figure 6-6 g,j,i,l). Both of the pipefishes, *Trachyrhamphus bicoarctata* and *Halicampus grayi*, showed similar restricted distributions to these other species with catch rates of one individual per 1 – 2 km^2 (Figure 6-6 c,e) while the two pipefishes, *Haliichthys taeniophorus* and *Filicampus tigris*, and the seahorse *Hippocampus queenslandicus* showed catch rates of 6 – 12 individuals per km^2 (Figure 6-6 d,f,k).

The most common Syngnathidae caught was *Trachyrhamphus longirostris* and was recorded across most of the coastal region of the NPF, from the Tiwi Islands in the west to Weipa in the east (Figure 6-6 h). This species was recorded in both the banana prawn and tiger prawn seasons and although catch rates were up to 1 – 3 individuals per km^2, catches were consistent throughout most of the Gulf of Carpentaria coast and from Gove to Tiwi Islands (Figure 6-6 h).

There were seven species of Syngnathidae that were not recorded by the crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program or NPF prawn population monitoring surveys between 2002 and 2014 but have been recorded within the NPF previously from Museum records and CSIRO scientific research and observer surveys. These species (*Hippocampus histrix*, *Hippocampus kuda*, *Festucalex scalaris and Syngnathoides biaculeatus*) also showed restricted distributions around Groote Eylandt, Mornington Island, Weipa or Torres Strait waters (Figure 6-6 m – p).

Sawfishes

The sawfishes, as a group, showed a widespread distribution throughout both the inshore and offshore coastal regions of the NPF, from western Joseph Bonaparte Gulf to Weipa along the eastern side of the Gulf of Carpentaria (Figure 6-7 a). Lower mean catches were recorded during the tiger prawn season, with most catches at less than 1 individual per km^2 compared to up to 1 – 5 individuals per km^2 in the banana prawn season but as high as 43 individuals per km^2 in a low effort trawled grid around the Edward River – Mitchell River (Figure 6-7 a). As with the sea snake and syngnathid groups, there was a significant proportion of sawfish individuals that were not identified to species level thus included in the 'Unidentified Pristidae' (Figure 6-7 a). These unidentified catch records were mostly recorded during the tiger prawn season, likely due to difficulties in identifying large animals at night that are not being brought on board. Most of these individuals were recorded around the Tiwi Islands and within the coastal regions of the Gulf of Carpentaria between Gove and Mornington Island with catch rates around 1 individual per 10 – 100 km^2 (Figure 6-7 b).

The majority of 'Unidentified Pristidae' are likely to be one species; *Anoxypristis cuspidata* as this is the most common sawfish species recorded in the NPF. Around 97% of all sawfishes recorded are this one species. The distribution of *Anoxypristis cuspidata* was widespread, from western Joseph Bonaparte Gulf to Weipa in the east (Figure 6-7 d). Although catch rates were recorded up to 43 individuals per km^2 during the banana prawn season and up to 14 individuals per km^2 during the tiger prawn season, most trawl catches were much less than 5 individual per km^2 and 1 individual per km^2, respectively. Highest catch rates were seen around the Tiwi Islands, southeastern corner (east Mornington Island and Karumba) and east side of the Gulf of Carpentaria from the Mitchell River to Weipa regions) during the banana prawn season and western Joseph Bonaparte Gulf, Tiwi Islands and Mornington Island during the tiger prawn season.

Pristis zijsron had catch rates of up to 5 individuals per km^2 around the Tiwi Islands with much lower mean catch rates of less than one individual per 6 – 8 km^2 within the Joseph Bonaparte Gulf and western side of the Gulf of Carpentaria, and mostly in the tiger prawn season (Figure 6-7 c). The other two species of sawfishes recorded during the crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys from 2002 to 2016, *Pristis pristis* and *Pristis clavata* showed a patchy distribution across the NPF region from Joseph Bonaparte Gulf to Weipa (Figure 6-7 e,f). *Pristis pristis* showed highest catch rates of 1 individual per 2 – 10 km^2 in the Joseph Bonaparte Gulf, Tiwi Islands, Gove and Weipa regions while *Pristis clavata* showed similar highest catch rates in the Joseph Bonaparte Gulf and Karumba regions.

Elasmobranchs

There were few catch records available for the one 'at risk' elasmobranch species, the Porcupine Ray (*Urogymnus asperrimus*). This species was caught mainly along the western coast of the Gulf of Carpentaria and off the Tiwi Islands only during the tiger prawn season (Figure 6-8 a). However, distribution records show that this species occurs along the majority of coastline within the Gulf of Carpentaria around to Weipa in the east.

Teleosts

The two 'at risk' teleost species of *Lepidotrigla* (*Lepidotrigla spinosa* and *Lepidotrigla* sp A) were not recorded during the crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program or NPF prawn population monitoring surveys from 2002 to 2016. These species were only caught within the NPF region during the previous CSIRO scientific research and observer surveys prior to 2002 (Figure 6-9 a,b). *Lepidotrigla spinosa* was caught around the Weipa region while *Lepidotrigla* sp A was found between Gove and north Groote and in offshore waters north-east of Vanderlins.

Invertebrates

The two 'at risk' Squillidae species that were being monitored during the crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys all showed widespread distributions across the NPF region (Figure 6-10 a,b). The Brown-striped Mantis Shrimp, *Dictyosquilla tuberculata*, was recorded from Joseph Bonaparte Gulf in the west to south of Weipa in the east during the banana prawn season and as far east as Karumba during the tiger prawn season. Highest catch rates for this species, up to 42 individuals per km^2, were recorded around Tiwi Islands, from Gove to Groote Eylandt and around Karumba. Few have been recorded along the eastern side of the Gulf of Carpentaria (Figure 6-10 a). Stephenson’s Mantis Shrimp, *Harpiosquilla stephensoni*, was more commonly caught around the Tiwi Islands, Gove and along the eastern side of the Gulf of Carpentaria, with few being recorded along the western side. Highest mean catch rates were up to 16 individuals per km^2 for this species and catch rates were higher and more consistent during the banana prawn season compared to the tiger prawn season (Figure 6-10 b).

Figure 6-1: Maps showing the NPF commercial trawl effort distribution (boat days ≥5 days) in each 6 nautical mile grid for the 2005 – 07, 2008 – 10, 2011 – 13 and 2014 – 16 banana prawn seasons across the Northern Prawn Fishery.


2005-07 Banana Season
Commercial Boat Days
5 - 26
26 - 66
66 - 176


2008-10 Banana Season
Commercial Boat Days
5 - 26
26 - 66
66 - 176


2011-13 Banana Season
Commercial Boat Days
5 - 26
26 - 66
66 - 176


2014-16 Banana Season
Commercial Boat Days
5 - 26
26 - 66
66 - 176

Figure 6-2: Maps showing the NPF commercial trawl effort distribution (boat days >5 days) in each 6 nautical mile grid for the 2005 – 07, 2008 – 10, 2011 – 13 and 2014 – 16 tiger prawn seasons across the Northern Prawn Fishery.


2005-07 Tiger Season
Commercial Boat Days
5 - 68
68 - 209
209 - 473


2008-10 Tiger Season
Commercial Boat Days
5 - 68
68 - 209
209 - 473


2011-13 Tiger Season
Commercial Boat Days
5 - 68
68 - 209
209 - 473


2014-16 Tiger Season
Commercial Boat Days
5 - 68
68 - 209
209 - 473

Figure 6-3: Following maps showing the catch records (grey circles represent a position where a species has been recorded; presence data) and overall catch rates (numbers per km^2) during the banana (Top) and tiger (Bottom) prawn seasons for the dolphins; (a) Unidentified Delphinidae. Presence data includes all records from the crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program, NPF prawn population monitoring surveys and CSIRO scientific research and observer surveys in the NPF. Catch rate data only includes data collected from the crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program and the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys from 2002 to 2016.

(a) Delphinidae spp - Unidentified Dolphins



(a) Delphinidae spp - Unidentified Dolphins



Figure 6-4: Following maps showing the catch records (grey circles represent a position where a species has been recorded; presence data) and overall catch rates (numbers per km^2) during the banana (Top) and tiger (Bottom) prawn seasons for the marine turtles; (a) All Marine Turtles combined, (b) Unidentified Cheloniidae, (c) *Caretta caretta*, (d) *Chelonia mydas*, (e) *Eretmochelys imbricata*, (f) *Lepidochelys olivacea* and (g) *Natator depressus*. Presence data includes all records from the crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program, NPF prawn population monitoring surveys and CSIRO scientific research and observer surveys in the NPF. Catch rate data only includes data collected from the crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program and the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys from 2002 to 2016.

(a) Cheloniidae Group - All Marine Turtles



(a) Cheloniidae Group - All Marine Turtles



(b) Cheloniidae spp - Unidentified Turtles



(b) Cheloniidae spp - Unidentified Turtles



(c) Caretta caretta - Loggerhead Turtle



(c) Caretta caretta - Loggerhead Turtle



(d) Chelonia mydas - Green Turtle



(d) Chelonia mydas - Green Turtle



(e) Eretmochelys imbricata - Hawksbill Turtle



(e) Eretmochelys imbricata - Hawksbill Turtle



(f) Lepidochelys olivacea - Olive Ridley Turtle



(f) Lepidochelys olivacea - Olive Ridley Turtle




(g) Natator depressus - Flatback Turtle
Banana Prawn Season
Catch Rate (numbers/km2)
0.01 - 0.24
0.25 - 0.86
0.87 - 1.79
1.80 - 3.42


(g) Natator depressus - Flatback Turtle
Tiger Prawn Season
Catch Rate (numbers/km2)
0.01 - 0.24
0.25 - 0.86
0.87 - 1.79
1.80 - 3.42

Figure 6-5: Following maps showing the catch records (grey circles represent a position where a species has been recorded; presence data) and overall catch rates (numbers per km^2) during the banana (Top) and tiger (Bottom) prawn seasons for the sea snakes; (a) All Sea Snakes combined, (b) Unidentified Hydrophiidae, (c) *Acalyptophis peronii*, (d) *Aipysurus duboisii*, (e) *Aipysurus mosaicus*, (f) *Aipysurus laevis*, (g) *Astrotia stokesii*, (h) *Disteira kingii*, (i) *Disteira major*, (j) *Enhydrina schistosa*, (k) *Hydrophis elegans*, (l) *Hydrophis mcdowelli*, (m) *Hydrophis ornatus*, (n) *Hydrophis pacificus*, (o) *Lapemis curtis*, (p) *Pelamis platurus*, (q) *Hydrelaps darwiniensis*, (r) *Hydrophis atriceps*, (s) *Hydrophis caerulescens*, (t) *Hydrophis inornatus*, (u) *Parahydrophis mertoni* and (v) *Hydrophis fasciatus*. Presence data includes all records from the crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program, NPF prawn population monitoring surveys, CSIRO scientific research and observer surveys and Museum records in the NPF. Catch rate data only includes data collected from the crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program and the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys from 2002 to 2016. Maps (q) to (v) only show presence data as no individuals were caught from 2002 to 2016.

(a) Hydrophiidae Group - All Sea Snakes



(a) Hydrophiidae Group - All Sea Snakes



(b) Hydrophiidae spp - Unidentified Sea Snakes



(b) Hydrophiidae spp - Unidentified Sea Snakes



(c) Acalyptophis peronii - Horned Sea Snake



(c) Acalyptophis peronii - Horned Sea Snake



(d) Aipysurus duboisii - Dubois Sea Snake



(d) Aipysurus duboisii - Dubois Sea Snake



(e) Aipysurus mosaicus - Mosaic Sea Snake



(e) Aipysurus mosaicus - Mosaic Sea Snake



(f) Aipysurus laevis - Olive Sea Snake



(f) Aipysurus laevis - Olive Sea Snake



(g) Astrotia stokesii - Stokes Sea Snake



(g) Astrotia stokesii - Stokes Sea Snake



(h) Disteira kingii - Speckacled Sea Snake



(h) Disteira kingii - Speckacled Sea Snake



(i) Disteira major - Olive-headed Sea Snake



(i) Disteira major - Olive-headed Sea Snake



(j) Enhydrina schistosa - Beaked Sea Snake



(j) Enhydrina schistosa - Beaked Sea Snake



(k) Hydrophis elegans - Elegant Sea Snake



(k) Hydrophis elegans - Elegant Sea Snake



(l) Hydrophis mcdowelli - Small-headed Sea Snake



(l) Hydrophis mcdowelli - Small-headed Sea Snake



(m) Hydrophis ornatus - Ornate Sea Snake



(m) Hydrophis ornatus - Ornate Sea Snake



(n) Hydrophis pacificus - Large-headed Sea Snake



(n) Hydrophis pacificus - Large-headed Sea Snake



(o) Lapemis curtis - Spine-bellied Sea Snake



(o) Lapemis curtis - Spine-bellied Sea Snake



(p) Pelamis platurus - Yellow-bellied Sea Snake



(p) Pelamis platurus - Yellow-bellied Sea Snake



(q) Hydrelaps darwiniensis - Sea Snake



(r) Hydrophis atriceps - Sea Snake



(s) Hydrophis caerulescens - Sea Snake



(t) Hydrophis inornatus - Sea Snake



(u) Parahydrophis mertoni - Sea Snake



(v) Hydrophis fasciatus - Sea Snake



Figure 6-6: Following maps showing the catch records (grey circles represent a position where a species has been recorded; presence data) and overall catch rates (numbers per km^2) during the banana (Top) and tiger (Bottom) prawn seasons for the pipefishes and seahorses; (a) All Pipefishes and Seahorses combined, (b) Unidentified Pipefishes and Seahorses, (c) *Trachyrhamphus bicoarctata*, (d) *Haliichthys taeniophorus*, (e) *Halicampus grayi*, (f) *Filicampus tigris*, (g) *Hippocampus zebra*, (h) *Trachyrhamphus longirostris*, (i) *Trachyrhamphus* sp A, (j) *Choeroichthys brachysoma*, (k) *Hippocampus queenslandicus*, (l) *Trachyrhamphus* sp Short-tailed, (m) *Hippocampus histrix*, (n) *Hippocampus kuda*, (o) *Festucalex scalaris* and (p) *Syngnathoides biaculeatus*. Presence data includes all records from the crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program, NPF prawn population monitoring surveys and CSIRO scientific research and observer surveys in the NPF. Catch rate data only includes data collected from the crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program and the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys from 2002 to 2016. Maps (m) to (p) only show presence data as no individuals were caught from 2002 to 2016.

(a) Syngnathidae Group - All Pipefishes and Seahorses



(a) Syngnathidae Group - All Pipefishes and Seahorses



(b) Syngnathidae spp - Unidentified Pipefishes and Seahorses



(b) Syngnathidae spp - Unidentified Pipefishes and Seahorses



(c) Trachyrhamphus bicoarctata - Double-ended Pipefish



(c) Trachyrhamphus bicoarctata - Double-ended Pipefish



(d) Haliichthys taeniophorus - Ribboned Pipefish



(d) Haliichthys taeniophorus - Ribboned Pipefish



(e) Halicampus grayi - Gray's Pipefish



(e) Halicampus grayi - Gray's Pipefish



(f) Filicampus tigris - Tiger Pipefish



(f) Filicampus tigris - Tiger Pipefish



(g) Hippocampus zebra - Zebra Seahorse



(g) Hippocampus zebra - Zebra Seahorse



(h) Trachyrhamphus longirostris - Straightstick Pipefish



(h) Trachyrhamphus longirostris - Straightstick Pipefish



(i) Trachyrhamphus sp A - Pipefish



(i) Trachyrhamphus sp A - Pipefish



(j) Choeroichthys brachysoma - Pacific Short-bodied Pipefish



(j) Choeroichthys brachysoma - Pacific Short-bodied Pipefish



(k) Hippocampus queenslandicus - Queensland Seahorse



(k) Hippocampus queenslandicus - Queensland Seahorse



(l) Trachyrhamphus sp Short-tailed - Pipefish



(l) Trachyrhamphus sp Short-tailed - Pipefish



(m) Hippocampus histrix - Thorny Seahorse



(n) Hippocampus kuda - Spotted Seahorse



(o) Festucalex scalaris - Ladder Pipefish



(p) Syngnathoides biaculeatus - Alligator Pipefish



Figure 6-7: Following maps showing the catch records (grey circles represent a position where a species has been recorded; presence data) and overall catch rates (numbers per km^2) during the banana (Top) and tiger (Bottom) prawn seasons for the sawfishes; (a) All Sawfishes combined, (b) Unidentified Pristidae, (c) *Pristis zijsron*, (d) *Anoxypristis cuspidata*, (e) *Pristis pristis* and (f) *Pristis clavata*. Presence data includes all records from the crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program, NPF prawn population monitoring surveys and CSIRO scientific research and observer surveys in the NPF. Catch rate data only includes data collected from the crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program and the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys from 2002 to 2016. Map (g) only shows presence data as no individuals were caught from 2002 to 2016.

