REPORT NO. 3507

MIT2019-01 REVIEW OF DOLPHIN ACOUSTIC DETERRENT DEVICE MITIGATION IN INSHORE FISHERIES



MIT2019-01 REVIEW OF DOLPHIN ACOUSTIC DETERRENT DEVICE MITIGATION IN INSHORE FISHERIES

SIMON CHILDERHOUSE, OLIVIA JOHNSON, LAURA TREMBLAY BOYER

Prepared for Department of Conservation, Conservation Services Programme

CAWTHRON INSTITUTE
98 Halifax Street East, Nelson 7010 | Private Bag 2, Nelson 7042 | New Zealand
Ph. +64 3 548 2319 | Fax. +64 3 546 9464
www.cawthron.org.nz

REVIEWED BY:
Deanna Clement

APPROVED FOR RELEASE BY:
Chris Cornelisen

ISSUE DATE: 30 July 2020

RECOMMENDED CITATION: Childerhouse S, Johnson O, Tremblay-Boyer L 2020. DOC MIT2019-01 Dolphin dissuasive device mitigation in inshore fisheries. Prepared for Department of Conservation. Cawthron Report No. 3507. 34 p. plus appendices.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Dolphin Acoustic Deterrent Devices (ADD; also commonly referred to as pingers) are thought to limit interactions between dolphins and fishing nets by emitting high frequency signals that persuade animals to avoid the noise source. While there is little quantitative data or empirical evidence from New Zealand (NZ) research as to the efficacy of ADDs, there is anecdotal information that they may be effective in reducing dolphin bycatch in set net fisheries. In New Zealand, ADDs are being used by some fishers in the deep-water jack mackerel trawl fishery and also in some inshore set net fisheries, targeting a range of different species, but their efficacy in these various settings has not been formally tested. However, there is some international evidence for their success in overseas fisheries. The Cawthron Institute was contracted by the Department of Conservation to carry out a literature review of ADD use internationally and to provide recommendations for a potential experimental trial of these devices in NZ inshore commercial fisheries.

The main conclusions drawn from the ADD literature as it relates to Hector's and Māui dolphin bycatch mitigation are:

- while success rates across marine mammal species have been variable, there have been significant examples of large reductions in bycatch through the use of ADDs
- limited ADD trials with Hector's and Māui dolphins in New Zealand have produced ambiguous results, but provide some indication that Hector's dolphins display avoidance behaviour around active ADDs
- ADDs appear most successful for cetaceans that are neophobic (i.e. fear of anything new), are easily startled, and have large home-ranges. They are, therefore, more likely to be effective for phocoenids (i.e. porpoises) than coastal delphinids such as Hector's and Māui dolphins which are boat-positive and unlikely to be strongly neophobic. As such, ADDs may be a less effective mitigation method for Hector's and Māui dolphins but this requires testing to confirm. Assessment of ADD efficacy will not be possible to assess without well designed, repeatable field trials
- prior to undertaking field trials, the ADD effectiveness must be evaluated against several key considerations:
    - What reductions in bycatch are achievable?
    - Are any reductions likely to meet management goals?
    - What sample sizes would be necessary in order to yield sufficient statistical power to quantify effectiveness?
- if ADDs are implemented, assessment of long-term effectiveness would require dedicated enforcement and compliance monitoring regimes as well as high levels of observer coverage

- the focus of this review has been on mitigating impacts from commercial inshore fisheries; however, any effective mitigation option should also be applied to recreational fisheries wherever possible.

Based on this review, there is evidence to support the trial of ADDs as a mitigation tool to reduce bycatch of Hector's and Māui dolphin in NZ inshore fisheries. Therefore, it is recommended that a staged approach to research is undertaken and that initial trials that pose no risk to dolphins should be undertaken. Results from initial trials will provide critical data needed to evaluate the potential of progressing research to a pilot scale field study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

GLOSSARY

ADD	Acoustic Deterrent Device, which includes pingers & AHDs
AHD	Acoustic Harassment Device. A type of ADD emitting louder sounds (i.e. >185 dB re 1 µPa at 1 m) than a standard ADD
Cawthron	The Cawthron Institute
COP	Code of Practice
CSP	Conservation Services Programme
dB re 1µPa @ 1m	Standard measurement for loudness (energy) of underwater sound
DOC	Department of Conservation
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations
FNZ	Fisheries NZ
km	Kilometre
m	Metre
MPI	Ministry for Primary Industries
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration of the US Government
NZD$	New Zealand dollar
Pinger	ADD emitting relatively low intensity sounds < 150 dB re 1 µPa at 1 m
PSC	Protected Species Capture (Fisheries NZ database)
US$	United States of America dollar
WAREHOU	Fisheries Catch Effort database administered by Fisheries NZ
WCNI	West Coast North Island

1. INTRODUCTION

Dolphin Acoustic Deterrent Devices (ADD; also commonly referred to as pingers) are thought to limit interactions between dolphins and fishing nets by emitting high frequency signals that persuade animals to avoid the noise source. Signals can be modulated (in length and width) to limit the potential of dolphins becoming de-sensitised or adapting to the signal. ADDs generally operate a different frequency to the frequency of cetacean echolocation so there is no direct interference with echolocation (Kastelein et al. 2006). While there are few quantitative data or empirical evidence from New Zealand research as to the efficacy of ADDs (Stone et al. 2000; Dawson & Lusseau 2005), there is anecdotal information that they may be effective in reducing dolphin bycatch in set net fisheries (T. Clarke, Fisheries Inshore NZ Ltd, pers. comm.). In New Zealand, ADDs are being used by some fishers in the deep-water jack mackerel trawl fishery and also in some inshore set net fisheries targeting a range of different species, but their efficacy in these various settings have not been formally tested. However, there is some evidence for their success in international fisheries (e.g. Dawson et al. 2013; Hamilton & Baker 2019).

ADDs come in a wide range of types and configurations and have been used to address two main marine mammal fishery issues: bycatch and depredation (Dawson et al. 2013). For the purpose of this review, we use the term ADD to cover all active sound emitters that are designed to reduce or modify marine mammal interactions with fisheries. There are two main types: pingers which emit relatively low intensity sounds (e.g. < 150 dB re 1 µPa at 1 m) and Acoustic Harassment Devices (AHD) which emit louder sounds (e.g. > 185 dB re 1 µPa at 1 m). The latter devices are designed to cause discomfort or pain when an animal approaches closely (Dawson et al. 2013). The key difference between these two types of ADDs is that the former aims to alert the marine mammal to the presence of a fishing net (hopefully eliciting avoidance behaviour) whilst the latter acts to make the location so unpleasant that they choose to avoid the area. A summary of all available ADDs is provided in Dawson et al. (2013).

The mechanism by which ADDs reduce bycatch in fisheries is generally poorly understood, but it is likely that mechanisms differ between species, fisheries, and ADD types. Dawson et al. (2013) identifies four main hypotheses to explain how low noise ADDs (i.e. pingers) reduce bycatch rates:

1. The sounds emitted by acoustic pingers cause aversion and act to displace animals from the vicinity of the pinger
2. Pinger sounds encourage echolocation or otherwise alert the cetaceans to the presence of the net and hence, make avoidance of entanglement more likely
3. Pinger sounds interfere with the animal's echolocation system, causing them to leave the area
4. Pinger sounds act by altering the distribution of prey.

Hypothesis 1 has been strongly implicated in the observed decline in bycatch rates of harbour porpoises, but not for any other species (including Hector's dolphins). There is little scientific evidence to validate any of the other three hypotheses (Dawson et al. 2013). By contrast, loud noise ADDs (e.g. AHDs) work on the principle of hypothesis 1 but produce sounds so loud that physiological injury (e.g. Temporary Threshold Shift or Permanent Threshold Shift) is expected if marine mammals do not move away. In general, the range of displacement of marine mammals by ADDs has confirmed that individuals are often only displaced by 10s or 100s of metres around an active ADD (e.g. Culik et al. 2001; Tixier et al. 2015), but it is possible that individuals can be displaced over larger distances if the deployment of ADDs is widespread and over a long time period, although this has been difficult to demonstrate.

The Cawthron Institute (Cawthron) was contracted by the Department of Conservation (DOC) to carry out a literature review of ADD use internationally and to provide recommendations for a potential experimental trial of these devices in NZ inshore commercial fisheries. This project forms a part of the Conservation Services Programme (CSP) Annual Plan 2019–2020.



Figure 1. Examples of an Acoustic Deterrent Devices (ADDs) (left panel) including potential configurations used in trawling (centre panel) and setnet (right panel) fishing operations. Graphics modified from Marintech (www.marintech.co.nz).