(a) Pristidae Group - All Sawfishes



(a) Pristidae Group - All Sawfishes



(b) Pristidae spp - Unidentified Sawfishes



(b) Pristidae spp - Unidentified Sawfishes



(c) Pristis zijsron - Green Sawfish



(c) Pristis zijsron - Green Sawfish



(d) Anoxypristis cuspidata - Narrow Sawfish



(d) Anoxypristis cuspidata - Narrow Sawfish



(e) Pristis pristis - Largetooth Sawfish



(e) Pristis pristis - Largetooth Sawfish



(f) Pristis clavata - Dwarf Sawfish



(f) Pristis clavata - Dwarf Sawfish



Figure 6-8: Following maps showing the catch records (grey circles represent a position where a species has been recorded; presence data) and overall catch rates (numbers per km^2) during the banana (Top) and tiger (Bottom) prawn seasons for the elasmobranch; (a) *Urogymnus asperrimus*. Presence data includes all records from the crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program, NPF prawn population monitoring surveys and CSIRO scientific research and observer surveys in the NPF. Catch rate data only includes data collected from the crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program and the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys from 2002 to 2016.

(a) Urogymnus asperrimus - Porcupine Ray



(a) Urogymnus asperrimus - Porcupine Ray



Figure 6-9: Following maps showing the catch records (grey circles represent a position where a species has been recorded; presence data) for the teleosts; (a) *Lepidotrigla spinosa* and (b) *Lepidotrigla* sp A. Presence data includes all records from the crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program, NPF prawn population monitoring surveys and CSIRO scientific research and observer surveys in the NPF from 1976 to 2016.

(a) Lepidotrigla spinosa - Shortfin Gurnard



(b) Lepidotrigla sp A - Gurnard



Figure 6-10: Following maps showing the catch records (grey circles represent a position where a species has been recorded; presence data) and overall catch rates (numbers per km^2) during the banana (Top) and tiger (Bottom) prawn seasons for the mantis shrimps; (a) *Dictyosquilla tuberculata* and (b) *Harpiosquilla stephensoni*. Presence data includes all records from the crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program, NPF prawn population monitoring surveys and CSIRO scientific research and observer surveys in the NPF. Catch rate data only includes data collected from the crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program and the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys from 2002 to 2016.

(a) Dictyosquilla tuberculata - Brown-striped Mantis Shrimp



(a) Dictyosquilla tuberculata - Brown-striped Mantis Shrimp



(b) Harpiosquilla stephensoni - Stephenson's Mantis Shrimp



(b) Harpiosquilla stephensoni - Stephenson's Mantis Shrimp



Raw catch data

Initially, mean catch rates (non-modelled) were plotted separately by ‘Region’ (Figure 6-11) and by ‘Year’ (Figure 6-12) for the crew-member observer, AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring data to assess and verify the quality of the crew-member observer data against the AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring data sets.

The catch rates recorded by the crew-member observers for the ‘unidentified' individuals for the sea snake and sawfish groups were generally higher than those recorded by AFMA scientific observers and during the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys (Table 6-9). This was a result of the difference in data recording procedures between the programs. Species identification was carried out by scientific observers onboard vessels during the AFMA scientific observer program and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys therefore resulting in a higher proportion of individuals identified to species (Table 6-9). The crew-member observers were trained more in the photographing and data recording of each individual but with some training aimed at identification of the larger more difficult species to photograph in field situations, such as marine turtles and sawfishes. The photographs collected were then later used by CSIRO scientific staff to identify all individuals to species. If photographs were not taken or the photographs did not aid in species identification, this would lead to lower species catch rates and higher catch rates for the unidentified individuals of a group reported by the crew-member observers.

The marine turtle group, both 'Unidentified Cheloniidae' and each species, showed quite varied mean catch rates across 'Regions' for each of the crew-member observer, AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring data sets (Figure 6-11). However, the mean catches across ‘Regions’ were relatively consistent between the three data sets. Most of the ‘Unidentified Cheloniidae’ catches from the crew-member observer program were recorded around the Karumba and eastern side of the Gulf of Carpentaria (‘Region’ 8 and 9). The crew-member observer program also recorded low mean catches of the two most common species, *Lepidochelys olivacea* and *Natator depressus*, in these two ‘Regions’. Catch rates across the 'Years' from 2012 to 2016 showed a distinct decline for the ‘Unidentified Cheloniidae’ group as crew-member observers improved in species identifications and data recording (photographs) (Figure 6-12). For the most common marine turtle, the Flatback Turtle (*Natator depressus*), there has been a downward trend in catch rates over 2011 to 2016 however were still within the range from earlier years. There were too few catch records of marine turtles from the AFMA scientific observer program and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys to show any trends across 'Regions' and 'Years' for comparison with the crew-member observer data (Figure 6-11; Figure 6-12).

The sea snakes were the most noticeable group that showed disparity between the crew-member observer and AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys in the proportion of individuals identified to species level (Table 6-9). The mean catch rate of 'Unidentified Hydrophiidae' was higher across all 'Regions' and all 'Years' for the crew-member observer program but reasonably similar between the AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring data sets (Figure 6-11; Figure 6-12). Therefore the actual catch rates recorded by the crew-member observer program for the more common sea snake species such as *Hydrophis elegans* and *Lapemis curtis*, would likely be slightly under-estimated due to the higher proportion of ‘Unidentified Hydrophiidae’ recorded.

There were strong similarities between the three data sets in the catch rates for most of the sea snake species. Although the actual values for catches in some 'Regions' and 'Years' were higher in one data set than others, the trends across 'Regions' and 'Years' showed consistency. There were some exceptions such as for *Hydrophis elegans*, *Hydrophis pacificus* and *Lapemis curtis*, where catches recorded from the AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys were similar between these two data sets but considerably higher than those recorded from the crew-member observer program (Figure 6-11; Figure 6-12). The catch rates for most sea snake species appeared to be stable or slightly increasing over the last three years; 2014 to 2016. One of the most common species; *Hydrophis elegans*, did show a distinct decline in catch rates from the AFMA scientific observer data compared to the crew-member observer and NPF prawn population monitoring survey data but not to levels lower than years prior to this.

The Syngnathidae group are quite difficult to identify with the exception of one common species; *Trachyrhamphus longirostris*. This resulted in a large number of 'Unidentified Syngnathidae' compared to the number of individuals identified to species level for all three data sets; crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys (Figure 6-11; Figure 6-12). The catch rates for both the 'Unidentified Syngnathidae' and *Trachyrhamphus longirostris* were generally comparable over ‘Region’ and ‘Years’ between the crew-member observer program and the AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys (Figure 6-11; Figure 6-12). This indicates that the crew-member observer program is quite successful at accurately recording catches of the Syngnathidae species which are often difficult to detect in trawl catches due to their small size and cryptic nature.

There were some discrepancies between the AFMA scientific observer program and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys where higher catch rates for the Syngnathidae species were recorded in one data set within some 'Regions' and 'Years’ but lower in others. There was no clear pattern in catch rates for any of the three data sets, however the crew-member observer data set showed more consistent catch rates across the 'Regions' and 'Years' compared to the AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring data sets (Figure 6-11; Figure 6-12). For *Trachyrhamphus longirostris*, trends in catch rates were more comparable. Apart from a few 'Regions' and 'Years' outliers, the crew-member observer program showed quite similar catch rate trends for this species to the AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring catch data.

The sawfishes were another group where the proportion of individuals identified to species were much lower in the crew-member observer program compared to the AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys (Table 6-9). The crew-member observer catches of 'Unidentified Pristidae' were therefore higher across most 'Regions' and 'Years' (Figure 6-11; Figure 6-12). The crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys recorded very few individuals of the Dwarf Sawfish (*Pristis clavata*). For the Green Sawfish (*Pristis zijsron*), mean catch rates were low across all 'Regions' and 'Years' but were generally similar between the crew-member observer and NPF prawn population monitoring data sets (Figure 6-11; Figure 6-12). There has been a very distinct decline in mean catch rates from 2013 to 2016 from the AFMA scientific observer program, however catch rates were also significantly higher over these years compared to the crew-member observer program and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys. The Largetooth Sawfish (*Pristis pristis*) appeared to show relatively low but stable catch rates over the last few years from 2013 to 2016.

The most common sawfish, *Anoxypristis cuspidata*, makes up about 97% of the catch composition for that group in the NPF (Brewer et al 2007). While the catch rates of this species recorded by the crew-member observer program were consistently lower than catches recorded during the AFMA scientific observer program and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys, when combined with the 'Unidentified Pristidae' catch, showed comparable catch rate trends across both ‘Regions’ and 'Years' from 2003 to 2016.

There were too few individuals recorded for the 'at risk' elasmobranch species (*Urogymnus asperrimus*) and no catches recorded for the two ‘at risk’ teleost species (*Lepidotrigla spinosa* and *Lepidotrigla* sp A) to show any catch rate trends across the 'Regions' and 'Years' for either the crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program or the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys (Figure 6-11; Figure 6-12).

The Squillidae species, *Dictyosquilla tuberculata* had higher catch rates recorded by the crew-member observer program across all ‘Years’ and within most 'Regions' except for ‘Regions’ along the east side of the Gulf of Carpentaria compared to the AFMA scientific observer program and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys (Figure 6-11; Figure 6-12). Catches have shown to be increasing significantly from 2009 when this species was added to the ‘at risk’ bycatch list to 2015. There was a marked decline in catch rates in 2014 and again in 2016, however 2015 catches were the highest of any year and the lower catch rates for these two later years were higher than what was recorded prior to 2012. The crew-member observer catches of *Harpiosquilla stephensoni* have been steadily increasing since 2009 to the highest for any year in 2016. However, catch rates recorded during the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys have been higher and in decline from 2012 to 2016.

Although there were some discrepancies in actual catch rates between the crew-member observer program and AFMA scientific observer program and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys, the trends in catch rates across 'Regions' and 'Years' were generally similar for many TEP and 'at risk' species. This indicates that the data recorded and collected from the crew-member observer program was reliable, especially in the last few years of data collection, in terms of identifying catch rate trends and for its use in sustainability assessments.

Table 6-9: Summary of the total numbers of individuals recorded and the percentage of those individuals identified to species level for each of the TEP and 'at risk' bycatch groups from each of the four data sources.

Data Source	Group	Total Number of Individual	Number Identified to Species	Percentage of Individuals Identified to Species																
				Pre-2002	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Mean
Crew-member Observer	Dolphin	1	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	0.0
	Turtle	310	193	-	-	45	100	-	29	40	80	17	80	73	63	68	77	78	70	62.3
	Sea Snake	17042	13650	-	-	63	72	79	77	55	30	43	55	84	78	96	88	95	95	80.1
	Syngnathidae	1294	1042	-	-	-	100	-	0	46	27	24	74	88	77	81	71	93	85	80.5
	Sawfish	981	793	-	-	61	86	100	68	29	40	60	57	89	84	90	98	96	90	80.8
	Elasmobranch	11	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	100	-	100	100	45.0
	Squillidae	32715	32460	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	54	100	100	100	100	100	100	99.2
AFMA Scientific Observer	Turtle	25	20	-	-	-	-	100	-	100	100	-	100	100	33	75	100	-	100	80.0
	Sea Snake	2217	2200	-	-	-	-	100	-	99	100	98	99	99	100	100	98	100	99	99.2
	Syngnathidae	344	160	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	5	91	67	33	66	92	73	60	97	46.5
	Sawfish	263	257	-	-	-	-	86	-	100	109	100	87	100	96	87	100	100	100	97.7
	Elasmobranch	5	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100	100.0
	Squillidae	455	455	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100.0
NPF Prawn Monitoring	Turtle	24	10	-	-	-	50	-	-	50	0	100	-	67	33	0	50	0	50	41.7
	Sea Snake	1738	1704	-	79	100	94	98	97	100	100	98	99	98	99	99	96	100	100	98.0
	Syngnathidae	146	101	-	0	100	0	-	-	25	35	75	67	50	84	62	60	94	100	69.2
	Sawfish	98	97	-	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	80	99.0
	Squillidae	112	112	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100	100	100	100	100	100.0
CSIRO Scientific Survey	Turtle	261	222	85	-	-	100	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	85.1
	Sea Snake	2719	2472	91	-	91	91	90	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	90.9
	Syngnathidae	71	60	86	-	-	50	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	84.5
	Sawfish	389	347	88	-	100	100	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	89.2
	Elasmobranch	9	9	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0

Modelled catch rate trends

Two stage models were then used to estimate the trend in catch rates through time for TEP and ‘at risk’ bycatch species caught during the crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys and where sample numbers were large enough for the models to fit. The probability of obtaining a non-zero catch was modelled using a GLM with Binomial response. The count, conditional on non-zero catch was then modelled using a GLM with a truncated Poisson distribution. In addition to ‘Year’ and ‘Effort’, the explanatory variables included in the final model were ‘Region’ and ‘Depth’. The same model forms and explanatory variables were used on the crew-member observer, AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring data sets. The ‘Year’ trend for each species was obtained by setting ‘Depth’ to the mean depth recorded (24m) and ‘Region’ to 6 (the ‘Region’ containing the most samples).

There were 11 species; eight sea snake species (*Aipysurus mosaicus*, *Aipysurus laevis*, *Astrotia stokesii*, *Disteira major*, *Hydrophis elegans*, *Hydrophis ornatus*, *Hydrophis pacificus* and *Lapemis curtis*), one syngnathid (*Trachyrhamphus longirostris*), one sawfish species (*Anoxypristis cuspidata*), and one invertebrate species (*Dictyosquilla tuberculata*) caught during the crew-member observer program that were able to be modelled for catch rate trends from 2003 to 2016. The 'Unidentified Pristidae' group was combined with the *Anoxypristis cuspidata* species; this species accounts for about 97% of all sawfish caught therefore nearly all of the 'Unidentified Pristidae' would likely be this species.

When the AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring data sets were combined, models were successfully fit to three species of sea snake; *Disteira major*, *Hydrophis elegans* and *Lapemis Curtis*, one species of sawfish; *Anoxypristis cuspidata*, and one species of syngnathid; *Trachyrhamphus longirostris*. This was due to the much smaller number of catch records in the AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring data sets for each species compared to the crew-member observer data set. Furthermore, the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys are only distributed within six 'Regions' while the AFMA scientific observer program was spread over the entire 10 'Regions'. The inclusion of the AFMA scientific observer data also expanded the model coverage across eight 'Regions' (addition of 'Regions' 1 and 2) instead of the six 'Regions' when only the NPF prawn population monitoring data was used.

The crew-member observer data for *Aipysurus mosaicus* showed a relatively stable catch rate trend across the 2003 to 2016 period with slightly higher catches of one individual per 30 – 50 km^2 in the earlier years (2004 and 2005) and again in 2016 (Figure 6-13). From 2009 to 2012, catches remained around one individual per 100 km^2 with catches increasing from 2013 to 2016.

There was a similar catch rate trend for *Aipysurus laevis* with the crew-member observer catches varying from one individual per 15 km^2 to one individual per 30 km^2 between 2003 and 2009, although the 95% confidence intervals around most of the means were large (Figure 6-14). In 2010, catch rates were lowest, at around one individual per 50 km^2, then steadily increasing to around one individual per 12 km^2 in 2015 and 2016.