1.1. Project scope

The project has the following main objectives:

1. Review of international literature of the types of ADDs used and their influence on bycatch events (summarised in a matrix), leading on to a specific review of NZ set net and trawl fisheries with all protected NZ dolphin species, including Hector's and Māui dolphins
2. Develop a methodology for possible field trials and assessment of ADDs appropriate to an inshore fishery environment (i.e. set net and trawl) to mitigate bycatch of Hector's and Māui dolphins
3. Propose recommendations for future research on the use of ADDs in the NZ inshore fishery with respect to bycatch mitigation of Hector's and Māui dolphins.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Literature review findings

Our literature search approach and evaluation criteria, as well as a breakdown of these findings for each criterion, can be found in Appendix 1. In addition, a summary of specific publications, and the nature of the information contained within each, is provided in Appendix 3 and with an electronic version of the full database available from CSP[1].

The review identified 43 relevant research papers spanning the period 1998 to 2019 that discussed ADDs. Most were published scientific reports (77%) or government reports (16%). This literature review builds on the existing review papers that have considered the use and efficacy of ADDs (e.g. McPherson 2011; MacKay & Knuckey 2013; Dawson et al. 2013; Childerhouse et al. 2013; FAO 2018; Hamilton & Baker 2019). This document structured to complement and update the previous work presented in Childerhouse et al. (2013) which, while addressing mitigation options for set net fisheries, also covered ADDs. Since Dawson et al. (2013) and Childerhouse et al. (2013), only seven additional papers on ADDs have appeared in published literature. Perhaps, unsurprisingly, given the small amount of new research, the general conclusions of all these reviews have remained broadly consistent over this period.

There are many different ways to measure efficiency of ADDs. The two main areas of ADD efficacy examined in this review correspond to a direct reduction in bycatch levels and a direct reduction in target fish catch. There have been many ADD studies conducted over the last 20 years that have investigated the efficacy of ADDs in reducing marine mammal bycatch (Appendix 3). However, there has been considerable variation in the success of reducing bycatch. The wide range of results between studies is likely to reflect biological differences between bycaught species, fishery types, types of ADDs (e.g. low noise ADDs, high noise AHDs), and geographical locations. For example:

- The greatest success rate appears to be for beaked whale species (Carretta et al. 2008) and harbour porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*) (Alfaro Shigueto 2010; Gönener & Bilgin 2009; Northridge et al. 2011; Palka et al. 2008).
- There have been varying degrees of success for bottlenose (*Tursiops truncatus),* common (*Delphinus delphis*), striped (*Stenella coeruleoalba*) and franciscana dolphins (*Pontoporia blainvillei*) (Dawson et al. 2013).
- There has been little or no evidence of success for Hector's (*Cephalorhychus hectori hectori*) (Stone et al. 1997, 2000), Indo-pacific humpback (*Sousa chinensis*) (Berg Soto et al. 2009; Soto et al. 2012), and tucuxi dolphins (*Sotalia*

[1] Database available from csp@doc.govt.nz

fluviatilis) (Monteiro-Neto et al. 2004), although there have been limited studies on these species.

As a result of considerable previous research (Kraus et al.1997; Carretta & Barlow 2011; Palka et al. 2008; Northridge et al. 2011; Orphanides & Palka 2013), ADDs are currently mandatory in several commercial fisheries, including the Gulf of Maine groundfish gill net fishery and the California drift net fishery under various 'Take Reduction Plans' (NOAA 2013a, 2013b) and also in some fisheries in the European Union (e.g. EU standard 2016/0074). The mandatory use of ADDs in the California drift net fishery was concluded to be the primary reason for the recorded 100% decline in bycatch rates of beaked whales over the course of 17 years of observations, rather than other mitigation techniques applied during the same period, which included seasonal closures and limitations on fishing depth (Carretta et al. 2008).

Bycatch rates of harbour porpoises were found to be significantly reduced in several studies, although the statistical power of these results vary (see Appendices 1 and 3 for details). In a large dataset from the North East Atlantic, Palka et al. (2008) found ADDs resulted in significantly less harbour porpoise bycatch when correctly functioning devices were used. However, nets with an incomplete set of ADDs had greater bycatch than those with no ADDs, and it was suggested that porpoises may perceive a gap in functioning ADDs as a gap in the net, and therefore, swim towards it. Bycatch reduction for harbour porpoise as a direct result of ADDs use by fisheries has also been demonstrated in the Black Sea (Gönener & Bilgin 2009) and Peru (Alfaro Shigueto 2010). Two simulated studies (e.g. ADD experiments where nets were not used but where a net surrogate (e.g. rope without gill net mesh) was used instead) of ADD effectiveness found a significant decrease in the echolocation rate of porpoises around active ADDs (Carlstrom et al. 2009; Hardy et al. 2012). EU regulations require vessels > 12 m in length to use ADDs on static nets to minimise risk to cetaceans. There are no similar regulations in New Zealand that require the use of ADDs in any fishery, but some fishers use ADDs under a voluntary Code of Practice implemented by industry.

While the use of ADDs has proved effective for harbour porpoises, some fishers are concerned with the impracticalities of using such a high number of devices (Northridge et al. 2011). Tests of louder ADDs have suggested that they may be effective at reducing bycatch rates over up to 10 times the distance as standard ADDs, but bycatch reduction rates were not as high (e.g. ~65% with louder devices compared to ~90% with low noise devices, Northridge et al. 2011). However, the authors suggested further testing was needed as sample sizes were too small to be statistically robust. Larsen et al. (2013) conducted a controlled experiment testing the effect of increased ADD spacing on harbour porpoise bycatch in the Danish North Sea. Current regulations at that time required ADDs to be spaced no more than 200 m apart, but this study found spacing at 455 m resulted in 100% bycatch reduction compared to fishing without ADDs. The original 200 m spacing was a conservative estimate based on preliminary results of the effectiveness of ADDs. However, the additional trials by Larsen et al. (2013) confirmed that larger spacing was just as effective in reducing bycatch rates following robust trials.

Most studies examining bottlenose dolphins focused on depredation of nets rather than bycatch rates. Depredation causes economic losses to the fishery through reduced catch and net damage, as well as conservation concerns, as animals often become entangled. Studies showed varied responses by bottlenose dolphins to ADDs, with some results showing a decrease in net damage, greater target species catch by fishers (Brotons et al. 2008a; Buscaino et al. 2009; Gazo et al. 2008), and decreased interaction rates between dolphins and nets (Waples et al. 2013). However, as Dawson et al. (2013) highlighted, there have been two other studies where fatal entanglements of bottlenose dolphins continued to occur in nets equipped with ADDs, suggesting that results from one area or fishery cannot necessarily be applied to another area or fishery as both dolphin and fishery behaviour is likely to be highly variable between areas (Northridge et al. 2003; Read & Waples 2010).

Common dolphin responses to ADDs has also been inconsistent as highlighted by Berrow et al. (2008). This simulated study (e.g. ADD experiment where nets were not used but where a net surrogate (e.g. rope without gill net mesh) was used instead) on the south coast of Ireland found no evidence of avoidance to active ADDs, while Carretta and Barlow (2011) found a 50% reduction in common dolphin bycatch with ADDs used in the Californian gill net fishery. These two fisheries have considerably different target species and fishery gear types which may account for the differences between the two results. However, it also reiterates the importance of fishery-specific data to assess the effectiveness of ADDs as what works in one fishery and area may not work in another.

Overall, there were 10 references from our literature review that demonstrated both a decrease in cetacean bycatch levels, and no negative impact on target fish catch levels by fishers. While data from all the references included in this review were considered in investigating the efficacy of ADDs, in addition to a reduction in capture/catch rates, a 'successful' study was categorised as also having a moderate to high degree of scientific rigour. Eight references met these requirements and are used to summarise some of the key features of a robust research programme that successfully demonstrated the efficacy of ADD in reducing bycatch (Figure 2, Table 1). To investigate the overall advantages and disadvantages of these eight studies, scientific rigour[2], target species catch rate, and reduced cetacean bycatch primary factors were combined with project cost to provide a useful overview of the utility of the study (see Appendix 1, Section A1.2.7). Based on the data presented in Figure 2,

[2] This assessment was undertaken through a consideration of how well the reference met accepted scientific norms for the following categories: (i) experimental design, (ii) appropriate statistical analysis, (iii) robust results and (iv) conclusions follow results (Childerhouse & Johnson 2020).

there does not appear to be any clear or consistent patterns demonstrating successful methodologies to reduce capture rates relative to the different cost categories.



Figure 2. Investigation of the relationship between scientific rigour (Y axis), estimated project cost (X axis) and efficacy of the ADD in reducing bycatch (see legend for an explanation) from a review of 43 research papers covering ADD studies. The numbers inside circles correspond to the number of the research paper summarised in Table 1 and Appendix 3. Note: points have been spread out to avoid overlap so they can be clearly read. Lines join points within a cost category.

It is also important to consider that studies that do not achieve a significant or interesting result are unlikely to be published. Therefore, it is possible that a range of other studies that have not demonstrated efficacy may not have been published. Therefore, the available literature may present a more positive assessment of the efficacy of ADDs than potentially the greater body of work undertaken.

Table 1. Summary of ADD studies that are considered to have a moderate or high degree of scientific rigour and robustly demonstrated a reduction of cetacean capture rates. The reference number corresponds to the number of the paper as covered in Appendix 3 and Figure 2.

Reference number	Reference	Year	Study name (ADD type)	Gear codes	Species	Key finding	Exhibited avoidance	Bycatch reduction	Maintained target catch	Level of efficacy	Costs (NZD)
3	Barlow and Cameron 2003	2003	Field experiments showed that acoustic pingers reduced marine mammal bycatch in the California drift gill net fishery (Dukane NetMark 1000)	Set net	Dolphins and pinnipeds	Pingers significantly reduced total cetacean and pinniped entanglement in drift gill nets without significantly affecting swordfish or shark bycatch. Results also indicate a strong positive correlation between number of pingers and bycatch reduction. For six marine mammal species tested separately with this study, bycatch reduction was statistically significant for short beaked common dolphins (P = 0.001) and California sea lions (P = 0.02). Bycatch reduction is not statistically significant for the other species tested separately, but sample sizes and statistical power were low, and bycatch rates were lower in nets fitted with pinger devices for six of the eight other cetacean and pinniped species. For a net with 40 pingers, models predicted approximately a 12-fold decrease in entanglement for short-beaked common dolphins, a 4-fold decrease for other cetaceans, and a 3-fold decrease for pinnipeds	Yes	77%	Y	Pingers significantly reduced total cetacean and pinniped entanglement in drift gill nets without significantly affecting swordfish or shark catch. The authors believe that pingers are unlikely to reduce the bycatch of all cetacean species or all pinniped species.	$1,000,000+
5	Bordino et al. 2002	2002	Reducing incidental mortality of franciscana dolphin (*Potoporia blainvillei*) with acoustic warning devices attached to fishing nets (Dukane NetMark 1000)	Set net	Franciscana dolphin	A highly significant reduction in bycatch for this species. However, sea-lions damaged the fish in active pinger nets significantly more than silent nets, and the damage increased over the course of the study. 61% of entangled dolphins were females and 56% of the females were immature. Necropsies also revealed that five of 17 retrieved females were pregnant. Among males, 90% were immature. Entangled dolphins were not eating the target species of the fishery.	Yes	84%	No	The alarms were effective at reducing the incidental mortality of the franciscana dolphin in bottom-gillnets in the study area. Entangled dolphins were not eating the target species of the fishery, but sea lion depredation increased.	$1,000,000+

Reference number	Reference	Year	Study name (ADD type)	Gear codes	Species	Key finding	Exhibited avoidance	Bycatch reduction	Maintained target catch	Level of efficacy	Costs (NZD)
6	Brotons et al. 2008a	2008	Do pingers reduce interactions between bottlenose dolphins and nets around the Balearic Islands? (Aquatec AQUAmark 210)	Set net	Bottlenose dolphins	Net interaction rates were significantly reduced by 49% with active pingers, but not all brands were equally effective. Target fish species catch yields were increased by 9% with active pingers, though not significantly. The largest increase in profit per unit effort (PPUE) was seen in the conditions where pingers were inactive. Previous work on this fishery has shown that there is a strong seasonal effect on both dolphin-net interaction rates and PPUE (Brotons et al. 2008b). and while all brands showed some reduction in the active condition compared to the no-pinger control, only the reduction for Aquatec pingers was significant ($P = 0.0064$, Table 3). These pingers reduced the net interaction rate by 70% in active nets. The study showed that pingers may have potential as an effective mitigation measure, but the results were not conclusive and additional research is required. If pingers are introduced, a longitudinal study will be critical to monitor the impact of pingers on cetacean mortality levels and to monitor the possibility of habituation and/or sensitisation to the pinger stimuli. Furthermore, the widespread introduction of pingers into this fishery would significantly change the acoustic ecology of Balearic coastal waters and monitoring the effects of this change on the dolphin population would be important.	Yes	49%	Not reported	Shows potential for reducing net interactions, but requires further research	$50,000 - 100,000
8	Carretta & Barlow 2011	2011	Long-term effectiveness, failure rates, and 'dinner bell' properties of acoustic pingers in a gillnet fishery (ADD type not specified)	Set net	Dolphins & pinnipeds	The proportion of net sets with cetacean bycatch was significantly lower ($P = 6.7 \times 10^{-7}$) in sets with ≥ 30 pingers attached (4.4% of sets with bycatch) than in sets without pingers (8.4% of sets). Common dolphin bycatch rates on sets with ≥ 30 pingers was nearly 50% lower than those without pingers. Bycatch of other cetaceans was not significantly affected by pinger use; however, sample sizes were small. Beaked whales were not observed as bycatch in the year prior to pinger use. Bycatch was 10x greater when > 1 pinger failed. Over 14 years there was no evidence of habituation.	Yes	50%	Not reported	The proportion of sets with cetacean bycatch was significantly lower in sets with ≥ 30 pingers (4.4% of sets with bycatch) than in sets without pingers (8.4% of sets).	<$10,000
9	Carretta et al. 2008	2008	Acoustic pingers eliminate beaked whale bycatch in a gill net fishery (ADD type not specified)	Set net	Beaked whales	Beaked whale bycatch dropped from 33 in 3303 net sets during the first six years of the observer program, to none in 4381 sets over the last 10 years while pingers were in use. Results suggest beaked whales may be among the most sensitive cetacean taxa to pinger frequencies. The difference in beaked whale entanglement rates with and without pingers is so large that it cannot be explained as a sampling artifact (though population decline of toothed whales needs to be considered). In contrast, bycatch rates of all cetaceans (mostly dolphins) decreased by only 50% over the same period.	Yes	90%	Not reported	Beaked whale bycatch dropped 100%, bycatch rates of all cetaceans (mostly dolphins) decreased by only 50% over the same period	<$10,000

Reference number	Reference	Year	Study name (ADD type)	Gear codes	Species	Key finding	Exhibited avoidance	Bycatch reduction	Maintained target catch	Level of efficacy	Costs (NZD)
31	Mangel et al. 2013	2013	Using pingers to reduce bycatch of small cetaceans in Peru's small-scale driftnet fishery (Dukane NetMark 1000)	Set net	Dolphins	Pingers were effective at reducing bycatch of small cetaceans in the Peruvian small-scale driftnet shark fishery. Given the vast size of this fishery and its current levels of bycatch of small cetaceans (Alfaro Shigueto et al. 2010; Mangel et al. 2010), appropriate use of pingers could result in mortality reductions of thousands of individuals annually and would represent an important step for the conservation of small cetaceans in the south-eastern Pacific. There was no statistically significant difference in catch rates of sharks and rays, the primary target species in this fishery, between control (no pinger) and experimental (pinger) net sets.	Yes	37%	Yes	Pingers reduced bycatch of small cetaceans in the Peruvian small-scale driftnet fishery. Most dramatically for the common dolphins. There was no statistically significant difference in catch rates of sharks and rays, the primary target species in this fishery, between control and experimental net set.	$100,000 - $500,000
36	Palka et al. 2008	2008	Effect of pingers on harbour porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) bycatch in the US Northeast gill net fishery (ADD type not specified)	Set net	Harbour porpoises	Bycatch rates in hauls without pingers were greater than those with pingers. Unexpectedly, when hauls had an incomplete set of pingers, bycatch was greater than those without pingers altogether. As mesh size increased so did bycatch rate, despite the presence of pingers. All observed bycatch was in nets of > 15 cm mesh size. No evidence of temporal trends in bycatch, suggesting no habitation so far.	Yes	50%	No clear evidenc e either way	Support that pingers can reduce harbour porpoise bycatch in an operational fishery. Uses fishing effort as a proxy for target catch rates, but not clear if this was maintained or not.	$1,000,000+

Reference number	Reference	Year	Study name (ADD type)	Gear codes	Species	Key finding	Exhibited avoidance	Bycatch reduction	Maintained target catch	Level of efficacy	Costs (NZD)
43	Waples et al. 2013	2013	A field test of acoustic deterrent devices used to reduce interactions between bottlenose dolphins and a coastal gillnet fishery (SaveWave White & Black)	Set net	Bottlenose dolphins	Fish catch was significantly lower when dolphin-net interactions were observed. Pingers did not affect fish catch, but bottlenose dolphin interaction decreased, and echolocation increased with active pingers. The durability of pingers however, is not sufficient for effective deployment in this fishery. * Bycatch rates were not reported, and this value rather reflects a reduction in interaction rate (e.g. the number of observed dolphin interactions with the net)	Yes	49%*	Yes	SaveWaves were effective in deterring dolphins from interacting with Spanish mackerel gillnets, although the observations from the research vessel indicate that ADDs did not eliminate interactions entirely. Pingers did not affect fish catch, but dolphin interaction decreased, and echolocation increased with active pingers.	$1,000,000+

2.1.1. Potential effects of ADDs on dolphins

To understand potential effects, it is necessary to identify the mechanism by which ADDs are likely to work and this is poorly understood in scientific literature, but it is likely that there are a range of different mechanisms in operation between cetacean species, fisheries, and ADD types.