The catch rate trend for *Astrotia stokesii* showed a steady decline from about one individual per 15 km^2 in 2003 to 2005 to one individual per 60 km^2 in 2010. From 2011 to 2015, there was a steady increase to similar levels seen in 2003 to 2005, with slightly lower catch rates of one individual per 20 km^2 in 2016 (Figure 6-15).

While catches for *Disteira major* during the crew-member observer program were generally quite stable overall, around one individual per 10 – 15 km^2 over the 2003 to 2016 period, there was a marked decline to one individual per 30 km^2 between 2006 to 2010 (Figure 6-16). The catch rate for 2008 was considerably lower than any other year however the sample size was also small. The catch rate trend over the last six years from the crew-member observer program has remained stable, one individual per 10 – 15 km^2. There were sufficient catch records on this species to fit models to the combined AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring data. Catches were consistently lower and less variable compared to the crew-member observer data (Figure 6-16). The annual mean catches were around one individual per 35 km^2 between 2003 and 2007 and during the last eight years catch rates were very stable around one individual per 50 km^2.

As *Hydrophis elegans* was one of the most common species of sea snakes recorded in the NPF, the models were successfully fit to both the crew-member observer data and the combined AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring data (Figure 6-17). Both data sets showed significant variability in catch rates over the period of 2003 to 2016 with large 95% confidence intervals in the earlier years. However, the trends for each data set were quite similar between 2003 and 2009 with an increase from around one individual per 10 km^2 in 2003 to a high of one individual per 5 km^2 in 2006 for the crew-member observer data and 2007 for the combined AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring data. From 2007 to 2011, catch rates dropped in both the crew-member observer data and combined AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring data to one individual per 15 – 20 km^2. Catches of *Hydrophis elegans* recorded from the crew-member observer program then steadily increased to a high of one individual per 5 km^2 in 2016 while catches recorded from the combined AFMA scientific observer program and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys were relatively stable at one individual per 15 – 20 km^2 over the same time period (Figure 6-17).

There was no clear shifting trend in the catch rates recorded by crew-member observers for *Hydrophis ornatus* from 2003 to 2016 (Figure 6-18). Although the 95% confidence intervals were large within most years, there was a slight decline in catch rate between 2009 and 2010 from around one individual per 40 – 50 km^2 to one individual per 70 – 100 km^2. This was followed by a steady increase in catches from 2011 to 2013 to the higher levels of one individual per 40 – 50 km^2 observed earlier in 2003 to 2006 and then remaining stable to 2016.

While catches were noticeably lower in 2010 (one individual per 200 km^2), the catch rates observed for *Hydrophis pacificus* between 2011 and 2016 were quite stable, around one individual per 50 – 60 km^2 (Figure 6-19). However, the 95% confidence intervals were also very large for all years, indicating high variability in catch rates within years.

The only other sea snake species where models were successfully fit to both the crew-member observer and the combined AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring data sets was, *Lapemis curtis*. Although there was considerable variability over the years from 2003 to 2016 and associated large 95% confidence intervals in catch rates over the 2003 to 2007 period for both the crew-member observer and combined AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring data sets, the trends across nearly all years showed quite strong similarities (Figure 6-20).

The catch rates recorded by the crew-member observer program for *Lapemis curtis* ranged from about one individual per 8 – 50 km^2 over the period of 2003 to 2016 (Figure 6-20). Although catch rates were high (one individual per 10 – 13 km^2) through the earlier years (2003 – 2007), they were also highly variable within years. This was followed by a significant drop in catch rates between 2007 and 2009 (one individual per 40 – 50 km^2). From 2010 onwards, there was then a steady increase observed to around 8 individuals per km^2 in 2016. The combined AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring data showed a similar range in catches however had much larger 95% confidence intervals around the means for most years (Figure 6-20). The catch rate trend from 2003 to 2016 followed a similar pattern except for the last year (2016) where catch rates remained stable around one individual per 20 – 25 km^2 rather than increasing as seen in the crew-member observer data.

Due to the overall low numbers of sawfish caught during the crew-member observer program and the low participation rate of crew-member observers in the period from 2007 to 2009, the model could only fit data from 2010 to 2016. The modelled catch rates for the combined 'Unidentified Pristidae' and *Anoxypristis cuspidata* catches recorded by the crew-member observers showed a slight declining trend across the years of 2010 to 2016, however this was not a significant decline (Figure 6-21). The catch rates seen in the combined AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring data showed a very similar trend for this species compared to the crew-member observer catches. There was also associated large 95% confidence intervals around the means for all years indicating highly variable catches within the years. Mean catch rates ranged from one individual per 30 km^2 in 2010 and 2011 to one individual per 50 km^2 in 2016.

Although a large proportion of the Syngnathidae catches were not identified to species, *Trachyrhamphus longirostris* is one of the few species that is easily identified and therefore catches would not be under-estimated by the 'Unidentified Syngnathidae' grouping. The crew-member observer catches have shown a general increasing trend from 2010 with about one individual per 50 km^2 to 2015 with one individual per 10 km^2 (Figure 6-22). A similar trend was also seen in the combined AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring data, although the catch rates were slightly higher and larger associated 95% confidence intervals around the means for all years indicating highly variable catches within the years. There was a deviation from the increasing catch trend in 2014 and again in 2016, with catch rates declining to levels seen across the 2010 to 2012 period.

The only invertebrate species with crew-member observer sample numbers high enough to be modelled for catch rate trends; *Dictyosquilla tuberculata*, showed a general increase in catch rates between 2010 and 2015 from around one individual per 20 km^2 to greater than one individual per km^2 (Figure 6-23). Similar to the pattern seen for the syngnathid, *Trachyrhamphus longirostris*, there was a decline in the catch rates in 2014 and 2016 to levels observed in the 2010 to 2011 period (one individual per 10 – 20 km^2). The significant increase in catch rates from 2010 to 2015 for both *Trachyrhamphus longirostris* and *Dictyosquilla tuberculata* are likely partly due to the improvements of the crew-member observers in identifying and recording these small species that are often difficult to spot in the large catches of trawl bycatch that is landed.

For the remaining TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species where models could not be fit to any of the data sets; crew-member observer, AFMA scientific observer or NPF prawn population monitoring data, the trends in catches over the 2003 to 2016 period could only be inferred by examining the unmodelled catch data in Figure 6-11 and Figure 6-12.

Figure 6-11: Mean catch rates (numbers per km^2) of the TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species from the (a) crew-member observer program (red points), (b) AFMA scientific observer program (blue points) and (c) NPF prawn population monitoring surveys (black points) by 'Regions' from 2003 to 2016.




A. cuspidata
P. pristis
P. clavata
U. asperrimus
Mean catch rate (number/ km^2)
Region
0.0
0.5
1.0
1.5
0.00
0.02
0.04
0.06
0.08
0.01
0.03
0.05
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10


Syngnathidae
H. histrix
T. bicoarctata
H. taeniophorus
Mean catch rate (number/ km2)
Region
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
0 2 4 6 8 10
0.00 0.01 0.02 0.03 0.04 0.05
0.00 0.02 0.04 0.06 0.08


H. grayi
H. kuda
C. brachysoma
F. scalaris
Mean catch rate (number/ km^2)
Region
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
0.00 0.02 0.04 0.06
0.00 0.01 0.02 0.03 0.04 0.05
0.00 0.05 0.10 0.15 0.20


F. tigris
H. zebra
S. biaculeatus
T. longirostris
Mean catch rate (number/ km2)
Region
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10


H. queenslandicus
Trachyrhamphus sp A
Trachyrhamphus sp short-Tailed
Cheloniidae
Mean catch rate (number/ km2)
Region
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
0.00 0.01 0.02 0.03 0.04 0.05 0.06
0.00 0.05 0.10 0.15 0.20


C. caretta
C. mydas
E. imbricata
L. olivacea
Mean catch rate (number/ km²)
Region
0.00
0.01
0.02
0.03
0.04
0.05
0.06
0.08
0.10
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10


N. depressus
Hydrophiidae
A. peronii
A. duboisii
Mean catch rate (number/ km2)
Region
0.00
0.02
0.04
0.06
0.08
0.10
0.12
0.0
0.1
0.2
0.3
0.4
0.05
0.15
0.20
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10


A. mosaicus
A. laevis
A. stokesii
D. kingii
Mean catch rate (number/ km²)
Region
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
0.0 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5
0.00 0.05 0.10 0.15 0.20 0.25


D. major
E. schistosa
H. caerulescens
H. elegans
Mean catch rate (number/ km2)
Region
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10


H. mcdowelli
H. ornatus
H. pacificus
L. curtis
Mean catch rate (number/ km^2)
Region
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
0.00 0.05 0.10 0.15 0.20 0.25
0.0 0.5 1.0 1.5
0.0 0.5 1.0 1.5 2.0 2.5


P. platurus
Mean catch rate (number/ km2)
0.00
0.05
0.10
0.15
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Region
Delphinidae
Mean catch rate (number/ km2)
0.00
0.02
0.04
0.06
0.08
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Region

Figure 6-12: Mean catch rates (numbers per km^2) of the TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species from the (a) crew-member observer program (red points), (b) AFMA scientific observer program (blue points) and (c) NPF prawn population monitoring surveys (black points) by 'Year' for 'Regions' 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 10.




A. cuspidata
P. pristis
P. clavata
U. asperrimus
Mean catch rate (number/ km2)
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016


Syngnathidae
H. histrix
T. bicoarctata
H. taeniophorus
Mean catch rate (number/ km2)
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016


H. grayi
H. kuda
C. brachysoma
F. scalaris
Mean catch rate (number/ km2)
0.00
0.05
0.10
0.15
0.01
0.02
0.03
0.04
0.06
0.08
0.12
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016


F. tigris
H. zebra
S. biaculeatus
T. longirostris
Mean catch rate (number/ km2)
0.00
0.02
0.04
0.06
0.08
0.10
0.12
0.01
0.03
0.05
0.0
0.5
1.0
1.5
2.0
2.5
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016


H. queensladicus
Trachyrhamphus sp A
Trachyrhamphus sp short-Tailed
Cheloniidae
Mean catch rate (number/ km^2)
0.00
0.01
0.02
0.03
0.04
0.05
0.06
0.10
0.15
0.20
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016


C. caretta
C. mydas
E. imbricata
L. olivacea
Mean catch rate (number/ km^2)
0.00
0.01
0.02
0.03
0.04
0.05
0.06
0.07
0.08
0.10
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016


N. depressus
Hydrophiidae
A. peronii
A. duboisii
Mean catch rate (number/ km2)
0.00
0.05
0.10
0.15
0.20
0.0
0.1
0.2
0.3
0.4
0.5
0.02
0.04
0.06
0.08
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016


A. mosaicus
A. laevis
A. stokesii
D. kingii
Mean catch rate (number/ km2)
2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016
0.00 0.05 0.10 0.15
0.00 0.05 0.10 0.15 0.20 0.25
0.0 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4
0.00 0.02 0.04 0.06 0.08 0.10 0.12


D. major
E. schistosa
H. caerulescens
H. elegans
Mean catch rate (number/ km^2)
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016


H. mcdowelli
H. ornatus
H. pacificus
L. curtis
Mean catch rate (number/ km^2)
0.00 0.02 0.04 0.06 0.08 0.10 0.12
0.0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8
0.00 0.05 0.10 0.15 0.20 0.25 0.30
0.0 0.5 1.0 1.5 2.0 2.5
2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016


P. platurus
Mean catch rate (number/ km^2)
0.00
0.05
0.10
0.15
0.20
0.25
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016
Delphinidae
Mean catch rate (number/ km^2)
0.00
0.02
0.04
0.06
0.08
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016



Figure 6-13: Trends in mean catch rate (numbers per km²) with 95% confidence intervals for the sea snake; *Aipysurus mosaicus*, based on a depth of 24 m and in 'Region' 6 from the crew-member observer program (red points) from 2003 to 2016.



Figure 6-14: Trends in mean catch rate (numbers per km^2) with 95% confidence intervals for the sea snake; *Aipysurus laevis*, based on a depth of 24 m and in 'Region' 6 from the crew-member observer program (red points) from 2003 to 2016.



Figure 6-15: Trends in mean catch rate (numbers per km^2) with 95% confidence intervals for the sea snake; *Astrotia stokesii*, based on a depth of 24 m and in 'Region' 6 from the crew-member observer program (red points) from 2003 to 2016.



Figure 6-16: Trends in mean catch rate (numbers per km^2) with 95% confidence intervals for the sea snake; *Disteira major*, based on a depth of 24 m and in 'Region' 6 from the crew-member observer program (red points) and the AFMA scientific observer program and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys combined (black points) from 2003 to 2016.



Figure 6-17: Trends in mean catch rate (numbers per km^2) with 95% confidence intervals for the sea snake; *Hydrophis elegans*, based on a depth of 24 m and in 'Region' 6 from the crew-member observer program (red points) and the AFMA scientific observer program and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys combined (black points) from 2003 to 2016.



Figure 6-18: Trends in mean catch rate (numbers per km²) with 95% confidence intervals for the sea snake; *Hydrophis ornatus*, based on a depth of 24 m and in 'Region' 6 from the crew-member observer program (red points) from 2003 to 2016.



Figure 6-19: Trends in mean catch rate (numbers per km²) with 95% confidence intervals for the sea snake; *Hydrophis pacificus*, based on a depth of 24 m and in 'Region' 6 from the crew-member observer program (red points) from 2010 to 2016.



Figure 6-20: Trends in mean catch rate (numbers per km^2) with 95% confidence intervals for the sea snake; *Lapemis curtis*, based on a depth of 24 m and in 'Region' 6 from the crew-member observer program (red points) and the AFMA scientific observer program and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys combined (black points) from 2003 to 2016.



Figure 6-21: Trends in mean catch rate (numbers per km²) with 95% confidence intervals for the sawfishes; 'Unidentified Pristidae' and *Anoxypristis cuspidata* combined, based on a depth of 24 m and in 'Region' 6 from the crew-member observer program (red points) and the AFMA scientific observer program and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys combined (black points) from 2010 to 2016.



Figure 6-22: Trends in mean catch rate (numbers per km^2) with 95% confidence intervals for the Straightstick Pipefish; *Trachyrhamphus longirostris*, based on a depth of 24 m and in 'Region' 6 from the crew-member observer program (red points) and the AFMA scientific observer program and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys combined (black points) from 2010 to 2016.



Figure 6-23: Trends in mean catch rate (numbers per km^2) with 95% confidence intervals for the Brown-striped Mantis Shrimp; *Dictyosquilla tuberculata*, based on a depth of 24 m and in 'Region' 6 from the crew-member observer program (red points) from 2010 to 2016.

Crew-member and AFMA observer coverage levels; 2003 – 2016

The number of NPF crew participating in the crew-member observer program has significantly increased since 2010 (Table 5-2; Figure 6-24 a). From a low of between three to seven observers during the 2006 to 2010 tiger prawn season surveying 500 to 1,300 trawls per year, the participation rate has increased to eight to 11 crew-member observers annually over the last six years. This has also led to an increase in the number of trawls surveyed by crew-member observers, from about 1,400 in 2009 and 2010, around 2,900 in 2011 and 2012, over 3,000 in 2013 and 2014, around 3,000 in 2015 and 2,700 in 2016. This consistent level of coverage has met or exceeded the recommended crew-member observer coverage required to successfully assess the sustainability of bycatch species in the NPF (Brewer et al 2007).

The majority of crew-member observer coverage in the NPF has been during tiger prawn seasons. In 2004 there were four crew-member observers recording catches of TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species during the banana prawn season from about 310 trawls (Figure 6-24 a). Not until 2011 was there any more coverage of the banana prawn season. From 2011 to 2013, between one and four crew-member observers have recorded data from a total of approximately 800 trawls surveyed during the banana prawn seasons. Over the last three years, 2014 to 2016, there have been between one and three crew-member observers recording catch data from around 900 trawls during the banana prawn season.