Dawson et al. (2013) identified four main hypotheses to explain how quiet ADDs (i.e. pingers rather than AHDs) reduce bycatch rates:

1. The sounds of acoustic pingers are generally aversive and act to displace animals from the vicinity of the pinger
2. Pinger sounds encourage echolocation or otherwise alert the animals to the presence of the net and hence make avoidance of entanglement more likely.
3. Pinger sounds interfere with the animals' sonar, causing them to leave the area
4. Pinger sounds act by altering the distribution of prey.

Hypothesis 1 has been strongly implicated in the observed decline in bycatch rates of harbour porpoise using pingers but not for any other species (including Hector's dolphins). There is little evidence for any of the other three hypotheses (Dawson et al. 2013). By contrast, loud ADDs (e.g. AHDs) work on the principle of Hypothesis 1 but produce sounds so loud that physiological injury (e.g. Temporary Threshold Shift or Permanent Threshold Shift) is expected if marine mammals do not move away. In general, the range of displacement of marine mammals from ADDs has confirmed that individuals are often only displaced by 10s or 100s of metres around an active ADD (e.g. Culik et al. 2001; Tixier et al. 2015) but it is possible that individuals can be displaced over large distances if the deployment of ADDs is widespread and long term although this has been difficult to demonstrate.

If Hypothesis 1 is proved to be the mechanism for how ADDs act as deterrents, then a potential risk from their use includes a significant habitat exclusion. If ADDs are used extensively and repeatedly in preferred habitat areas of cetacean species, there is potential for animals to be denied access to important areas. This is an undesirable outcome in the use of ADDs. It is likely to be more of a threat to coastal species such as Hector's and Māui dolphins, which have small home ranges (Dawson et al. 2013).

Assuming ADDs work in reducing bycatch rates for Hector's dolphins, there is then the question of whether Hector's are displaced from important habitats as a result of the presence of ADDs. This could mean that while bycatch rates are reduced (e.g. a positive effect) dolphins are excluded from an important breeding or feeding area (e.g. a negative effect), the net effect for dolphins could be either positive or negative. Hence, it is essential that when considering the benefits of ADDs, we also need to better understand the mechanism which is causing the effect and how this directly effects the dolphins. If the effect is exclusion from a marine area, what are the biological and ecological implications for the dolphins? Therefore, understanding and quantifying each of these issues is important in assessing the effectiveness of ADDs as mitigation tools.

ADDs are very effective in reducing beaked whale bycatch (Carretta et al. 2008), and these results indicate how sensitive these species are likely to be with respect to anthropogenic sound in general, but ADD effectiveness varies greatly between cetacean species. It should be noted that the authors concluded ADDs were the primary reason for the decline in beaked whale bycatch levels. We note however, that ADDs were implemented alongside a range of other mitigation techniques (e.g. time-area closures and gear modifications) and therefore, the resulting reduction in whale bycatch is likely to reflect a full suite of mitigation techniques rather than simply the introduction of ADDs.

There is potential for ADDs to increase noise pollution in the environment. Minimising this impact is one reason for testing and determining the minimum number and spacing of ADDs on fishing nets to reduce bycatch. Too few ADDs or nets with ADDs that are not working has been shown to increase dolphin-net interactions (Palka et al. 2008), but too many may also have negative consequences for species. Using more ADDs than required will not only increase noise pollution unnecessarily but could greatly increase overhead costs to fisheries and affect practicality (Larsen et al. 2013; Northridge et al. 2011). Tests of a louder acoustic device on small cetacean bycatch in the United Kingdom (Northridge et al. 2011) have appeared effective in terms of reducing the number of devices needed, with estimates of effective range ranging between 400 m for standard ADDs to between 1.2 and 3 km for louder ADDs (i.e. ~165 dB re 1μPa@1m) (Northridge et al. 2011). While fewer, louder devices might be more effective at mitigation, the trade-off could be that cetaceans are excluded from not only the nets but also important habitat away from the which is sub-optimal in terms of mitigation. The additional potential impact of using louder ADDs and introducing more noise into the ocean is not well understood and should be a consideration for any research.

Further to the need to conduct behavioural studies, ADDs may cause dolphins to change their acoustic behaviour (e.g. stop vocalising), but still remain in the area. This change could be significant if a key component of their behaviour (e.g. communication, echolocation) was reduced or limited. This would be difficult to investigate as acoustic monitoring might show a difference in vocalisations detected when in reality dolphin density remains unchanged. Therefore, two or more monitoring methods (e.g. visual and acoustic) should be undertake simultaneously to assess any potential behavioural changes. This would also address the issues above whereby it is important to understand the mechanism by which dolphin interaction rates are being reduced, as a single monitoring method may mask the overall effect.

Another potential issue involved with the use of cetacean acoustic deterrents is the potential for animals to become habituated to pinger sounds, where the behavioural response of animals lessens with long-term exposure rendering ADDs ineffective. Some long-term studies have found no evidence of this in active fishery scenarios (Carretta & Barlow 2011; Palka et al. 2008), while Carlstrom et al. (2009) detected some signs of habituation during a simulated trial. The risk of habituation occurring is likely increased if some reward such as prey, is to be gained by ignoring the deterrent. For instance, there are concerns that for some marine mammal species, particularly pinnipeds, that acoustic deterrents may act as a 'dinner bell' associated with an easy source of food (Aydi et al. 2013, Bordino et al. 2002, Snape et al. 2018). However, there is mixed evidence for this type of response, and it is likely to vary considerably by species (Carretta & Barlow 2011). In the case of Hector's dolphins, they are not considered to be neophobic (e.g. they are boat positive) and therefore may be attracted to ADDs.

2.1.2. Potential ADD effects on New Zealand inshore fisheries

Whilst ADDs have shown some success in mitigating bycatch, they come with associated costs (e.g. purchase of ADDs and regular replacement of batteries, modification of nets and vessels to accommodate ADDs in nets, downtime for modifications, increase haul time for same length of net with ADDs, reduced length of gear set given longer set and haul times) for inshore fisheries, particularly when used extensively. These devices are relatively expensive in terms of the cost of initial setup and maintenance. Northridge et al. (2011) estimated, depending on the ADD model used, the number of ADDs required per net (based on pinger spacing requirements), and the fisheries to be covered, costs to fisheries for implementing ADDs could range from between NZD$230,000 to NZD$5.1 million. Similarly, trials of acoustic devices can be cost-prohibitive. This is particularly the case for fisheries with relatively low cetacean bycatch rates, as a large number of trial net sets would need to be conducted in order to gain sufficient statistical power to determine effectiveness (Dawson et al. 2013). Several studies have highlighted concern for the robustness of ADDs and the extent of their battery life (Alfaro Shigueto 2010; Carretta & Barlow 2011; Hardy et al. 2012; Orphanides & Palka 2013; Waples et al. 2013). Maintaining a large number of these devices can prove costly in terms of both repairs and downtime (e.g. vessel being unable to fish if sufficient working ADDs are not available) (Alfaro Shigueto 2010; Northridge et al. 2011; Waples et al. 2013). Additionally, Northridge et al. (2011) reported safety concerns (e.g. longer workdays leading to increased fatigue, increased risk of entanglement nets with ADDs) for crew members when ADDs become entangled in gear.

2.1.3. The application of ADDs in NZ inshore fisheries

Some ADDs have been trialled in NZ fisheries (Stone et al. 1997, 2000; Dawson & Lusseau 2005) with mixed results. ADDs have been used sporadically in the NZ set net fishery (Ramm 2010, 2011); however, low observer coverage and lack of compliance prevented conclusions being made on their efficacy in reducing bycatch of protected marine species (Dawson et al. 2013). Nonetheless, ADDs are being used under voluntary Codes of Practice by some commercial fishers. A review by Dawson et al. (2013) of previous ADD studies undertaken on Hector's dolphins found no evidence that they were physically displaced from moored ADDs, but avoidance reactions were observed in 66% of nearby dolphin groups when an ADD was immersed from a drifting boat. However, this latter result was questioned in that boat-based trials may provide poor measures of responses to ADDs, given the possible confounding effect of the vessel, the potential for dolphins to be startled by the sudden onset of ADD sounds at close range (e.g. see Teilmann et al. 2006), and that they do not mimic the behavioural context associated with nets that are actively fishing (Dawson et al. 2013). Any future study investigating the effectiveness of ADDs for Hector's or Māui dolphins must elucidate behaviour around ADDs attached to nets containing fish. This is essential given considerations previously stated including foraging motivations around nets, pinger habituation, neophobic behaviour etc.