For the July 2017 crew-member training workshop, 12 NPF crew were recruited for the 2017 tiger prawn and 2018 banana prawn seasons.

The AFMA scientific observers have recorded catches of TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species from 2005 to 2016. Although the spatial and temporal coverage by the AFMA scientific observers were much lower overall compared to the crew-member observers, there was a more even spread of trawls recorded between the banana and tiger prawn seasons (Table 5-2; Figure 6-24 b). During the 2005 to 2016 banana prawn seasons, there were between two and five vessels boarded annually by AFMA scientific observers resulting in 65 to 245 trawls per year surveyed for TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species. In the 2005 to 2016 tiger prawn seasons, three to nine vessels were boarded and 140 to 433 trawls surveyed annually by AFMA scientific observers. This level of coverage has also met or exceeded the recommended scientific observer coverage required to successfully assess the sustainability of bycatch species in the NPF (Brewer et al 2007).



Figure 6-24: Plot of (a) number of crew-member observers (line) that participated in the crew-member observer program and the total number of prawn trawls (bar) that were recorded by the crew-member observers from 2003 to 2016 and (b) number of vessels AFMA scientific observers boarded (line) and total number of prawn trawls (bar) that were recorded by AFMA scientific observers for both the banana and tiger prawn seasons.

7. DISCUSSION

Data Collection

Brewer et al (2007) estimated from analytical power calculations that a minimum of ten crew-member observers and one AFMA scientific observer were required to collect catch data from at least 2,350 trawls each year to detect declines in the TEP and ‘at risk’ bycatch species. Between 2005 and 2008, the crew-member observer program had a participation level of no more than about half this level; three to six observers and 450 to 1,320 trawl records in any given year (Table 5-2). This fell considerably short of the minimum level of coverage that is required for the crew-member observer program to detect significant catch rate changes in the TEP and ‘at risk’ bycatch species. Furthermore, a high proportion of the catch records in these years could not be identified to species level, making the data of limited use. This caused some data quality issues that had to be taken into account for the catch rate trend analyses of TEP and ‘at risk’ bycatch species for the first 2009 Bycatch Sustainability Assessment (Fry et al 2009).

One of the main issues was the apparent inconsistency between the crew-member observer data and the AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring data sets. This was partly due to the disparities in the data at a species level from differences in the proportion of individuals identified to species for each of the data sets. For example, nearly 100% of all sea snakes and 100% of the sawfishes were identified to species from the AFMA scientific observer program and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys in the years 2003 to 2008 (see Table 6-9). However, in some years of the crew-member observer program only 30 – 55% of sea snakes and 30 – 60% of sawfishes were identified to species as there was a lack of associated photographs with the catch data and scientific staff could not verify the species.

Participation levels for both the crew-member observer and AFMA scientific observer programs improved during the 2009 to 2013 period for the second 2014 Bycatch Sustainability Assessment (Fry et al 2015). Furthermore, the previous data quality issues had been addressed through more rigorous training at the annual crew-member observer workshops. This led to more robust catch data being collected through the crew-member observer program. For example, the proportions of sea snakes and sawfishes being successfully identified to species rose to 80 – 95% and 85 – 90%, respectively for the crew-member observer program during this period. The number of crew-member observers increased to at least 12 per year and collected catch data from between 2900 and 3600 trawls per year. This increase in catch detections since the first Bycatch Sustainability Assessment in 2009 (Fry et al 2009) led to a larger number of TEP and ‘at risk’ bycatch species being analysed for catch rate trends. In the 2009 assessment, there were only two sea snake species (*Hydrophis elegans* and *Lapemis curtis*) and one sawfish species (*Anoxypristis cuspidata*) that had enough detections to allow modelling of catch rate trends. In the 2014 assessment, there were 11 species; seven sea snakes (*Aipysurus mosaicus, Aipysurus laevis, Astrotia stokesii*, *Disteira major*, *Hydrophis elegans*, *Hydrophis ornatus* and *Lapemis curtis*), one syngnathid (*Trachyrhamphus longirostris*), one sawfish (*Anoxypristis cuspidata*) and two invertebrates (*Dictyosquilla tuberculata* and *Solenocera australiana*) and the 'Unidentified Hydrophiidae' group.

Over the last three years (2014 – 2016), the crew-member observer and AFMA scientific observer programs have continued to improve in its performance with consistent reliable data collection methods and maintained its level of coverage for the banana prawn and tiger prawn seasons. This resulted in meeting or exceeding the recommended levels of fishery coverage annually required to successfully assess the sustainability of bycatch species in the NPF.

With the additional crew-member observer data collected from the 2014 to 2016 banana prawn and tiger prawn seasons, it was possible to model catch rate trends for eight sea snake species (*Aipysurus mosaicus*, *Aipysurus laevis*, *Astrotia stokesii*, *Disteira major*, *Hydrophis elegans*, *Hydrophis ornatus*, *Hydrophis pacificus* and *Lapemis curtis*), one syngnathid (*Trachyrhamphus longirostris*), one sawfish (*Anoxypristis cuspidata*) and one invertebrate species (*Dictyosquilla tuberculata*).

However, there are still many TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species that were not able to be modelled in this 2017 Bycatch Sustainability Assessment. This is because the number of catch data records for many of these is still quite low, even for species that have been recorded since the start of the crew-member observer program. Some groups (turtles, sawfishes and sea snakes) have been recorded by crew-member observers in the NPF since the programs' introduction in 2003. These species have also been regularly monitored during the AFMA scientific observer program from 2005 and the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys from 2002. However, for the syngnathids (TEP), elasmobranch, small teleost and invertebrate ‘at risk’ bycatch species, catches have only been monitored by crew-member observers, CSIRO and AFMA scientific observers since 2006 (syngnathids and elasmobranchs), 2009 (invertebrates) or 2011 (teleosts).

Sustainability of bycatch species in the NPF

As the NPF has been operating for more than 40 years, there is no true baseline for catch rates for any of these species. Trends in catch rates of TEP and ‘at risk’ bycatch species over time are confounded by the continuous changes that have occurred over the fishery’s lifetime; such as changes in fishing power, gears, timing of the fishing seasons, size of the fleet and commercial effort distribution. One of the major effects on catches of some TEP species, such as marine turtles and some large elasmobranchs, over the history of the fishery has been the introduction of TEDs and BRDs in prawn trawl nets (Brewer et al 2004; Brewer et al 2006). The introduction of these devices was made mandatory for all NPF vessels in 2000 and 2001, respectively. Some species are also impacted by other activities in northern Australia. For example, marine turtles or their eggs are a traditional food source for indigenous people in northern Australia and SE Asia; and increasing coastal developments can potentially impact turtle nesting sites along the Australian coasts. Sawfish species are impacted by the Queensland N3 and N9 gillnet fisheries that operate in the coastal waters of north Queensland (Peverell 2005) and the development of coastal mining operations in the far north may have an impact on sawfish populations and their nursery habitats.

Detecting changes in the catch rates, and therefore abundance, of these rare bycatch species has proven to be difficult in multispecies tropical trawl fisheries where the bycatch component of catches is usually very species diverse. Several previous studies have used quantitative approaches to assess the risk to trawling for a range of species caught as bycatch in the NPF (Brewer et al 2007; Zhou and Griffiths 2008; Zhou et al 2009a). From a power analysis of trawl data, Brewer et al (2007) estimated the levels of fishery-dependent sampling effort required to detect declines in catch rates of prawn trawl bycatch. They suggested that between 15,536 and 24,933 trawls were required to be able to detect a 20% drop in catches for rare bycatch species (< 0.1 individuals/ha^{-1} or < 10 individuals/km^2) over one year with a power of 90% and a level of significance of 5%. They concluded that the power to detect even quite large declines in catch rates of the rarely caught species would only be possible after some years (e.g. 5 – 10 years) of modest-sized annual surveys.

Over the three year period from 2011 to 2013, the total number of trawls surveyed by the crew-member observer program has reached about 10,000 trawls. This level of coverage has been maintained over the years of this bycatch assessment period (2014 – 2016) with more than 9,500 trawls surveyed. In the years previous to this however, the crew-member observer program only surveyed about 400 to 1,300 trawls each year. This improvement has led to an increase in the number of the more common TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species being assessed for changes in catch rate trends. In addition, the continued improvements in training of the crew-member observers has also resulted in more robust data collection and recording. This is evident from the catch records for groups such as the syngnathids and ‘at risk’ invertebrates where catch rates were consistent between the crew-member observer program and the AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys. Therefore the crew-member observer program has been effective at accurately recording catches of these TEP and ‘at risk’ bycatch species which are often difficult to detect in trawl catches due to their small size and cryptic nature.

The initial analysis of the AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring data in this and the previous NPF bycatch assessment found that these data sets were relatively consistent in catch rate trends with the crew-member observer data collected over the last few years and it appears that there is little evidence of under-reporting of the species by the crew-member observer program. Furthermore, the modelled catch rate trends using only the crew-member observer data for the three most commonly caught species of sea snakes (*Disteira major*, *Hydrophis elegans* and *Lapemis curtis*), one species of sawfish (*Anoxypristis cuspidata*) and one species of syngnathid (*Trachyrhamphus longirostris*) were generally similar to the modelled catch rate trends when the AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring data sets were combined. For these five species at least, the crew-member observer data can be demonstrated to be statistically similar to the fishery-independent scientific data (AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring) and of sufficient quality to be used in scientific catch rate trend analysis.

Marine turtles

There were five species of marine turtles recorded within the NPF region. Most turtle species are known to be highly migratory and widely distributed, occurring in most tropical waters of the Indo-Pacific region. However, there is one endemic species to northern Australia, *Natator depressus* with this species being the most common species recorded in the NPF.

It is difficult to quantify the effect of trawling on turtle populations with other impacts such as indigenous hunting for food, egg collecting and disruptions to turtle nesting sites caused by coastal infrastructure progress and other impacts such as pollution and ghost-fishing. However, since the introduction of Turtle Excluder Devices in the NPF in 2000, catches of turtles have declined significantly (Brewer et al 2006). The mortality of turtles from commercial trawling has also been significantly reduced due to the effectiveness of TEDs at quickly removing these animals from the prawn trawl catch once they enter the net opening and travel down the net throat.

Brewer et al (2006) showed that TEDs were very effective at reducing the catches of turtles; excluding 99 – 100% of turtles from prawn nets with TEDs installed. Brewer et al (2004) reported that all of the types of TEDs assessed for turtle exclusion rates were very effective at significantly reducing catches of this group in a range of different regions and under a variety of weather conditions. A similar study by Robins et al (2003) found that the most common species caught in the NPF was *Natator depressus* (60%) and *Lepidochelys olivacea* (29%) and reported a reduction of more than 95% in turtle catches when TEDs were installed in prawn nets. It has been estimated that since the introduction of TEDs in the NPF, turtle catches have decreased from about 5,000 – 6,000 per year (Poiner and Harris 1996; Robins et al 2003) to less than 30 (Brewer et al 2004). Furthermore, Poiner and Harris (1996) reported about 10 – 18% of turtles caught drowned and another 50% damaged by prawn trawl nets prior to the introduction of TEDs in the NPF while Robins et al (2003) estimated about 22% of turtles caught in nets without TEDs die. With the introduction of TEDs, this level of undesirable impact has been reduced to less than 0.5% of the turtles previously caught and prawn trawling is now an insignificant source of turtle mortality (Brewer et al 2004).

Our results showed that the marine turtles had a widespread distribution across northern Australia and mean catch rates were variable across 'Regions' and 'Years' in each of the three data sets. Although the catch rates were also low due to the use of TEDs during the crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys, there appeared to be a decline in raw catch rates reported from the crew-member observer program over the period of 2011 and 2016 for the Flatback Turtle (*Natator depressus*). This decline was only seen in the crew-member observer data and to levels not lower than seen in previous years. Furthermore, there appeared to be no general decline in catches for any of the five turtle species or the 'Unidentified Cheloniidae' group from the AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring data.

As this group is listed as protected species in the EPBC Act 1999, any interactions with fishing activities in the NPF needs to be recorded. Therefore, continued monitoring by fishery-dependent and fishery-independent programs is required. However, due to the effectiveness of TEDs in the fishery, it is unlikely that sufficient catch data will be recorded in future to carry out a robust catch rate trend assessment on these species. Brewer et al (2007) concluded that between 24,000 and 124,000,000 trawls were needed to detect an annual decline in catches of turtles in the NPF when TEDs were used. There is already strong evidence that indicates current commercial prawn trawling practices of using TEDs has minimal impact on their populations.

Sea snakes

There are approximately 30 species of sea snakes occurring in northern Australia, about half of which are endemic to this region (Stobutzki et al 2000). There are 20 species of sea snakes reported within the NPF region with 14 of these recorded by the crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program or NPF prawn population monitoring surveys. A number of survival studies have shown that sea snake mortality, both within-trawl and post-trawl deaths, from commercial prawn trawling is about 48 – 60% of all snakes caught (Wassenberg et al 1994; Ward 1996; Stobutzki et al 2000; Wassenberg et al 2001). The survival of sea snakes depended on a number of factors; when the snake enters the net, weight of the total catch, how snakes are treated post-capture, the species and its morphology and most importantly, duration of trawl (Stobutzki et al 2000). They reported that trawls over three hours duration resulted in sea snake mortality rates of up to 75%. Furthermore, a study on life-history traits of sea snakes showed that this group may be highly susceptible to trawling (Fry et al 2001). They found that trawl catches were comprised of a significantly greater proportion of females to males for most species. However, most of the sea snakes caught were mature – 67% for males and 89% for females – and few juvenile snakes were recorded within commercial prawn trawl grounds. Sea snakes are also live-bearers and produce few offspring every year; between 3 and 20 young per clutch. The females of most species, with the exception of *Aipysurus mosaicus*, gave birth in the months of February to March, which does not overlap with the current prawn trawling seasons.

It has been shown that TEDs and BRDs that are currently used in the commercial fleet, and their placement within nets, have very little effect (< 5% reduction) on the catches of sea snakes (Brewer et al 2004; Brewer et al 2006; Milton et al 2008). In the 2004 to 2006 tiger prawn seasons, Milton et al (2009a) assessed the performance of currently used BRDs by asking commercial fishers to change the positioning of these devices closer to the codend. They found that a reduction in sea snake catches of at least 43% was achievable when the Fisheye BRD was set at 66 meshes compared to 120 meshes from the codend drawstring. Furthermore, trials of a new BRD, the Popeye Fishbox, by AFMA scientific observers on commercial vessels showed this device reduced catches of sea snakes by 85% when set at 70 meshes from the drawstring. The implementation of more effective BRD's, at a position closer to the drawstring is likely to be an effective measure in further reducing catches of sea snakes by commercial prawn trawlers in the NPF.

A number of studies, including this NPF bycatch assessment, have shown that the distributions and catch rates of each species are spatially and temporally patchy within the NPF (Heatwole 1975; Redfield et al 1978; Wassenberg et al 1994; Ward 1996; Stobutzki et al 2000; Fry et al 2001; Milton et al 2008, Fry et al 2015). Stobutzki et al (2000) showed that from research trawling in the Gulf of Carpentaria, catch rates for *Hydrophis elegans* slightly declined between 1989 and 1998, along with three other species; *Disteira kingii*, *Disteira major* and *Hydrophis mcdowelli*. These species also appeared to prefer open habitats with flat bottom, typical of prawn trawl grounds. However, catch rates for the more reef-associated species; *Aipysurus* and *Astrotia* species, remained relatively stable over the same period (Stobutzki et al 2000). They did show that there were some regional differences in sea snake catch rate trends over time. Within most regions there was little change in the overall mean catch rates except for Weipa where catches have halved from the 1989 to the 1996 – 98 period. The species compositions at Groote, Mornington and Weipa regions had also changed over this time. There was no marked changes in the distribution and catch rates of the sea snakes from this NPF bycatch assessment to the previous 2014 NPF bycatch assessment (Fry et al 2015). There was also little change in the fishery effort distribution for the crew-member observer program over the reporting period of 2011 – 2013 to 2014 – 2016.

There have also been several studies investigating the susceptibility of sea snakes to trawling using risk assessment analysis. Milton (2001) used a ranking matrix of susceptibility to trawling and capacity of populations to recover from impact on the sea snake species in the NPF. He identified two species to be at higher risk to trawling; *Disteira kingii* and *Hydrophis pacificus*. Although *Disteira kingii* populations showed a higher capacity to recover than most species, it was the second most susceptible species to trawling due to its restricted distribution (Milton 2001). *Hydrophis pacificus* showed a restricted distribution within the Gulf of Carpentaria and nearby regions and favoured potential trawl ground habitats (Milton 2001). In a similar study, Milton et al (2008) used a quantitative risk assessment to quantify the impacts of trawling on populations of sea snakes in the NPF. Using research and commercial trawl catch data from 1976 to 2007, they showed that the abundances of most species of sea snakes in the NPF have been relatively stable over the last 30 years. The two species that had localised catch distributions in the NPF, *Disteira kingii* and *Hydrophis pacificus* (Milton 2001), showed evidence of recent declines in abundance on commercial prawn trawling grounds (Milton et al 2008). However, these fishing grounds only accounted for an estimated 16% of their available habitat within the NPF managed area.

There has been a considerable amount of catch data collected up to now from the current crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys. The distribution and catch data collected by these programs for this assessment has shown that both of these two species show a relatively restricted distribution through the NPF region with abundances higher in the coastal regions within the high commercial effort areas of the fishery. For *Disteira kingii*, catch rates varied considerably from 2003 to 2016 and between the three data collection programs with no clear trend evident. The catch rates over time for *Hydrophis pacificus* have been relatively steady over the last few years in the crew-member observer program. However, there has been a steady increase in catches of *Hydrophis pacificus* from 2004 to 2012 followed by a marked decline in catch rates over the last four years recorded from the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys.

Milton et al (2008) also estimated an index of fishing mortality for each species of sea snake and compared these to a conservative sustainable trawl impact reference point of half their natural mortality rate. They concluded that trawl mortalities for most species were low (less than 2.6% per year), and below the reference points for each species. *Hydrophis pacificus* had the highest estimated mean fishing mortality but this was less than half the sustainable trawl impact reference point. Therefore, they concluded that no species appeared to be at risk at current levels of fishing effort in the commercial fishery (Milton et al 2008). This is a result supported by this NPF bycatch sustainability assessment, where no sea snake species appeared to show any significant decline in catch rates over time.

A recent study by Zhou et al (2009b) developed an integrated approach to investigate the fishing impact on population sustainability of rare sea snake species. This approach involved developing a quantitative sustainability assessment coupled with population trends modelling. The sustainability assessment component used simple detection-nondetection data for population estimation and linked sustainability to simple life-history traits. They applied the approach to assess the sustainability of 14 species of sea snakes incidentally caught in the NPF. Their results indicated that the risks to population sustainability and extinction for each sea snake species from fishing was mitigated by the distribution of individuals in unfished areas, their low catch rate, and some post-trawl survival (Zhou et al 2009b). The estimated mean fishing mortality rate was low for all species in that study, but there was also high uncertainty. They concluded that none of the 14 sea snake species in the NPF were found to be unsustainable at current fishing intensity levels. However, they did recommend periodical reviews of sea snake sustainability if fishing intensity and effort distribution patterns change (Zhou et al 2009b). Given that the commercial fishing effort distribution has not changed markedly over the last few years (see Figure 6-1 and Figure 6-2), it is likely that there has been no change to the susceptibility of the sea snake species in the NPF.

These studies appear to support our results on the susceptibility of sea snakes to trawling in the NPF. This current assessment did not identify any sea snake species that are likely to be adversely impacted by trawling in the NPF. There was a general trend in the crew-member observer data of lower catch rates across the 2007 to 2010 period for many species. This coincided with a high in catch rates during the same period for the 'Unidentified Hydrophiidae' group, which can be explained by the poorer quality of data provided by the crew-member observers from 2007 to 2010. However, over the last three years (2014 – 2016) there has been a noticeable decline in recordings of the ‘Unidentified Hydrophiidae’ group to only slightly higher than seen in the AFMA scientific observer program or NPF prawn population monitoring surveys. This indicates that the crew-member observer program is collecting robust and reliable data on the sea snakes for the NPF bycatch sustainability assessment.

From the crew-member observer data collected between 2014 and 2016, most of the species showed no clear declines in catch rates. Catch rates appeared to slightly increase for many species such as *Acalyptophis peronii*, *Aipysurus mosaicus*, *Aipysurus laevis*, *Astrotia stokesii*, *Disteira major*, *Hydrophis elegans* and *Lapemis curtis*. There were only two species that showed slight declines in crew-member observer catch rates over the 2014 to 2016 period; *Hydrophis mcdowelli* and *Hydrophis ornatus*. However, this was not supported from the AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring results for *Hydrophis mcdowelli*. The catch rates reported during the AFMA scientific observer program and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys for *Hydrophis ornatus* over this period did show a similar slight decline, except for the high 2015 catch from the AFMA scientific observer program. The distribution of this species however was widespread across the NPF and not restricted within the current inshore commercial fishing effort distribution.

Although there was insufficient data to undertake robust catch rate trend analysis for all of the sea snake species recorded in the NPF, the observed catch distributions and mean catch rates recorded suggested that catches for most species were relatively stable or increasing over the time period of 2002 to 2016. Brewer et al (2007) reported that to detect declines of 50% over five years for the nine most common sea snake species would require using ten crew-member observers and one AFMA scientific observer (2,350 trawls). To detect changes for the 11 most common species of sea snakes would require at least 15 crew-member observers and three AFMA scientific observers and more than 8,400 trawls. These recommended levels of coverage have been met by the crew-member observer and AFMA scientific observer programs for the last six years and have provided robust and reliable data to assess eight sea snake species in this assessment with none of these species shown to have significant declining catch trends.

As the sea snake group is also listed as protected species under the EPBC Act 1999, any interactions with fishing activities in the NPF needs to be recorded. Therefore, continued monitoring by fishery-dependent and fishery-independent programs is required to obtain sufficient catch data to undertake a robust catch rate trend analysis for each of the species.

Syngnathids

There have been at least 14 species of syngnathids recorded within the NPF region. Some of the species have only been recorded from historical CSIRO scientific research and observer surveys. However, there are 10 species recorded during the crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys within the NPF region. There were very low numbers of catch records available for all but the most common species; *Trachyrhamphus longirostris*. The low catch rates for most of the syngnathid species was due to the difficulty in identifying individuals to species and the requirement to release the individual quickly once captured (all Syngnathidae species are listed as protected under the EPBC Act 1999).

Most of the syngnathid individuals caught during the earlier CSIRO scientific research and observer surveys where fresh specimens that could be identified on board whereas the method used to record species of syngnathids caught during the crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys was to photograph each individual and identify it later in the laboratory from the photograph. Photographing specimens is not a reliable method of species identification for this group as there is considerable variation in colour and morphology within most species of syngnathids. This led to a high proportion of syngnathid catches recorded only to 'Unidentified Syngnathidae' and under-reporting of individuals at a species level.

For the most common species where catch rate trend analysis was possible, *Trachyrhamphus longirostris*, there were differences in catch rates between the data recorded by the crew-member observers, AFMA scientific observers and in NPF prawn population monitoring surveys. Since 2012, catches reported in the AFMA scientific observer program and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys have been steadily decreasing while catches reported by the crew-member observer program have been lower and more stable over that period.

Brewer et al (2007) did not assess the number of trawls needed to detect declines in catches of the syngnathids in the NPF. However, they did suggest that due to their rarity, small size and difficulty in finding them amongst the small bycatch, a large number of trawls would be required to be sampled to adequately assess their sustainability to prawn trawling. Furthermore, syngnathids are generally associated with structures on the substrate and due to their body shape are poor swimmers so unlikely to be capable of swimming up into the codend to escape through any top-mounted BRD.

As the Syngnathidae group is listed as protected species under the EPBC Act 1999 and catch rate trend analysis was only possible for one syngnathid species, it is necessary to continue monitoring these species in the future, using both fishery-dependent and fishery-independent sampling, to obtain sufficient catch data to undertake a robust catch rate trend analysis on those rarer species. However to obtain useful data on their catch (distributions and biology), specimens of each species need to be retained by crew-member observer and scientific staff to allow proper identification and collection of life-history information. This requires a permit from the Department of Environment, Heritage and Arts and relevant state fisheries departments. This process has been implemented in the last few years with crew-member observers collecting up to 50 individuals per year from a range of species for species identification and life-history characteristics.

Sawfishes

There were four species of sawfishes recorded within the NPF region. The sawfishes are regarded as highly vulnerable to any reductions in their population level because of their life-history characteristics (Simpfendorfer 2000). This group has become nationally and internationally recognised as being at risk to fishing activities with populations already being severely impacted by fishing in a number of countries and are likely to take several decades to recover from significant reductions in populations (Brewer et al 2004). They are caught as bycatch by a number of trawl and gillnet fisheries in northern Australia and generally have high fishing mortalities associated with being caught (Stobutzki et al 2000, Peverell 2005).

The sawfishes have been identified as at risk to trawling from a previous risk assessment of the bycatch species in the NPF using ranking criteria for the susceptibility of species to capture and mortality and capacity to recover once the population is depleted (Stobutzki et al 2000; Stobutzki et al 2002; Zhou and Griffiths 2008). They reported that three of the four sawfish species previously recorded in the NPF region were least likely to be sustainable from prawn trawl fishing due to their benthic or demersal habits and having restricted depth ranges; the Green Sawfish (*Pristis zijsron*), Largetooth Sawfish (*Pristis pristis*) and Dwarf Sawfish (*Pristis clavata*). Furthermore, their life-history characteristics such as having low survival rates, producing low numbers of young, small population size and restricted distribution ranges and mostly within the trawl grounds of the NPF (from catch records and low catch rates as shown in this assessment), means that these species have a low capacity to recover from trawl impacts on the populations (Stobutzki et al 2000).

Zhou and Griffiths (2008) used a quantitative ecological risk assessment approach – Sustainability Assessment for Fishing Effects (SAFE) – to estimate fishing impacts and compare the impacts to sustainability reference points based on life-history parameters of these species. They concluded that potentially the most vulnerable sawfish species to current commercial trawling in the NPF was *Pristis pristis*, as this species had an estimated fishing mortality close to its estimated minimum unsustainable fishing mortality.

The first Bycatch Sustainability Assessment (Fry et al 2009) showed little change in catches of sawfishes as a result of the introduction of TEDs into the commercial fleet. Brewer et al (2004) noted that these species often become entangled in trawl nets, especially in front of the TED, due to the numerous teeth along their rostrum. This was also found in the catch data collected from the crew-member observer program over the years with most sawfishes recorded as being caught just in front of the TED or hanging out of the TED opening with their rostrum tangled in the mesh flaps of the TED opening. Griffiths et al (2006a) also found only a slight increase in the capacity to recover from trawl impacts for this sawfish species as a result of the installation of TEDs.

As with the previous two Bycatch Sustainability Assessments (Fry et al 2009; Fry et al 2015), there was insufficient catch data available for three out of the four species of sawfish to carry out catch trend analysis. The ability to detect population declines for the most common species, *Anoxypristis cuspidata*, in the NPF would require at least ten crew-members and one AFMA observer collecting data from 2,350 trawls every year (Brewer et al 2007). The level of fishery coverage by the crew-member observer and AFMA scientific observer programs over the last six years exceeded this minimum required number of trawls. However due to difficulties in species identifications of some sawfish catch records, to successfully fit a model to the catch data for this species also required combining the catch data for the 'Unidentified Pristidae' group. Brewer et al (2007) reported that this common species comprised 97% of the catch in the NPF. We therefore assumed that nearly all of the unidentified sawfish catches recorded from the crew-member observer program was this one species. To detect declines in the other rarer sawfish species would require more crew-member observer and AFMA scientific observer coverage of a much larger number of trawls per year.

The modelled trend analysis of the crew-member observer data for *Anoxypristis cuspidata* showed only a slight decline in catch rates from 2011 to 2016, however this was not a clear downward trend. The unmodelled catch rate data from the crew-member observer program showed relatively stable catch rates over the same period (apart from a slight drop in 2013) for *Anoxypristis cuspidata* and a significant decline in catch rates of the 'Unidentified Pristidae' group, indicating an improvement in data collection methods. Although there appears to be little change in the modelled catch rate trend for this species since 2010, the slight decline in catches seen from the crew-member observer program indicates a possible need for priority monitoring of this species in the future.

As no catch rate trend analysis was possible for three of the four sawfish species and these three species of sawfish are listed as protected species under the EPBC Act 1999, it is necessary to continue monitoring all of the sawfish species in the future, using both fishery-dependent and fishery-independent sampling, to obtain sufficient catch data to undertake a robust trend analysis of catch rates for each species.

Elasmobranchs

The Sustainability Assessment for Fishing Effects (SAFE) study for the elasmobranchs (Zhou and Griffiths 2008) in 2006 highlighted eight species that were caught in very low numbers and only within commercially fished areas of the NPF. A number of these species also had higher estimated fishing-induced mortalities than their minimum unsustainable fishing mortalities; *Carcharhinus albimarginatus*, *Orectolobus ornatus*, *Squatina* sp. A, *Taeniura meyeni* and *Urogymnus asperrimus* (Zhou and Griffiths 2008). Two of these species, *Carcharhinus albimarginatus* and *Squatina* sp. A, were immediately removed from the ‘at risk’ list as a result of gathering further distribution and biological information and consultation with scientific experts (see Appendix A). The Banded Wobbegong (*Orectolobus ornatus*) was subsequently removed from the list in 2009 due to expert opinion and its primary distribution outside the current fishing effort distribution and the Blotched Fantail Ray (*Taeniura meyeni*) removed in 2011 from its estimated fishing mortality lower than its maximum sustainable mortality and its known distribution mostly outside the current fishing area.

The remaining species, the Porcupine Ray (*Urogymnus asperrimus*) has only been recorded nine times within the NPF during the historical CSIRO scientific research and observer surveys and five times during the crew-member observer program (2013, 2015 and 2016). However this species is also reported to occur widely across the Indo-Pacific region, including most of the northern Australian coast (Last and Stevens 2009; Fishbase 2014), and is more of a reef-associated species (Fishbase 2014) therefore most of the population is unlikely to be caught in prawn trawls.

With the introduction of TEDs in 2000, it is also likely that this large ray is effectively removed from the catch if it is encountered. The TEDs used in the current commercial fleet have led to a significant reduction in the overall catches of rays; >31% (Brewer et al 2006). There was also high exclusion rates for large rays from nets with TEDs installed, more than 94% (Brewer et al 2006). However, they concluded that the numbers of *Urogymnus asperrimus* caught were too low to make any TED-effect comparison. This species also occurs at large sizes in the NPF, so we expect that they may have similar exclusion rates in TED-installed nets similar to the results seen for the *Dasyatis* (30 – 40% reduction), *Himantura* (42 – 100% reduction) and the *Pastinachus* species (98% reduction) when compared to nets without TEDs. This is supported by the results from this assessment with the only five records of *Urogymnus asperrimus* caught during the crew-member observer program from 2003 to 2016 were landed in Try nets which do not have TEDs installed and these were released alive.

Brewer et al (2007) estimated from power calculations that the ability to detect a decline in large rays was highly dependent on crew-member observer effort levels. Annual effort levels required varied from 4,150 trawls (10 crew-member observers and one AFMA scientific observer) to detect a 50% decline in *Urogymnus asperrimus* to over ten years to 15,644 trawls to detect a 25% decline in five years (Brewer et al 2007). Since the start of their monitoring in 2006, there was insufficient catch data for this elasmobranch species to carry out a modelled catch rate trend analysis.

The fact that *Urogymnus asperrimus* has only been found five times during the crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program or NPF prawn population monitoring surveys from 2006 to 2016 and it would most likely be excluded by TEDs, we conclude that it is unlikely that this species is at risk from trawling by the NPF and *Urogymnus asperrimus* should be removed from the list of bycatch species being monitored.