ADDs appear most successful for cetaceans that are neophobic (i.e. fear of anything new) or easily startled and have large home-ranges (Dawson et al. 2013). Therefore, they are more likely to be effective for phocoenids (i.e. porpoises) than coastal delphinids, and it is a reasonable assumption that ADDs will not be effective with all small cetaceans. Based on these assumptions, ADDs are, therefore, unlikely to be an effective mitigation technique for Hector's and Māui dolphins. An equally important consideration is that even if ADDs could deter Hector's or Māui dolphins from fishing nets, could they support a zero bycatch goal? The required bycatch reduction for Nationally Critical Māui dolphins would need to be 100%, and a similarly high level would need to be achieved for Hector's dolphin (Slooten 2013). Based on the available evidence, it seems that attaining these levels with the use of ADDs alone is not presently feasible. Dawson et al. (2013) noted that the challenges associated with undertaking a trial on these two dolphin populations could be significant given the sample sizes necessary (not stated) to demonstrate their effectiveness (e.g. positive or negative).

The Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI) and DOC (2012) reviewed the use of ADDs as a mitigation technique for Hector's and Māui dolphin and arrived at the following conclusion:

> *The use of ADDs to reduce interactions between Hector's dolphins and set nets has been investigated and MPI considers the efficacy of these devices to be unproven for Māui dolphins. ADDs have proven to be effective for some cetacean species but have not been conclusively established as effective for Māui dolphins or Hector's dolphins. It is also not known what undesired impacts ADDs may cause, for example exclusion of the Māui dolphins from their natural habitat and foraging areas. MPI considers any benefits these devices would provide to be unknown and unclear, which could result in*

unnecessary costs being imposed on industry. If the use of ADDs was required off the WCNI [West Coast North Island], data collection on the efficacy of this practice would also be required. However, such data collection is unlikely to be feasible given the small population size of Māui dolphins. Requiring the use of ADDs alone would not be sufficient to determine whether or not ADDs are effective in reducing the risk of fishing-related mortality from set nets.

This statement is now 8 years old and it is unclear if this position has changed since that time as no similar statement has been made recently.

2.2. Commercial set net and trawl fisheries involved in bycatch of Māui and Hector's dolphins

Of the two sub-species, only Hector's dolphins have ever been reported caught in both set net and inshore trawl fisheries, but the actual observed catches are few (Figure 3). Observed set net bycatch of Hector's dolphins was greater than one in most years, but observer coverage varied considerably over the same period. No bycatch of Māui dolphins has ever been recorded in any fishery while an observer was aboard a fishing vessel, but some direct reports from fishers have been made.

No Hector's or Māui dolphin has ever been reported by observers as bycatch in trawl fisheries (source: Dragonfly Protected Species Database) although there has been some self-reporting of Hector's dolphin catch directly from trawl fishers (Roberts et al. 2019). Observer coverage in those both set net and trawl fisheries is low (Figure 4) especially for set net fishing. This limits the ability to reliably estimate dolphin-fishing interactions, although observer coverage has been increasing since 2012.

The rate of bycatch from self-reporting fishers (i.e. no observer on-board) in the set net fishery is much lower than the rate reported from the observed set net fishery: 0.000086 individuals per km of set nets from non-observed sets vs 0.0012 individuals per km from observed set nets between 2006–2018 (source: Dragonfly Protected Species Database). This indicates that reporting rates of captures by fishers are likely very low. Unobserved fishing effort at this stage is thus unlikely to be of use in the estimation of bycatch rates and, therefore, we suggest that observer data are the best source of information to accurately quantify dolphin encounters with fishing gear.



Figure 3. Annual number of observed captures of Hector's dolphins for set net (all target species combined) effort by fishing year (grey) with the total amount of nets with observer coverage (red). Source: Dragonfly Protected Species Database



Figure 4. Observer coverage (inshore fishery) as a percentage of the total kilometres of net observed for set net (red), and total trawls observed (blue). Source: Dragonfly Protected Species Database

Roberts et al. (2019) modelled the expected number of fleet-wide encounters with Hector's dolphins from observed sets and results predicted (year-dependent) between 39 and 71 set net mortalities (Figure 5), and between 14 and 42 mortalities by inshore trawl (mean prediction; Figure 6). When compared to the total fishing effort, this equates to one capture per 400 km of set net, and one per 3000 inshore trawls. These values reflect the mean value over the five-year period 2014–2018.

The relatively low level of estimated bycatch for Hector's dolphins is even lower for Māui dolphins. Roberts et al. (2019) also applied their model to Māui dolphins and results showed that mortality was expected to be less than one individual caught per year from both trawl and set net fishing effort.



Figure 5. Mean predicted Hector's dolphin mortality (black) from commercial set net effort reproduced from Roberts et al. (2019). The set net effort (red; km) is included for context. Note that the effort values reported here are the values that were used as part of the Roberts et al. (2019) model and therefore, may not exactly match statistics reported elsewhere.



Figure 6. Mean predicted Hector's dolphin mortality (black) from inshore trawl effort reproduced from Roberts et al. (2019). The trawl effort (blue; sets) is included for context. Note that the effort values reported here are the values that were used as part of the Roberts et al. model and therefore may not exactly match statistics reported elsewhere.

2.3. Review of ADD use in New Zealand fisheries

The following is quoted from Dawson and Slooten (2005) summarising set net activity in NZ fisheries:

> Nevertheless, Canterbury fishermen voluntarily use pingers under a 'Code of Practice' (COP; Southeast Finfish Management Company, 2000) which, in addition to pinger use, encourages the setting of nets with the tide and the avoidance of setting nets in depths of less than 30 m or when dolphins are around the vessel; it also advises on what might reasonably be considered best practice. In addition, some gillnetters have voluntarily shifted their fishing operations away from areas with high densities of Hector's dolphins. It has been difficult, however, to ensure that pingers are used as required. While most of the skippers in the Canterbury gill net fleet (Motunau to Timaru) have been cooperative, one refused to carry observers. Another insisted that it was dangerous for his crew member to attach pingers to the net as it is set. Since he believed that setting and hauling operations pose the greatest risk, he dangled pingers from his boat during these times. His nets, when set, were unalarmed. Of the 68 gillnet sets observed in Canterbury in 1999/2000, only 28% complied with

the COP instructions for pinger deployment (Blezzard, pers. comm.). It is in the nature of fishermen to vary practices to find what seems the best solution, but this can mean that it is difficult to ensure effective use by everyone.

2.3.1. ADDs in trawl fisheries

Most (72%) of the references from the current review were related to ADD use in set nets while only 4 (7%) references included details about ADDs in trawls (see Appendix 3 for a summary of each paper reviewed). Given the significantly higher bycatch rate of cetaceans in set nets, most research has focused on that area. As a result, most of the summary and conclusions in this report principally relate to ADDs in set nets, but it is also worth noting some of the data from trawl fisheries.

Baker et al. (2014) noted that experimental research on ADDs in trawls has produced mixed results, with significant reductions in cetacean bycatch rates being observed in some fisheries when pingers have been used (Gazo et al. 2008; Northridge et al. 2010), but no evidence of an effect in other fisheries (Berrow et al. 2008; Hardy et al. 2012). Our review identified that whilst bycatch reduction was achieved through pinger use, all four of these papers had low to moderate levels of scientific rigour, which reflected generally poor experimental design and low sample sizes. There is also concern around the long-term effectiveness of ADD use in trawl fisheries (potentially related to habituation issues) and the consistency of efficacy, both of which need investigation in any future studies.

ADDs have been used in NZ trawl fisheries with the primary aim of reducing common dolphin bycatch, although there has been no assessment of their efficacy. The key messages provided in the following sections of this report apply equally to both set net and trawl fisheries. Specifically, ADDs can work in some cases for both types of fisheries, but a formal body of research is required to demonstrate long-term efficacy and to elucidate the various behavioural impacts on different cetacean species as a result of acoustic disturbance

3. STUDY DESIGN FOR ACOUSTIC DETERRENT DEVICE FIELD TRIALS

We identified a range of issues that need to be considered when designing trials for testing the efficacy of ADDs to mitigate bycatch of Hector's and Māui dolphins. An analysis and overview of these issues is provided in Appendix 2. Based on this review, the following elements were identified as being essential to the development of a robust experiment trial:

- statistically robust study design including use of appropriate controls and double-blind experiments and testing of continuous pulses including a random selection of variable frequencies to identify which is the most effective. Southall et al. (2016) summarised experimental studies to measure behavioural responses to sonar, but which could equally be applied to ADD experiments
- robust testing of ADD function (e.g. amplitude, frequency, duty cycle, signal type, etc) including long term performance
- use of independent government observers and/or independent scientists to provide robust and accurate monitoring data
- large sample sizes (e.g. > 25% of all fishing effort)
- consideration and monitoring of range of potential variables rather than only a single variable and fixing variables wherever possible to maximise the chance of detecting an effect (e.g. many studies considered only one dependent variable and found an affect that may have actually be due to a variable that wasn't monitored)
- formal necropsies of deceased dolphins for which cause of death was not able to be directly confirmed
- Longitudinal spatial/temporal studies and consideration of issues such as habituation. In particular, use of long-term, existing, robust data sets to establish base line capture rates is particularly useful
- calculation of statistical power for results to aid in accurate interpretation of any significant (and non-significant) results
- concurrent monitoring of commercial fish catch rates as an essential part of the trial to demonstrate any impact on catch
- clear instructions and communication provided to all parties involved in the trials (e.g. fishers, observers, managers) to ensure experimental designs are implemented both accurately and consistently between vessels, areas, and years, (including appropriate training
- field trials need to be well-funded. Most of the reviewed research, that provide robust fisheries level results, utilised existing government observer programmes that were estimated as exceeding USD$1 million in value.