Teleosts

Similar to the elasmobranchs, the 2006 Sustainability Assessment for Fishing Effects study for the teleosts (Zhou et al 2009a) highlighted a number of species that were caught in very low numbers and only within commercially fished areas. Two of these species had estimated fishing mortality rates exceeding their maximum sustainable yield; *Dendrochirus brachypterus* and *Scorpaenopsis venosa*. These two species, along with *Hemirhamphus robustus*, *Lutjanus rufolineatus* and *Parascolopsis tosensis* also had their upper confidence interval (95%) of estimated mean fishing mortality rate exceed their minimum unsustainable fishing mortality rate (Zhou et al 2009a). As a result of consensus at the February 2009 Bycatch subcommittee meeting, four other species were also included in the ‘at risk’ list; *Onigocia spinosa*, *Benthosema pterotum*, *Scomberoides commersonnianus* and *Sphyraena jello* (Zhou et al 2009a; see Appendix A). Subsequently, all of these species, except for *Dendrochirus brachypterus* and *Scorpaenopsis venosa*, were removed from the ‘at risk’ list as a result of gathering further distribution information – most distributions were primarily outside the NPF region – and consultation with scientific experts (see Appendix A). These two remaining species were removed from the 'at risk' priority list at the end of 2011 due to the 2010 SAFE study that showed both had estimated fishing mortality lower than their maximum sustainable mortality.

In the same 2010 SAFE re-run, two more species were identified as 'at risk' and added to the priority list; *Lepidotrigla spinosa* and *Lepidotrigla* sp A. These two species have only been recorded during the historical CSIRO scientific research and observer surveys and appeared to have restricted distributions across the NPF. There is very limited data on these two species. They appear to be quite rare with little information on distribution within the NPF, they are also difficulty in identify and there is a lack of suitable descriptive information available to assist in species identification onboard vessels. For these reasons, these two species have only been monitored during the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys since 2011.

Brewer et al (2007) estimated from power calculations that the ability to detect a decline in these small bycatch species was highly dependent on crew-member observer effort levels. A 25% decline in both of these teleost species would only be detectable with at least 15 crew-member observers and five AFMA scientific observers collecting annual data. However, to detect a 50% decline over five or ten years, then only ten crew-member observers and one AFMA scientific observer was needed (Brewer et al 2007).

To date, neither of these two species have been recorded during the surveys. It is recommended that they continue to be monitored by the NPF prawn population monitoring surveys until there is more distribution and catch information collected.

Invertebrates

There were six species of invertebrates that were included in the ‘at risk’ bycatch list in 2009; two squid, one cuttlefish, one prawn and two mantis shrimp species (see Appendix A). These were included as a result of consensus at the February 2009 Bycatch subcommittee meeting. Subsequently, most of these species, except for the prawn; *Solenocera australiana*, and two mantis shrimp species; *Dictyosquilla tuberculata* and *Harpiosquilla stephensoni*, were removed from the ‘at risk’ list as a result of gathering further distribution information – either distributions were primarily outside the NPF region or not likely to be caught or retained in prawn trawls – and consultation with scientific experts (see Appendix A).

In 2012, the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) certification process for the NPF acknowledged that *Solenocera australiana* has a widespread distribution across northern Australia, including in offshore areas, where no NPF trawling is likely to occur (Tonks et al 2008; Fry et al 2009). Although this prawn species is consistently caught in the NPF and has shown a steady increase in crew-member observer catches from 2010 to 2013, it was concluded that it is not adversely susceptible to impacts from NPF trawling and was removed from the ‘at risk’ priority list in 2013 (MRAG 2012).

In contrast, there were no catch records available for either of the two mantis shrimp species from past CSIRO scientific research and observer surveys in the NPF from 1976 to 2005 (Fry et al 2009). It was concluded that these two species were rare within the NPF. However, once the crew-member observer program, AFMA scientific observer program and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys began monitoring these two species in 2009, they were recorded quite regularly, occurring within many of the 10 'Regions’ and across the 'Years’ from 2009 to 2016. The consistent increases in crew-member observer, AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring survey catches for *Dictyosquilla tuberculata* from 2009 to 2016 indicate that this species is relatively common in the NPF. There has been a decline in catch rates in 2014 and 2016 from the crew-member observer program however 2015 had the highest catches of any year and catches were more patchy across the NPF rather than a wide-spread decline for these two years. Although the available catch records from the crew-member observer and AFMA scientific observer programs and NPF prawn population monitoring surveys indicate a species distribution mostly within the current commercial fishery effort distribution, its distribution is likely to be more widespread and our data suggest that this species is unlikely to be adversely impacted by trawling in the NPF.

While similar increases were seen for *Harpiosquilla stephensoni* during the crew-member observer program from 2009 to 2012, there was a marked drop in 2013 which was also evident from the AFMA scientific observer and NPF prawn population monitoring data. Catch rates again showed a steady increase in the crew-member observer program from 2014 to 2016 to highest catch rates seen in any year. It is therefore recommended that *Harpiosquilla stephensoni* continue to be monitored, at least for the next three years, using both fishery-dependent and fishery-independent sampling, until further distribution and catch data is available to undertake a robust catch rate trend analysis.

Conclusion

In 2009, the first Bycatch Sustainability Assessment identified major performance and data quality issues in the crew-member observer program leading to the program becoming ineffective in providing reliable and accurate data for catch rate trend analysis of TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species. This compromised the usefulness of the time-series data up to that point. As a consequence, the 2009 Bycatch Sustainability Assessment succeeded in assessing the catch rate trends of only three TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species; the sea snakes *Hydrophis elegans* and *Lapemis curtis* (formerly named *Lapemis hardwickii*) and sawfish *Anoxypristis cuspidata*. The crew-member observer data collected for the 2009 and 2010 banana and tiger prawn seasons continued to fail in its obligation to meet the minimum level of crew-member observer participation; ten crew-member observers (a total of 2,350 trawls per years) per year in the NPF as stated by Brewer et al (2007). These levels were regarded as the minimum level needed to detect a significant change in the catches of rare trawl bycatch of the NPF.

Since then, there has been a significant improvement in crew-member observer participation and data collection quality. This coincided with the implementation of a payment scheme for crew-member observers given the extra workload needed to complete their additional tasks on board the vessels. This scheme rewarded those observers that fulfilled a requirement in the proportion of trawls surveyed by the end of the tiger prawn season. The coverage levels of the crew-member observer program over the last six years have now exceeded the minimum requirements with at least 10 crew-member observers collecting catch data from more than 2,800 trawls per year and as high as 3,600 trawls. The quality of catch data has also improved with now greater than 80% of all TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species (excluding marine turtles) being photographed for species identifications by scientific staff.

The requirement for a minimum of one AFMA scientific observer for the banana and tiger prawn seasons has also been met. This data, along with the value-adding NPF prawn population monitoring surveys, were successfully used to validate crew-member observer data across eight of the ten NPF 'Regions'. This improvement has now led to the current Bycatch Sustainability Assessment in providing statistical analysis of the catch rate trends for 11 species; eight sea snake species (*Aipysurus mosaicus*, *Aipysurus laevis*, *Astrotia stokesii*, *Disteira major*, *Hydrophis elegans*, *Hydrophis ornatus*, *Hydrophis pacificus* and *Lapemis curtis*), one syngnathid (*Trachyrhamphus longirostris*), one sawfish species (*Anoxypristis cuspidata*), and one invertebrate species (*Dictyosquilla tuberculata*). It is anticipated that with continued crew-member participation and reliable data collection into the future, that this number of species can be further increased to detect significant changes in catch rates for many of the rarer TEP and 'at risk' bycatch species of the NPF. However, it is probable that for some of the rarest TEP and ‘at risk’ bycatch species, there will never be sufficient catch records collected to successfully carry out a robust analytical assessment of their sustainability to prawn trawling in the NPF region.

There are a number of scientific studies that show the marine turtles are already effectively removed from trawl nets by the installation of TEDs. There is evidence that these devices also significantly reduce catches of large elasmobranchs, such as the ‘at risk’ elasmobranch species. However, there is still some progress to be made on the types and positions of BRDs in the codend. For example, the Popeye Fishbox BRD and Fisheye BRD, when set at about 70 meshes from the codend drawstring, can effectively remove sea snakes. This net configuration has shown to reduce up to 85% of sea snakes from the codend and increase their survival rates of being trawled. Currently, a range of new BRDs and at net positions closer to the codend drawstring, are being independently tested in the NPFI (see Lawrence and Fry 2016). Further changes to net design, such as a semi-rigid throat section just in front of the TED or smaller sized mesh in front of the TED including the TED flaps, might increase sawfish escapement through the TED by reducing the chance of their rostrums getting tangled in the meshes of the net. However, these mitigation measures are not likely to produce significant declines in the catches for the other ‘at risk’ bycatch groups; the syngnathids, teleosts or invertebrates. Because these species are generally small in size and are benthic or at least benthic-associated species, their ability to escape through TEDs or top-mounted BRDs is limited.

Information from other published sources indicate that the ‘at risk’ elasmobranch and invertebrate species have wide-ranging distributions across the Indo-Pacific region with much of their distribution outside of the current commercial trawl effort distribution. This has led to some 'at risk' bycatch species being removed from the priority monitoring list, while others are being recorded in increasing numbers by the crew-member observer program, suggesting that initial abundance estimates have been underestimated and it is unlikely that these species are at risk from current trawling practices in the NPF. In 2018, the SAFE method will be re-run for all elasmobranch, teleost and invertebrate species occurring within the NPF and the results reported here may assist in determining the risk to these species of being adversely impacted by trawling in the NPF.

8. REFERENCES

Akaike, H., 1973. Information theory and an extension of the maximum likelihood principle. In: Petrov, B.N., Csaki, F. (Eds.), Proceedings of the 2nd International Symposium on Information Theory. Publishing House of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, pp. 268-281.

Allen, G.R. 1995 *Lutjanus rufolineatus*, a valid species of snapper (Pisces, Lutjanidae) with notes on a closely allied species, *Lutjanus boutton*. Rev. Fr. Aquariol. 22(1-2): 11-13.

Brewer, D.T., Griffiths, S., Heales, D.S., Zhou, S., Tonks, M., Dell, Q., Taylor, B..T., Miller, M., Kuhnert, P., Keys, S., Whitelaw, W., Burke, A. and Raudzens, E. 2007. Design, trial and implementation of an integrated, long-term bycatch monitoring program, road tested in the Northern Prawn Fishery. Final report on FRDC Project 2002/035. CSIRO Cleveland. Pp. 378.

Brewer, D.T., Heales, D.S., Eayrs, S.J., Taylor, B.R., Day, G., Sen, S., Wakeford, J., Milton, D.A., Stobutzki, I.C., Fry, G.C., van der Velde, T.D., Jones, P.N., Venables, W., Wang, Y-G., Dell, Q., Austin, M., Gregor, R., Pendrey, R., Hegerl, E., carter, D., Nelson, C., Nichols, J. and Gofton, T. 2004. Assessment and improvement of TEDs and BRDs in the NPF: a co-operative approach by fishers, scientists, fisheries technologists, economists and conservationists. Final report on FRDC Project 2000/173. CSIRO Cleveland. Pp. 412.

Brewer, D., Heales, D., Milton, D., Dell, Q., Fry, G., Venables, W. and Jones, P. 2006. The impact of Turtle Excluder Devices and Bycatch Reduction Devices on diverse tropical marine communities in Australia's Northern Prawn Trawl Fishery. Fisheries Research 81: 176-188.

Cogger, H.G. 1992 Reptiles and Amphibians of Australia. Reed Sydney.

CSIRO Data Map 2011. World Wide web electronic publication. www.csiro.au. Version 2011.

Dichmont, C.M., Die, D., Punt, A.E., Venables, W., Bishop, J., Deng, A. and Dell, Q. 2001. Risk analysis and sustainability indicators for prawn stocks in the Northern Prawn Fishery. Final Report on FRDC Project 98/109. CSIRO Cleveland. Pp. 187.

Dunning, M.C., Yeomans, K., and McKinnon, S.G. 2000. Development of a northern Australian squid fishery. Final report on FRDC Project 94/017 to the Fisheries Research and Development Corporation. Department of Primary Industries, Brisbane. 112 pages.

Fishbase 2014. World Wide Web electronic publication. www.fishbase.org. Version (11/2014).

Fricke, R. 1999. Fishes of the Mascarene Islands (Réunion, Mauritius, Rodriguez): an annotated checklist, with descriptions of new species. Koeltz Scientific Books, Koenigstein, Theses Zoologicae, Vol. 31: 759.

Fry, G.C., Milton, D.A. and Wassenberg, T.J. 2001. The reproductive biology and diet of sea snake bycatch of prawn trawling in northern Australia: characteristics important for assessing the impacts on populations. Pacific Conservation Biology 7: 55-73.

Fry, G., Brewer, D., Dell, Q., Tonks, M., Lawrence, E., Venables, W. and Darnell, R. 2009 Assessing the sustainability of the NPF bycatch from annual monitoring data: 2008. Final Report on AFMA Project R2008/826. December 2009. CSIRO, Cleveland. Pp. 176.

Fry, G., Barwick, M., Lawrence, E. and Tonks, M. 2015 Monitoring interactions with bycatch species using crew-member observer data collected in the Northern Prawn Fishery: 2013 – 2014. Final Report to AFMA; RR2013/0806. June 2015. CSIRO, Australia. Pp. 218.

Griffiths, S.P., Brewer, D.T., Heales, D.S., Milton, D.A. and Stobutzki, I.C. 2006a. Validating ecological risk assessments for fisheries: assessing the impacts of turtle excluder devices on elasmobranch bycatch populations in an Australian trawl fishery. Marine and Freshwater Research 57: 395-401.

Griffiths, S.P., Fry, G.C. and Van der Velde, T.D. 2006b. Population dynamics and fishery benefits of a large legal size of a pelagic sportfish, the Talang queenfish, *Scomberoides commersonnianus*, in northern Australia. Fisheries Research 82: 74-86.

Griffiths, S., Kenyon, R., Bulman, C., Dowdney, J. and Fuller, M. 2006c. Ecological risk assessment for the effects of fishing: Northern Prawn Fishery. Report for the Australian Fisheries Management Authority. CSIRO, Cleveland. Pp. 267.

Heatwole, H. 1975. Sea snakes of the Gulf of Carpentaria. In Dunson W.A. (ed) The biology of sea snakes. University Park Press, Baltimore. Pp. 145-149.

Heemstra, P.C. and Randall, J.E. 1993. FAO Species Catalogue. Vol. 16. Groupers of the world (family Serranidae, subfamily Epinephelinae). An annotated and illustrated catalogue of the grouper, rockcod, hind, coral grouper and lyretail species known to date. FAO Fish. Synop. 125(16): 382.

Hulley, P.A. 1986 Myctophidae. Pp. 282-321. In M.M. Smith and P.C. Heemstra (Eds.) Smiths' sea fishes. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.

Kuiter, R.H. and Tonozuka, T. 2001. Pictorial guide to Indonesian reef fishes. Part 2. Fusiliers - Dragonets, Caesionidae - Callionymidae. Zoonetics, Australia. Pp. 304-622.

Last, P.R. and Stevens, J.D. 2009. Sharks and Rays of Australia. Second Edition. CSIRO Publishing, Collingwood, Australia. Pp. 644.

Lawrence, E. and Fry, G. 2016. Final analysis of NPFI 'Kon's Covered Fisheyes' BRD trial data. Report for the Australian Fisheries Management Authority. CSIRO, Australia. Pp. 16.

Lieske, E. and Myers, R. 1994. Collins Pocket Guide. Coral reef fishes. Indo-Pacific & Caribbean including the Red Sea. Haper Collins Publishers. Pp. 400.

MRAG. 2012. Final Reoprt and Determination for Australian Northern Prawn Fishery. MRAG Americas, Inc. September 2012. Pp. 404.

McCullagh, P. and Nelder, J., 1989. Generalized Linear Models, Chapman I\& Hall, New York.