One fundamental issue to the success of field trials is the need to address social license-based expectations from iwi, and other key stakeholders, that trials will not result in an increase in capture rates and would not progress without good evidence to confirm that this would be the case. Extending this concept further, it would be unethical to undertake trials on Māui dolphin due to their critically endangered status and therefore, by default, trials would need to be undertaken on closely related Hector's dolphins as a proxy for Māui. Being able to establish that a ADDs will not increase capture rates with a high degree of certainty prior to moving into fisheries trials necessitates a staged approach to research starting with simple experiments to demonstrate potential efficacy without any risk to dolphins.

Utilising the five-staged approach outlined below, a series of experiments with increasing levels of complexity is recommended including the following components, with developmental stages dependent on positive results from each prior stage:

1. **Testing the in-water operation of one or more different types of ADDs**. Research would cover issues such as: (i) measuring the reliability of ADDs (e.g. do they operate consistently as designed over long time periods and are they robust enough to survive placement in operational fisheries), (ii) assessing battery life, (iii) confirming pulse frequencies and loudness, and (iv) measuring effective detection distances (e.g. underwater sound propagation in various sea conditions). Experiments could be as simple as deploying active ADDs on multiple moorings alongside acoustic recorders for several days to record ADD sound production as described in Erbe and McPherson (2012). This could be supplemented by acoustic recordings taken from a mobile acoustic recorder (e.g. SoundTraps) at known distances and depths from the ADD to describe propagation and the sound field. This would be relatively cheap, simple, and straightforward to achieve. *Estimated cost NZD$10-15k.*
2. **Testing simple behavioural responses of Hector's dolphins to active ADDs**. Research would address what type of behavioural response ADDs elicit in Hector's dolphins. This would determine if the ADD was effective as a mitigation device (e.g. if it excludes dolphins from an area of 10 m around the ADD it is unlikely to work but if it does over 100 m then it may). Specific research projects could include:
    a. land-based theodolite tracking of dolphin movements around ADDs programmed to turn on and off at random intervals[3], comparing closest approach data to avoid auto-correlation of sightings. This is similar to the approach trialled on Hector's dolphins by Stone et al. (1997) with a good example of this kind of study provided in Berg Soto et al. (2009). *Estimated cost NZD$50-65k*

[3] Some ADDs have this ability while others do not therefore, device choice to trial would be important. Alternatively, it may be possible to work with ADD manufacturers to develop modified ADDs for testing purposes.

b. assessment of Hector's and Māui dolphin fine-scale behavioural changes around nets. Including, but not limited to, measuring behaviour in the presence/absence of fish, boat noise etc., using acoustic detectors positioned separate to fish nets (e.g. F-PODS; measure dolphin presence and activity using trains of echolocation clicks). Devices would be programmed to turn on and off at random intervals while monitoring dolphin behaviour with a focus under various conditions on assessing avoidance and surfacing positions.
c. simply lowering an ADD programmed to turn on and off at random intervals into the water while monitoring dolphin behaviour with a focus on assessing avoidance and surfacing positions. This is similar to the approach trialled on Hector's dolphins by Stone et al. (1997) with a good example of this kind of study provided in Hardy and Tregenza (2010). *Estimated cost NZD$25-35k.*
d. boat-based line transect surveys through areas of high Hector's dolphin density towing ADDs programmed to turn on and off at random intervals while observers collect data on dolphin activity and distance to the vessel. This is a new area of research and not being trialled previously. *Estimated cost NZD$20-30k.*

An important and desirable inclusion in any field study is blind testing whereby the researchers do not know when the ADD is active or inactive. Some potentially useful extensions would include (i) the concurrent use of acoustic recorders in each of these projects to collect data on both the performance of the ADD and dolphin vocalisations and (ii) the use of a drone or fixed video cameras to collect video footage of swimming behaviour and potentially location data (i.e. distance of a surfacing dolphin from the ADD or vessel). It is important to be aware that any results from vessel-based research are likely to include a component of vessel effect given the boat-positive nature of Hector's dolphins. This needs to be accounted for in any project that uses a vessel. A critical consideration for research is testing for habituation which will require at least multi-week if not multi-month-long projects. Stage 1 could be undertaken in any location, whereas Stage 2 behavioural studies should be undertaken in an area of high Hector's dolphin density, such as Banks Peninsula, which has been used in other study populations for this species

3. **Exploratory data analysis**. Prior to starting *in situ* fishery trials, it is important to undertake statistical power analysis to establish likely sample sizes required for a robust trial. These analyses can be based on the effect sizes estimated in Stage 2, known or estimated capture rate, the spatial and temporal distribution of fishing effort and other relevant features. Ideally a spatially explicit model should be developed to identify potentially different sampling strata and to optimise sample strategies to maximise data collection. In addition, it is important to estimate the likely benefit of the implementation of the ADD to population level questions (i.e. will the expected improvement in capture rate translate into

significant, positive population growth or at least a reduction in the rate of decline). Following on from this modelling, it would be useful to estimate the budget required for the next two stages to support decisions such as an assessment against other mitigation options and potential management actions with consideration of cost-benefit analysis.

If it is assessed at this point that the trial could lead to increased capture rates (e.g. dolphin prey and/or dolphins are attracted to ADDs), then moving into fishery trials could lead to increased dolphin deaths. The level of uncertainty around this parameter is one of key parts of the assessment process and therefore needs to include an element of continued risk assessment.

A key step prior to starting the assessment process is to develop clear criteria for determining the success of a trial (e.g. hypothetically the goal of the trial could be to demonstrate a minimum reduction of 50% in dolphin use of areas with active ADDs, and 0% of dolphins were attracted to active ADDs). There are many possible evaluation criteria which could be applied, and these must be scientifically driven while noting that management drivers (e.g. economic) will also be important. These factors will also need to consider a level of uncertainty that is deemed acceptable. If these criteria are met, then progress to Stage 3.

It is also recommended that overseas researchers who have extensive experience in ADD and fishery-related trials be included in the discussion of the study design, and in interpretation of this analysis to ensure that New Zealand builds on existing expertise available around the world. This could be achieved through the use of technical working groups (TWG).

4. **Pilot trial in fishery**. A pilot field study should be undertaken in an area with a high level of interactions (e.g. Banks Peninsula), in areas where fishing takes place, and over a sufficient time period (dependent on variables such as expected interaction rate, numbers of boats, net size etc.) to provide robust results. There are a range of suitable and published research models from existing fisheries (Palka et al. 2008) that can be used to develop a structured programme. It is necessary to have clear triggers for management action developed prior to the start of the trial (e.g. traffic light system to halt trials using variables such as increased capture rates). Progression to Stage 5 would be dependent on results and success criteria from the pilot.
5. **Full trial in fishery**. Expand the pilot project and modify as required based on results. Rerun the modelling developed for Stage 3, which can now be populated with measured rather than estimated parameters and increase the spatial and temporal coverage of the trial. Continue with a full trial until data confirms the success or otherwise of the project (based on pre-determined success criteria) and make recommendations on adaptive fisheries management based on the best available data.

Conclusions: The most appropriate method for developing a trial study to investigate the effectiveness of ADDs for reducing bycatch of Hector's and Māui dolphins, is to take a staged approach with five successive stages building in both complexity and risk. The initial three stages should represent no additional risk to Hector's and Māui dolphins during their implementation, and therefore could be progressed immediately. Stages 4 and 5 include intrinsic risk due to expanding into operational fisheries, but this step should not be taken unless the data from Stages 1-3 confirms that the risk of increasing capture rate, or adverse changes in behaviour, has been robustly estimated to be negligible and the predicted benefits outweigh the costs. The design and analysis of such research should include technical input from international experts experienced in working with ADDs and fisheries issues.

4. RESEARCH CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The final component of this project is to propose recommendations for future research on the use of ADDs in the New Zealand inshore fishery[4] with respect to bycatch mitigation of Hector's and Māui dolphins.

In summary, the conclusions of the ADD literature as it relates to Hector's and Māui dolphin bycatch mitigation are:

- While achieving variable success rates across marine mammal species, there have been some significant examples of large reductions in bycatch through the use of ADDs
- Limited ADD trials with Hector's and Māui dolphins in New Zealand have produced ambiguous results, but show some indication that Hector's dolphins display avoidance behaviour around active ADDs
- ADDs appear most successful for cetaceans that are neophobic (i.e. fear of anything new), are easily startled, and have large home-ranges. They are, therefore, more likely to be effective for phocoenids (i.e. porpoises) than coastal delphinids such as Hector's and Māui dolphins. As such, ADDs may be a less effective mitigation method for Hector's and Māui dolphins but this requires testing to confirm. Assessment of ADD efficacy will not be possible to assess without well designed, repeatable field trials.
- Prior to undertaking field trials, the ADD effectiveness must be evaluated against several key considerations:
    - What reductions in bycatch are achievable?
    - Are any reduction likely to meet management goals?
    - What sample sizes would be necessary in order to yield sufficient statistical power to quantify effectiveness?
- If ADDs are implemented, assessment of long-term effectiveness would require dedicated enforcement and compliance monitoring regimes as well as high levels of observer coverage
- The focus of this review has been on mitigating impacts from commercial inshore fisheries; however, any effective mitigation option should also be applied to recreational fisheries wherever possible.

Based on this review, there is evidence to support the trial of ADDs as a mitigation tool to reduce bycatch of Hector's and Māui dolphin in NZ inshore fisheries. Therefore, it is recommended that a staged approach to research is undertaken (as outlined in Section 3 above) and that initial Stage 1 and 2 trials can be undertaken with no risk to

[4] We note that while these recommendations primarily relate to inshore set net and trawl fisheries (95% of the data we reviewed), many of the best practice methods identified could also be applied to other fisheries (e.g. jig and longline), while noting that base line investigation would be required given a smaller amount of available data on the efficacy of ADDs in these fisheries.

dolphins and results will provide critical data needed to evaluate the potential of progressing research to a pilot scale field study.

The following summary statements have been extracted from the conclusions provided in the relevant sections of Appendix 2. Full further details and coverage of these issues in greater detail, please refer to the appropriate section of Appendix 2.

A2.1.1. Hector's dolphin encounter rate vs catch rate with inshore fisheries

The capture rate for Māui and Hector's dolphins is low compared with many overseas fisheries, which will make any statistically robust estimation of improvements from ADDs challenging. This is not to say that genuine improvements in capture rate cannot be measured, but it will be difficult to do so in the short term (e.g. < 2-3 years). Instead, it is likely to require a large sample size (e.g. much higher level of observer or electronic monitoring than currently) collected over multiple years. It is highly unlikely that any statistically meaningful result could be achieved for Māui dolphins given the extremely low capture rate and extremely low number of individuals remaining in the population. Discussion of specific areas in which encounter rates are likely to be high is provided in Section A2.1.1.

A2.1.2. Hector's dolphin encounter rates and study densities

It is essential that any future ADD experiments be undertaken in areas where Hector's dolphin densities are likely to be consistently high throughout the year such as Banks Peninsula and further south towards Timaru as this will maximise potential interaction rates.

A2.2. Suitable ADD field trial sites

To maximise the sample size required to investigate the effectiveness of ADDs as a bycatch mitigation tool, study design needs to include areas where: (i) there are a high number of dolphins and (iii) a high degree of overlap with inshore fisheries trawl and set net effort. As noted in Roberts et al. (2019), the highest dolphin-fisheries interaction rate is around the Bank Peninsula region, potentially stretched between Kaikoura and Timaru.

A2.3. Development of a dolphin deterrence metric to assess ADD effectiveness

The best metric to measure the efficacy of ADDs is change in fisheries bycatch rates for the simple reason that it is the end goal. However, while changes in capture rates have been measured effectively overseas, this is likely to present a range of challenges for NZ fisheries including relatively low capture rates and difficulties with achieving high levels of observer coverage due to challenges placing observers on small inshore vessels . Both these issues are going to provide challenges in accurately estimating baseline levels of bycatch rates accurately and robustly. Therefore, measuring any change (positive or negative) will also be difficult.

Nevertheless, monitoring bycatch rates should be the ultimate goal for demonstrating the efficacy of ADDs. However, it is critical in the early project stages to first evaluate dolphin behavioural metrics, including abundance, habituation and displacement, in response to ADDs as this will provide valuable data to elucidate effectiveness of ADDs during preliminary trials prior to full fishery experiments. Ideally, a combination of direct and indirect metrics would be used in full fisheries trials, following a weight of evidence approach to provide a broad assessment across a range of variables.

A2.4. ADDs used in literature and presently available

As discussed in the Section 2.4, the only ADDs presently in use by commercial fishers in NZ are made by STM (Italy) (e.g. model DDD-03) and are therefore the obvious model of ADDs to test in the first instance. They also meet all the characteristics identified above including a pulse frequency range of 5-500 kHz which covers the full spectrum of Hector's and Māui dolphin vocalisations (and presumably also their audibility range).

A2.5. Social science considerations

Careful consideration of the potential implications from any ADD trials will be necessary to ensure stakeholders, the public and Treaty Partners are all aware of the research proposal and implications. Given the potential for possible increases in dolphin bycatch rates from an unsuccessful trial, it is essential that a structured and staged approach be taken towards any testing and thorough consideration of risks prior to any trial in a real-world fishery situation are identified and fully understood. Finally, there will be a need to develop a media and consultation plan around potential trials, although the existing DOC CSP and/or FNZ Aquatic Environment Working Group (AEWG) process would be an appropriate consultation vector.

A2.6. Elements of best practice methods for ADD trials

The components of existing trials that are identified in Section A2.6 should form the basis on any trial in New Zealand although there will need to be careful consideration of some of the elements (e.g. available funding, development of a large scale and robust monitoring programme). The elements identified generally relate to large scale trials in operational fisheries, but most could be equally well applied to smaller, preliminary trials prior to a large scale roll out at fishery level.

A2.7. Research costings

It is unhelpful to speculate about what an ADD trial may cost without knowing the structure of that trial. However, what is clear from the literature is that there are a variety of research projects that range in scale from small strictly experimental projects to large scale projects embedded in existing fisheries. Estimated costs for projects in the literature review ranged from < NZD$10,000 to greater than NZD$1 million, but we consider that the studies at the lower end of this range represent significant underestimates. Almost 20% of all studies had budgets that were estimated to be in excess of NZD$1 million and these generally reflected well designed studies that were undertaken across an entire fishery using Government and/or independent observers as the primary method for data collection. There were some small-scale field experiments which were undertaken for less than NZD$100,000 which provided useful data but were generally limited in their applicability due to small sample sizes (e.g. small numbers of ADDs and /or limited field effort). If a staged approach to research is undertaken, then the project could start off with modestly priced smaller studies and, based on positive results, progress through to larger, more expensive projects building on previous research findings.

A2.8. Key issues to consider for the experimental design of ADD efficacy trials with Hector's and Māui dolphins in NZ inshore fisheries

Consideration of the elements identified in the sections above coupled with the sources of uncertainty and bias identified in Section A1.2.5, will support the development of a robust experimental design to assess the efficacy of ADDs. Furthermore, there are some high-quality studies identified in the literature review (e.g. Appendix 3) which can provide useful templates to guide the development of NZ studies. In addition, the design and analysis of such research should include international experts experienced in working with ADDs and fisheries issues. The key issues identified include:

1. The relatively low capture rate of both Hector's and Māui dolphins compared to most fisheries bycatch issues overseas means that designing statistically robust trials will be challenging
2. Challenges with achieving high levels of robust monitoring related to item 1 above but also challenges with placing observers onto small, inshore vessels
3. Hector's and Māui dolphins have complex spatial and temporal pattern which will make design of a trial challenging
4. A trial should be both cost effective and adequately funded
5. Statistical power analysis is an essential element and may also be difficult to undertake due to limited available data
6. A staged experimental approach should be undertaken starting with simple trials that posed no additional risks to dolphins
7. Māui dolphins are critically endangered and should not be the subject of any trial which has the potential to lead to increases in bycatch rates
8. Gaining a social license to operate will be critical to the success of any project
9. Ongoing uncertainty around the status of the Hector's and Māui dolphin Threat Management Plan (TMP) may impact the design and implementation of future trials.

5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful to a range of people for sharing their expertise and experience with this issue. In particular, this issue has been informed by useful discussions in Technical Working Groups of the Conservation Services Programme of the Department of Conservation and the Hector's and Māui dolphin Threat Management Plan. In particular we would like to thank Tom Clark (Fisheries Inshore NZ Ltd), Dave James (Marintec), and Anton van Helden (Department of Conservation). Also, Marine Science Advisor project lead Dr. Karen Middlemiss (Department of Conservation) for useful discussions, contract management, and critical review of earlier drafts of this report.