Milton, D.A. 2001. Assessing the susceptibility to fishing of populations of rare trawl bycatch: sea snakes caught by Australia's Northern Prawn Fishery. Biological Conservation 101: 281-290.

Milton, D.A., Fry, G.C. and Dell, Q. 2009a. Reducing impacts of trawling on protected sea snakes: by-catch reduction devices improve escapement and survival. Marine and Freshwater Research 60: 824-832.

Milton, D.A., Fry, G.C., Kuhnert, P., Tonks, M., Zhou, S. and Zhu, M. 2009b. Assessing data poor resources: developing a management strategy for byproduct species in the Northern Prawn Fishery. Final Report. FRDC Project 2006/008. Pp. 214.

Milton, D., Zhou, S., Fry, G. and Dell, Q. 2008. Risk assessment and mitigation for sea snakes caught in the Northern Prawn Fishery. Final Report. FRDC Project 2005/051. Pp. 124.

Myers, R.F. 1991. Micronesian reef fishes. Second Ed. Coral Graphics, Barrigada, Guam. Pp. 298.

Peverell, S.C. 2005. Distribution of sawfishes (Pristidae) in the Gulf of Carpentaria, Australia, with notes on sawfish ecology. Environmental Biology of Fishes 73: 391-402.

Poiner, I.R. and Harris, A.N.M. 1996. Incidental capture, direct mortality and delayed mortality of sea turtles in Australia's Northern Prawn Fishery. Marine Biology 125: 813-825.

Randall, J.E., Allen, G.R. and Steene, R.C. 1990. Fishes of the Great Barrier Reef and Coral Sea. University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu, Hawaii. Pp. 506.

Redfield, J.A., Holmes, J.C. and Holmes, R.D. 1978. Sea snakes of the eastern Gulf of Carpentaria. Australian Journal of Marine and freshwater Research 29: 325-334.

Rees, A.J.J., Yearsley, G.K., Gowlett-Holmes, K. and Pogonoski, J. 1999. *Codes for Australian Aquatic Biota (on-line version)*. CSIRO Marine and Atmospheric Research, World Wide Web electronic publication, 1999 onwards. Available at: http://www.cmar.csiro.au/caab/.

Robins, C.M., Goodspeed, A.M., Poiner, I.R. and Harch, B.D. 2003. Monitoring the catch of turtles in the Northern Prawn Fishery. Fisheries Research and Development Corporation Final Report, Canberra.

Sainsbury, K.J., Kailola, P.J. and Leyland, G.G. 1985. Continental shelf fishes of the northern and north-western Australia. CSIRO Division of Fisheries Research; Clouston & Hall and Peter Pownall Fisheries Information Service, Canberra, Australia. 375 p.

Senou, H. 2001 Sphyraenidae. Barracudas. Pp. 3685-3697. In K.E. Carpenter and V. Niem (eds.) FAO species identification guide for fishery purposes. The living marine resources of the Western Central Pacific. Vol. 6. Bony fishes part 4 (Labridae to Latimeriidae), estuarine crocodiles. FAO, Rome.

Simpfendorfer, C.A. 2000. Predicting population recovery rates for endangered western Atlantic sawfishes using demographic analysis. Environmental Biology of Fishes 58: 371-377.

Stobutzki, I., Blaber, S., Brewer, D., Fry, G., Heales, D., Miller, M., Milton, D., Salini, J., van der Velde, T., Wassenberg. T., Jones, P., Wang, Y-G, dredge, M., Courtney, T., Chilcott, K. and Eayrs, S. 2000. Ecological sustainability of bycatch and biodiversity in prawn trawl fisheries. Final report on FRDC Project 96/257. CSIRO Cleveland. Pp. 512.

Stobutzki, I.C., Miller, M.J., Heales, D.S. and Brewer, D.T. 2002. Sustainability of elasmobranchs caught as bycatch in a tropical prawn (shrimp) trawl fishery. Fishery Bulletin 100: 800-821.

Tonks, M.L., Griffiths, S.P., Heales, D.S., Brewer, D.T. and Dell, Q. 2008. Species composition and temporal variation of prawn trawl bycatch in the Joseph Bonaparte Gulf, Northwestern Australia. Fisheries Research 89: 276-393.

Ward, T.M. 1996. Sea snake by-catch of prawn trawlers on the northern Australian continental shelf. Marine and Freshwater Research 47: 631-635.

Wassenberg, T.J., Salini, J.P., Heatwole, H., Kerr, J.D. 1994. Incidental capture of sea snakes (Hydrophiidae) by prawn trawlers in the Gulf of Carpentaria, Australia. Australian Journal of Maine and Freshwater Research 45: 429-443.

Wassenberg, T.J., Milton, D.A. and Burridge, C. 2001. Survival rates of sea snakes caught by demersal trawlers in northern and eastern Australia? Biological Conservation 100: 271-280.

Welsh, A.H., Cunningham, R., Donnelly, C., Lindenmeyer, D., 1996. Modelling the abundance of rare species: statistical models for counts with extra zeros. Ecological Modelling 88, 297-308.

Yeatman, J. 1993. Genetic and morphological aspects of Australian *Photololigo* spp. (Loliginidae: Cephalopoda). Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Marine Biology Department, James Cook University of North Queensland, 279 pp.

Zhou, S. 2011. Sustainability assessment of fish species potentially impacted in the Northern Prawn Fishery: 2007-2009. Report to the Australian Fisheries Management Authority (AFMA), Canberra, Australia. February 2011. Pp. 31.

Zhou, S. and Griffiths, S.P. 2008. Sustainability assessment for fishing effects (SAFE): a new quantitative ecological risk assessment method and its application to elasmobranch bycatch in an Australian trawl fishery. Fisheries Research 91: 56-68.

Zhou, S., Griffiths, S.P. and Miller, M. 2009a. Sustainability assessment for fishing effects (SAFE) on highly diverse and data-limited fish bycatch in a tropical prawn trawl fishery. Marine and Freshwater Research 60: 1-8.

Zhou, S., Milton, D.A. and Fry, G.C. 2012. Integrated risk analysis for rare marine species impacted by fishing: sustainability assessment and population trend modelling. ICES Journal of Marine Science 69: 271-280.

APPENDIX A – SUMMARY OF THE RISK ASSESSMENT RESULTS FOLLOWING THE OUTCOMES OF THE HIGHEST LEVEL OF ASSESSMENT

Taxonomic Group	Scientific Name	Common Name	Role in Fishery	Highest Level of Assessment	Risk Score	Justifications for removal from the list	Source	Current Action (provided by Dave Brewer)	Comments	Priority species as at 2013
Chondrichthyan	*Orectolobus ornatus*	Banded wobbegong	DI	SAFE	Extreme High Risk	Distribution across eastern Australian coast, reef associated. Experts agreed species was not at risk as it did not occur in area of the fishery.	Bycatch Subcommittee 27th January 2009	Remove from list.	Expert opinion provided by Chondrichthyan Technical Working Group; May 2009. See Last and Stevens (2009) and Fishbase (2014)	✘
Chondrichthyan	*Taeniura meyeni*	Blotched Fantail Ray	DI	SAFE 2011	Low Risk	Results from Zhou (2011) SAFE 2011 deemed this species low risk to current NPF fishing.	Bycatch Subcommittee 27th January 2009.	Remove from list.		✘
Chondrichthyan	*Urogymnus asperrimus*	Porcupine Ray	DI	SAFE 2011	Precautionary medium risk	To remain on list and continue to be addressed as part of the current monitoring program.	Bycatch Subcommittee 27th January 2009.	To remain on list.	To be re-assessed in future CSIRO project – by December 2014.	✓
Chondrichthyan	*Carcharhinus albimarginatus*	Silvertip shark	DI	SAFE	Extreme High Risk	Widely distributed outside of NPF; species has extensive distribution across tropical Indo-Pacific coastal waters; including Indonesian waters. Caught once in the fishery.	Bycatch Subcommittee 27th January 2009.	Remove from list.	See Last and Stevens (2009) and Fishbase (2014).	✘
Chondrichthyan	*Squatina albipunctata* (Squatina sp. A)	Eastern angel shark	DI	SAFE	Extreme High Risk	Species only occurs along the east coast of QLD, and south to Lakes Entrance, Victoria.	Bycatch Subcommittee 27th January 2009.	Remove from list.	See Last and Stevens (2009).	✘
Teleost	*Dendrochirus brachypterus*	Dwarf Lionfish	DI	SAFE 2011	Low Risk	Results from Zhou (2011) SAFE 2011 deemed this species low risk to current NPF fishing.	Bycatch Subcommittee 27th January 2009.	Remove from list.		✘
Teleost	*Scorpaenopsis venosa*	Raggy Scorpion fish	DI	SAFE 2011	Low Risk	Results from Zhou (2011) SAFE 2011 deemed this species low risk to current NPF fishing.	Bycatch Subcommittee 27th January 2009.	Remove from list.		✘

Taxonomic Group	Scientific Name	Common Name	Role in Fishery	Highest Level of Assessment	Risk Score	Justifications for removal from the list	Source	Current Action (provided by Dave Brewer)	Comments	Priority species as at 2013
	Parascolopsis tosensis	Tosa dwarf monocle bream	DI	SAFE	Precautionary Extreme High Risk	Distribution primarily outside the NPF; Western Pacific: Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Philippines, Taiwan, China and East Timor. Considered not at risk	Bycatch Subcommittee 27th January 2009.	Remove from list.	See Fishbase (2014) and Russell (1990).	✘
	Hemiramphus robustus	Three-by-two garfish	DI	SAFE	Precautionary Extreme High Risk	Species primarily occupies coastal regions and estuaries. Pelagic species and slender body morphology result in extremely low selectivity by trawls. Highly unlikely to be at risk by NPF	Bycatch Subcommittee 27th January 2009.	Remove from list.	Expert opinion provided by Shane Griffiths; July 2009.	✘
	Lutjanus rufolineatus	Yellowlined snapper	DI	SAFE	Precautionary Extreme High Risk	Reef associated, distribution primarily outside the NPF; Indo-West Pacific: Maldives, Japan to Indonesia and northern Australia east to Samoa and Tonga – but populations within the Gulf may be at risk	Bycatch Subcommittee 27th January 2009.	Remove from list.	See Fishbase (2014) and Allen (1995)	✘
	Onigocia spinosa	Midget flathead	DI	SAFE	Precautionary high	Distribution primarily outside the NPF; Western Pacific: Japan, South China Sea, Philippines, northwest shelf of Australia through Timor and Arafura Sea – but populations within the Gulf may be at risk	Bycatch Subcommittee 27th January 2009.	Remove from list.	See Fishbase (2014) and Sainsbury et al (1985).	✘

Taxonomic Group	Scientific Name	Common Name	Role in Fishery	Highest Level of Assessment	Risk Score	Justifications for removal from the list	Source	Current Action (provided by Dave Brewer)	Comments	Priority species as at 2013
	Benthosema pterotum	Skinnycheek lanternfish	DI	SAFE	Precautionary high	Deepwater species; 10-300m, Bathypelagic species and small body morphology result in extremely low selectivity by trawls. Highly unlikely to be at risk by NPF. Extensive distribution primarily outside the NPF; Indo-west Pacific: Arabian Sea to West Pacific, southeast Atlantic, possibly northwest Pacific and eastern Indian Ocean – but populations within the Gulf may be at risk	Bycatch Subcommittee 27th January 2009.	Remove from list.	See Fishbase (2014) and Hulley (1986).	✘
	Scomberoides commersonnianus	Talang queenfish	DI	SAFE	Precautionary high	Species has wide distribution outside the Gulf of Carpentaria, occupying coastal regions and estuaries across southern hemisphere tropical waters (very common species). Members confident that species is not at high risk. Pelagic distribution result in extremely low selectivity by trawls. Highly unlikely to be at risk by NPF	Bycatch Subcommittee 27th January 2009.	Remove from list.	Expert opinion provided by Shane Griffiths; July 2009. See Griffiths et al (2006b).	✘
	Sphyraena jello	Giant seapike	DI	SAFE	Precautionary High	Pelagic species with a wide distribution outside NPF. Most common around reefs. Extremely low selectivity by trawls, rarely caught in the fishery. Highly unlikely to be at risk by NPF	Bycatch Subcommittee 27th January 2009.	Remove from list.	Expert opinion provided by Shane Griffiths; July 2009.	✘

Taxonomic Group	Scientific Name	Common Name	Role in Fishery	Highest Level of Assessment	Risk Score	Justifications for removal from the list	Source	Current Action (provided by Dave Brewer)	Comments	Priority species as at 2013
	Ariosoma anago	Silvery Conger	DI	SAFE 2011	Precautionary medium risk	Distribution widespread in the Indo-West Pacific: Australia, China, India, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, New Caledonia, Philippines, Sri Lanka, Taiwan, Vietnam. In Australia likely to occur along the north, east and west coasts. Primarily outside the NPF. Habitat: coastal sandy and muddy bottoms. Considered not at risk.	SAFE 2011: Zhou (2011)	Remove from list.	See: www.Fishbase.org (2014) Rees (1999) CSIRO Data Map (2011)	✗
	Conger cinereus	Longfin African Conger	DI	SAFE 2011	Precautionary medium risk	Distribution widespread in Indo-Pacific region: Red Sea and East Africa to the Marquesan and Easter islands, north to southern Japan and the Ogasawara Islands, south to northern Australia and Lord Howe Island. Primarily outside the NPF. Habitat: common on reef flats and seagrass beds of shallow lagoons but ranges to depths of 80 m on outer reef slopes. Trawl mortality considered to be low. Considered not at risk.	SAFE 2011: Zhou (2011)	Remove from list.	See: www.Fishbase.org (2014) Myers (1991) Fricke (1999) CSIRO Data Map (2011)	✗

Taxonomic Group	Scientific Name	Common Name	Role in Fishery	Highest Level of Assessment	Risk Score	Justifications for removal from the list	Source	Current Action (provided by Dave Brewer)	Comments	Priority species as at 2013
	Epinephelus malabaricus	Malabar Grouper	DI	SAFE 2011	Precautionary medium risk	Distribution Indo-Pacific: Red Sea and East Africa to Tonga, north to Japan, south to Australia. Primarily outside the NPF. Habitat: coral and rocky reefs, tide pools, estuaries, mangrove swamps and sandy or mud bottom from shore to depths of 150m. Considered not at risk.	SAFE 2011: Zhou (2011)	Remove from list.	See: www.Fishbase.org (2014) Heemstra and Randall (1993) CSIRO Data Map (2011)	✘
	Lepidotrigla sp.	Triglidae: Gurnards	DI	SAFE 2011	Precautionary medium risk	Distribution: wide ranging in Pacific, Indian Oceans, species dependent	SAFE 2011: Zhou (2011)	N/A	See: www.Fishbase.org (2014) CSIRO Data Map (2011)	N/A
	Pterygotrigla hemisticta	Blackspotted Gurnard	DI	SAFE 2011	Precautionary medium risk	Distribution: western Pacific, wide distribution from Japan to Australia.	SAFE 2011: Zhou (2011)	Remove from list.	See: www.Fishbase.org (2014) CSIRO Data Map (2011)	✘
	Lepidotrigla sp C	Gurnard	DI	SAFE 2011	Precautionary medium risk	Distribution: includes outside of current NPF fishing region, wide ranging in Gulf of Carpentaria	SAFE 2011: Zhou (2011)	Remove from list.	See: CSIRO Data Map (2011)	✘
	Lepidotrigla spiloptera	Spotwing Gurnard	DI	SAFE 2011	Precautionary medium risk	Distribution: Indo-West Pacific – Red Sea, Somalia, Zanzibar, Bay of Bengal, Arafura Sea, Philippines, including outside of current NPF fishing region, wide ranging in Gulf of Carpentaria	SAFE 2011: Zhou (2011)	Remove from list.	See: www.Fishbase.org (2014) CSIRO Data Map (2011)	✘
	Lepidotrigla kishinoyi	Gurnard	DI	SAFE 2011	Precautionary medium risk	Distribution: Northwest Pacific – southern Japan, east China Sea, occurs mostly offshore of current NPF fishing region	SAFE 2011: Zhou (2011)	Remove from list.	See: www.Fishbase.org (2014) CSIRO Data Map (2011)	✘

Taxonomic Group	Scientific Name	Common Name	Role in Fishery	Highest Level of Assessment	Risk Score	Justifications for removal from the list	Source	Current Action (provided by Dave Brewer)	Comments	Priority species as at 2013
	Lepidotrigla sp 2	Gurnard	DI	SAFE 2011	Precautionary medium risk	Distribution: including outside of current NPF fishing region, wide ranging in Gulf of Carpentaria	SAFE 2011: Zhou (2011)	Remove from list.	See: CSIRO Data Map (2011)	✗
	Lepidotrigla spinosa	Shortfin Gurnard	DI	SAFE 2011	Precautionary medium risk	Distribution: eastern Indian Ocean – Australia; data poor	SAFE 2011: Zhou (2011)	To remain on list.	See: www.Fishbase.org (2014) CSIRO Data Map (2011)	✓
	Lepidotrigla argus	Long-finned Gurnard	DI	SAFE 2011	Precautionary medium risk	Distribution: Indo-West Pacific – northwestern Australia, Papua New Guinea, occurs mostly offshore of current NPF fishing region	SAFE 2011: Zhou (2011)	Remove from list.	See: www.Fishbase.org (2014) CSIRO Data Map (2011)	✗
	Lepidotrigla sp A	Gurnard	DI	SAFE 2011	Precautionary medium risk	No data available	SAFE 2011: Zhou (2011)	To remain on list.	See: CSIRO Data Map (2011)	✓
	Leptojulis cyanopleura	Shoulder-spot Wrasse	DI	SAFE 2011	Precautionary medium risk	Distribution Indo-West Pacific: Gulf of Oman to the Philippines and Australia. Primarily outside the NPF. Habitat: clear coastal slopes to outer reef lagoons on open rubble patches or rocky bottom, reef associated. Considered not at risk.	SAFE 2011: Zhou (2011)	Remove from list.	See: www.Fishbase.org (2014) Randall et al (1990) Kuiter and Tonozuka (2001) CSIRO Data Map (2011)	✗

Taxonomic Group	Scientific Name	Common Name	Role in Fishery	Highest Level of Assessment	Risk Score	Justifications for removal from the list	Source	Current Action (provided by Dave Brewer)	Comments	Priority species as at 2013
	Sphyraena qenie	Blackfin Barracuda	DI	SAFE 2011	Precautionary medium risk	Distribution Indo-Pacific: Red Sea and East Africa to the central Indian Ocean and French Polynesia. Eastern Pacific: Mexico and Panama. Primarily outside the NPF. Habitat: Reef associated, near current-swept lagoon and seaward reefs, probably disperses at night to feed. Fast pelagic species and slender body morphology result in extremely low selectivity by trawls. Highly unlikely to be at risk by NPF.	SAFE 2011: Zhou (2011)	Remove from list.	See: www.Fishbase.org (2014) Senou (2001) Lieske and Myers (1994) Myers (1991) CSIRO Data Map (2011)	✗
Invertebrate	*Euprymna hoylei*	Bobtail Squid	Discard	Level 2 PSA	High	Extremely rare in trawl catches. David Milton examined family level assessment and they were never caught. Reported around the Philippines and northwestern Australia (max 3-4 cm ML). Unlikely to be retained in prawn trawl nets.	Bycatch Subcommittee 27th January 2009.	Remove from list.	Expert opinion provided by Malcolm Dunning and David Milton; May 2009.	✗
Invertebrate	*Metasepia pfefferi*	Flamboyant cuttlefish	Discard	Level 2 PSA	High	Widespread but nowhere abundant in trawl catches throughout northern Australian waters to at least Moreton Bay, on the east coast. Occurs from shallow coral and rocky reefal areas to mid shelf depths. This is a small species (max ~10 cm ML) that probably only lives for a few months.	Bycatch Subcommittee 27th January 2009.	Remove from list.	Expert opinion provided by Malcolm Dunning; May 2009.	✗

Taxonomic Group	Scientific Name	Common Name	Role in Fishery	Highest Level of Assessment	Risk Score	Justifications for removal from the list	Source	Current Action (provided by Dave Brewer)	Comments	Priority species as at 2013
	Solenocera australiana	Coral Prawn	BP	Level 2 PSA	High	Widespread distribution across all of NPF and outside.	Bycatch Subcommittee 27th January 2009; MSC Certification Process (2012)	Remove from list.	Expert opinion provided by Fry et al 2009.	✘
	Photololigo sp. 3 and sp 4 of Yeatman (1993)	broad squid and slender squid	BP	Level 2 PSA	High	Major squid species in trawl byproduct. Species are wide spread across northern Australia (central NSW to Shark Bay WA); catchability in prawn trawls lower at night when squid move up into the water column. However, egg clusters and adults highly susceptible to trawling in spawning grounds (Dunning et al (2000). Current catch at acceptable biological catch limit; see Milton et al 2009b: Byproduct Assessment (FRDC 2006/008).	Bycatch Subcommittee 27th January 2009.	Remove from list.	Expert opinion provided by Malcolm Dunning; May 2009. Expert opinion provided by Milton. See Byproduct Assessment (FRDC 2006/008). See Dunning et al (2000).	✘
	Dictyosquilla tuberculata	mantis shrimp	BP	Level 2 PSA	High	To remain on list and continue to be addressed as part of the current monitoring program.	Bycatch Subcommittee 27th January 2009.	No new information. To remain on list.	To be re-assessed in current CSIRO project – by December 2009.	✓
	Harpiosquilla stephensoni	mantis shrimp	BP	Level 2 PSA	High	To remain on list and continue to be addressed as part of the current monitoring program.	Bycatch Subcommittee 27th January 2009.	No new information. To remain on list.	To be re-assessed in current CSIRO project – by December 2009.	✓
Marine Reptile	*Hydrophis belcheri*	a sea snake	TEP	Level 2 PSA	High	One individual found in northern Papua New Guinea and not found in Australia.	Bycatch Subcommittee 27th January 2009.	Remove from list.	Expert opinion provided by David Milton; May 2009. See Cogger (1992).	✘

Taxonomic Group	Scientific Name	Common Name	Role in Fishery	Highest Level of Assessment	Risk Score	Justifications for removal from the list	Source	Current Action (provided by Dave Brewer)	Comments	Priority species as at 2013
	Parahydrophis mertoni	Northern mangrove sea snake	TEP	Level 2 PSA	High (Tiger only)	Found in Mudflats and mangroves and not in depth zone of NPF.	Bycatch Subcommittee 27th January 2009.	Remove from list.	Expert opinion provided by David Milton; May 2009. See Cogger (1992)	✗
	Hydrophis ornatus	sea snake	TEP	SAFE	Fished less than maximum sustainable mortality (MSM)	Trawl mortality was below reference points. Remove from list as per Milton (2001) sea snake assessment (FRDC 2005/051).	As per Milton sea snake assessment (FRDC 2005/051)	Remove from list.	Expert opinion provided by David Milton; May 2009. Milton (2001) see Sea Snake Assessment (FRDC 2005/051).	✗
	Hydrophis pacificus	Large-headed sea snake	TEP	SAFE	Fished less than maximum sustainable mortality (MSM)	Trawl mortality was below reference points. Remove from list as per Milton Sea Snake Assessment (FRDC 2005/051).	As per Milton sea snake assessment (FRDC 2005/051)	Remove from list.	Expert opinion provided by David Milton; May 2009. See Sea snake Assessment (FRDC 2005/051).	✗
	Hydrophis vorisi	A sea snake	TEP	Level 2 PSA	High (Banana only)	Found in eastern Torres Strait only and not in NPF.	Bycatch Subcommittee 27th January 2009.	Remove from list.	Expert opinion provided by David Milton; May 2009. See Cogger (1992).	✗
	Ephalophis greyi	North-western Mangrove sea snake	TEP	Level 2 PSA	High	Found in mudflats and mangroves along WA coast and not in depth zone or distributed within NPF.	Bycatch Subcommittee 27th January 2009.	Remove from list.	Expert opinion provided by David Milton; May 2009. See Cogger (1992).	✗
	Hydrophis coggeri	Slender-necked sea snake	TEP	Level 2 PSA	High	Distribution outside NPF.	Bycatch Subcommittee 27th January 2009.	Remove from list.	Expert opinion provided by David Milton; May 2009. See Cogger (1992).	✗

* In cases where species have known widespread distributions primarily outside the NPF, the species is deemed not at risk. However, potential existence of sub-population/genetically distinct local populations, and how to manage this issue will need to be discussed by the bycatch subcommittee.

APPENDIX B – FIRST CSIRO DATA ANALYSIS WORKSHOP

Bycatch sustainability project 2008 – First internal workshop to assess methods for analysing bycatch data.

23-10-08

1. David Brewer (CMAR; Project Principal Investigator)
2. Dr. Bill Venables (CMIS; Senior Scientist)
3. Dr. You-Gan Wang (CMIS; Senior Scientist)
4. Min Zhu (CMIS; Project Scientist)
5. Dr. Trevor Hutton (CMAR; Fisheries Analyst)

Workshop objective: To present the available data to key CMAR and CMIS staff and to discuss possible approaches to analyse the data and potential problems that may arise.

Brief background

Fishery objective under EPBC – Demonstrate sustainability for all species impacted

Project objectives

1. To develop effective and acceptable methods for assessing annual sustainability by NPF bycatch, in partnership with the AFMA ERA/ERM process, using risk assessment techniques and other innovative analytical techniques.
2. To deliver an annual sustainability assessment report for selected NPF bycatch species
3. To recommend and justify crew-member and scientific observer coverage levels to AFMA and NORMAC for subsequent data collection years

(Assess whether the observer program is capable of delivering on it's management objectives)

Two approaches for informing management decisions

1. Periodic risk assessments
    a. To focus monitoring program
    b. Still needs guidelines for assessing trends in catches – e.g. limit reference points
2. Develop an assessment using monitoring data (and past, patchy catch data)
3. Other options – use alternative management strategies

Issues

1. Data for many species is sparse
2. No baselines
3. Little known about viable population sizes
4. Some species impacted by other activities

E.g. sawfishes also caught in the coastal gill net fisheries and Indonesian fisheries

Project approach

1. Assess value of crew-member observer data
    a. Validation against scientific observer data
    b. Assess value of observer programs and current effort levels
2. Develop an acceptable method for assessing sustainability
    a. May involve developing reference points (1st time for bycatch)
3. Deliver the first annual sustainability assessment for bycatch species

Broader management goal – to implement this approach in other Australian fisheries (SEF, GAB)

Workshop outcomes

1. The data looks ‘disturbing’ due to low no’s for many species as well as other anomalies
2. There may be issues in fishing power over time that may need to be taken into account

Data preparation and analyses ideas

1. Need to look at the disaggregated data to see where and when species occur, using reliable data sets, so we can set up ‘expected’ catch rate scenarios
2. Include mapping in space and time (a baysian prior)
3. Build a Poisson model using this data as a ‘hidden predictor’
4. Part of the analyses will be to look at how systematic differences between crew-member observers and scientific observers might be
5. Trend analyses may involve looking at comparing (parallel) curves, on a log scale.

Actions

1. Talk to Ross Darnell: RE accessing some of Bill’s, You-Gan’s and/or Min’s time (Dave B)
2. Get missing scientific observer and crew-member observer data from AFMA (Gary/Margaret)

APPENDIX C – SECOND CSIRO DATA ANALYSIS WORKSHOP

Bycatch sustainability project 2008 – Second internal workshop to assess methods for analysing bycatch data.

20th May 2009: 1000 – 1230

1. David Brewer (CMAR; Project Principal Investigator)
2. Gary Fry (CMAR; Project Co-investigator)
3. Dr. Bill Venables (CMIS; Senior Scientist)
4. Dr. Ross Darnell (CMIS; Senior Scientist)
5. Dr. Emma Lawrence (CMIS; Project Scientist)

Workshop objective: To assess and agree upon the best approach towards a sustainability assessment given the available data from crew-member observer, scientific observer programs and fishery-independent surveys.

Workshop Agenda and Outcomes

1. ***CMAR and CMIS attendance***
    a. Two key CMAR staff attended the workshop to provide project information on project background, desired project outcomes and data set issues.
    b. Three CMIS staff attended the workshop to provide expert advice on the most appropriate data analysis for each of the animal groups. This included one CMIS staff from Acton (ACT), who is responsible for the data analysis.

2. ***Status of current data sets***
    a. All catch and biological data currently available were provided to CMIS staff prior to the workshop.
    b. The data set is not yet complete. CSIRO is waiting on the following before data analysis can be started:
        i. Crew-member observer data for the 2006 tiger prawn season to be provided by AFMA.
        ii. All animals photographed by crew-member observers during the 2006, 2007 and 2008 tiger prawn seasons require species identifications.

3. ***Data sets available and data issues***
    a. *NPF Prawn Population Monitoring Data Set*
        i. Most robust data set; time series from 2002 to 2009; standardised with gear, time, location, accurate species identifications.
        ii. Collected ‘out of season’.
        iii. Does not include all species listed as ‘at risk’ (see Table 5-2).
        iv. Will be used to match to the crew-member observer data sets on a spatial and temporal scale (on the NPF banana prawn stock regional level) and then used to validate the crew-member observer data sets with respect to catch rates and species identifications.

    b. *NPF Crew-member Observer Data Set:*
        i. Collected within commercial season.
        ii. Possibly unbalanced in its spatial coverage of NPF; the data set will be compared to the entire NPF commercial effort distribution to determine level of effective coverage.

   iii. Only limited number of crew-member observer participation and declining annually.
   iv. All TEP and 'at risk' species recorded; however not all groups were recorded throughout full time series (2003-2009).
   v. Possible inaccuracies in species identifications and data recording.

c. *AFMA scientific observer data set:*
   i. Limited coverage on spatial and temporal scale in the NPF.
   ii. Has direct validation of crew-member observer data sets where AFMA scientific and crew-member observers overlap.
   iii. Only subset of TEP and 'at risk' animal groups recorded.

d. *CSIRO scientific research and observer data set:*
   i. Accurate species identifications of all TEP and 'at risk' animal groups recorded.
   ii. Collected 'out of season' and generally not spatially comparable with current NPF commercial fishery effort distribution.
   iii. Majority of data collected before crew-member observers and NPF prawn population monitoring time.

4. ***Appropriate methods of data analysis:***
   a. Issue of scarcity of data records for most species.
   b. Issue of available data differs in collection methodology, fishing gear used, time and space, initial analyses will need to be performed to determine the potential use of each of the data sets, rather than immediately pooling the data and analysing it as a whole.
   c. Where sufficient data is available for each animal group, a Poisson log-linear generalized linear model will be initially applied to the NPF fishery-independent monitoring survey and crew-member observer data sets separately.
   d. Comparisons on catch rates between these two data sets will be made to check for consistency. If the NPF monitoring and crew-member observer data are not demonstrably inconsistent the two data sets, including all the crew-member observer data, the data sets will be combined to produce more spatially comprehensive analyses.
   e. This data set matching on spatial and temporal scales procedure and comparisons with the NPF prawn population monitoring data sets will also be carried out on the AFMA scientific observer and CSIRO scientific research and observer data sets to check for compatibility and possible inclusions for the final analysis.
   f. For the rarest species, above analysis procedures will not be suitable; therefore the quantitative risk assessment (Zhou and Griffiths 2008) may be used to assess their current risk to trawling given the changes in NPF commercial effort; contractions in fleet size and spatial fishing distributions.

5. ***Action Items:***
   a. Gary F. to send Emma L. the complete NPF prawn population monitoring data set to begin preliminary analysis.
   b. Gary F. to follow up request with AFMA for outstanding crew-member observer data and species identifications.
   c. Following this, Gary F. to send the complete crew-member observer, AFMA scientific observer and CSIRO scientific research and observer data sets to Emma L. for matching and comparison analysis for possible data pooling before final analysis.

Meeting closed: 1230