6. REFERENCES

[All the references below were considered in this report although they might not appear as citations.]

Abraham ER, Richard Y, Berkenbusch K, Thompson F 2016. Summary of the capture of seabirds, marine mammals, and turtles in New Zealand commercial fisheries, 2002–03 to 2012–13. NZ Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 169. 205 p.

Alfaro Shigueto J 2010. Experimental trial of acoustic alarms to reduce small cetacean by catch by gillnets in Peru. Final Report to: Rufford Small Grants Foundation. February 2010. 12.

Alfaro-Shigueto J, Mangel JC, Pajuelo M, Dutton P, Seminoff J Godley BJ 2010. Where small scale can have a large impact: structure and characterization of small-scale fisheries in Peru. Fisheries Research 106: 8-17.

Aydi A, Ghorbel M, Bradai MN 2013. Do pingers reduce interactions between bottlenose dolphins and trammel nets around the Kerkennah Islands (Central Mediterranean Sea)? Cahiers de Biologie Marine 54: 375–383.

Barlow J, Cameron G 2003. Field experiments show that acoustic pingers reduce marine mammal bycatch in the California drift gill net fishery. Marine Mammal Science 19(2): 265-283.

Berrow S, Cosgrove R, Leeney R, O'Brien J, McGrath D, Dalgard J, Le Gall Y 2008. Effect of acoustic deterrents on the behaviour of common dolphins (*Delphinus delphis*). Cetacean Resource Management 10(3): 227-233.

Bordino P, Kraus S, Albareda D, Fazio A, Palmerio A, Mendez M, Botta S 2002. Reducing incidental mortality of franciscana dolphin *Pontoporia blainvillei* with acoustic warning devices attached to fishing nets. marine mammal science 18(4): 833-842.

Brotons JM, Grau AM, Rendell L 2008b. Estimating the impact of interactions between bottlenose dolphins and artisanal fisheries around the Balearic Islands. Marine Mammal Science 24:112–127

Brotons J, Munilla Z, Grau A, Rendell L 2008a. Do pingers reduce interactions between bottlenose dolphins and nets around the Balearic Islands? Endangered Species Research Vol. 5: 301–308.

Buscaino G, Buffa G, Sara G, Bellante A, Tonello A, Hardt F, Cremer M, Bonanno A, Cuttitta A, Mazzola S 2009. Pinger affects fish catch efficiency and damage to bottom gill nets related to bottlenose dolphins. Fisheries Science 75:537–544.

Carlström J, Berggren P, Tregenza NJC 2009. Spatial and temporal impact of pingers on porpoises. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 66(1): 72-82.

Carretta J, Barlow J 2008. Acoustic pingers eliminate beaked whale bycatch in a gill net fishery. Marine Mammal Science 24(4): 956–961.

Carretta J, Barlow J 2011. Long-term effectiveness, failure rates, and “dinner bell” properties of acoustic pingers in a gillnet fishery. Marine Technology Society Journal 45:7–19.

Childerhouse S, Johnson O 2020. POP2019-01 Electronic devices to assess distribution, diving and foraging behaviour of Hector's dolphins. Prepared for Department of Conservation. Cawthron Report No. 3512. 51 p. plus appendices.

Childerhouse S, Miller E, Steptoe V 2013. Review of mitigation techniques for setnet fisheries and applicability to New Zealand fisheries Prepared by Blue Planet Marine for the Department of Conservation. BPM-DOC-New Zealand setnet mitigation review-1. Wellington, New Zealand.

Cox T, Read A, Solow A, Tregenza N 2001. Will harbour porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*) habituate to pingers? Cetacean Resource Management 3(1): 81-86.

Cox T, Read A, Swanner D, Urian K, Waples D 2003. Behavioral responses of bottlenose dolphins, *Tursiops truncatus*, to gillnets and acoustic alarms. Biological Conservation 115: 203–212.

Cruz M, Jordao V, Pereira J, Santos R, Silva M 2014. Risso’s dolphin depredation in the Azorean hand-jig squid fishery: assessing the impacts and evaluating effectiveness of acoustic deterrents. ICES Journal of Marine Science 71(9): 2608-2620.

Culik BM, Koschinski S, Tregenza N, Ellis G 2001. Reactions of harbor porpoises *Phocoena phocoena* and herring *Clupea harengus* to acoustic alarms. Marine Ecology Progress Series 211: 255-260.

Dawson S, Slooten E 2005. Management of gillnet bycatch of cetaceans in New Zealand. Cetacean Resource Management 7(1): 59-64.

Dawson SM, Lusseau D 2005. Pseudoreplication problems in studies of dolphin and porpoise reactions to pingers. Marine Mammal Science 21: 175−176

Dawson S, Lusseau D 2013. Pseudo-replication confounds the assessment of long-distance detection of gillnets by porpoises: Comment on Nielsen et al. (2012). Marine Ecology Progress Series 478: 301-302.

Dawson S, Read A, Slooten E 1998. Pingers, porpoises and power: uncertainties with sing pingers to reduce bycatch of small cetaceans. Biological Conservation 84: 141-146.

Dawson S, Northridge S, Waples D, Read A 2013. To ping or not to ping: the use of active acoustic devices in mitigating interactions between small cetaceans and gillnet fisheries. Endangered Species Research 19: 201-221.

Elwen S, McGovern B, Tregenza N, Gridley T 2016. Impacts of acoustic identity pinger tags on bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*). Acoustical Society of America 27: 12.

Erbe C, McPherson C 2012. Acoustic characterisation of bycatch mitigation pingers on shark control nets in Queensland, Australia. Endangered Species Research 19.

FAO 2018. Report of the expert workshop on means and methods for reducing Marine mammal mortality in fishing and aquaculture operations, Rome, 20-23 March 2018. FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Report No.1231. Rome, Italy.

Gazo M, Gonzalvo J, Aguilar A 2008. Pingers as deterrents of bottlenose dolphins interacting with trammel nets. Fisheries Research 92: 70-75.

Gönener S, Bilgin S 2009. The Effect of pingers on harbour porpoise, *Phocoena phocoena* bycatch and fishing effort in the turbot gill net fishery in the Turkish Black Sea coast. Turkish Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 9: 151-157.

Hamer D, Childerhouse S, Gales N 2003. Odontocete bycatch and depredation in longline fisheries: A review of available literature and of potential solutions. Marine Mammal Science 28(4): 345-374.

Hamilton S, Baker B 2019. Technical mitigation to reduce marine mammal bycatch and entanglement in commercial fishing gear: lessons learnt and future directions. Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries 29: 233-247.

Hardy T, Williams R, Caslake R, Tregenza N 2012. An investigation of acoustic deterrent devices to reduce cetacean bycatch in an inshore set net fishery. Cetacean Resource Management 12(1): 85-90.

Kastelein R, Jennings N, Verboom W, de Haan D, Schooneman N 2006. Differences in the response of a striped dolphin (*Stenella coeruleoalba*) and a harbour porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) to an acoustic alarm. Marine Environmental Research 61: 363-378.

Kraus S, Read A, Solow A, Baldwin K, Spradlin T, Anderson E, Williamson J 1997. Acoustic alarms reduce porpoise mortality. Nature 388 (7 August 1997).

Kyhn L, Jørgensen P, Carstensen J, Bech N, Tougaard J, Dabelsteen T, Teilmann J 2015. Pingers cause temporary habitat displacement in the harbour porpoise *Phocoena phocoena*. Marine Ecology Progress Series 526: 253-265.

Larsen F, Krog C, Eigaard O 2013. Determining optimal pinger spacing for harbour porpoise bycatch mitigation. Endangered Species Research 20: 147-152.

Leeney R, Berrow S, McGrath D, O'Brien J, Cosgrove R, Godley B 2007. Effects of pingers on the behaviour of bottlenose dolphins. Journal of Marine Biological Association United Kingdom 87: 129-133.

Maccarrone V, Buffa G, Di Stefano V, Filiciotto F, Mazzola S, Buscaino G 2014. Economic assessment of dolphin depredation damages and pinger use in artisanal fisheries in the Archipelago of Egadi Islands (Sicily). Turkish Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 14: 173-181 (2014).

Mackay A, Knuckey I 2013. Mitigation of marine mammal bycatch in gillnet fisheries using acoustic devices, literature review. Final Report to the Australian Fisheries Management Authority. 25pp.

Mangel JC, Alfaro-Shigueto J, Van Waerebeek K, Cáceres C, Bearhop S, Witt MJ, Godley BJ 2010. Small cetacean captures in Peruvian artisanal fisheries: High despite protective legislation. Biological Conservation 143(1): 136-143.

Mangel J, Alfaro Shigueto J, Witt M, Hodgson D, Godley B 2013. Using pingers to reduce bycatch of small cetaceans in Peru's small-scale driftnet fishery. Fauna & Flora International, Oryx 47(4): 595-606.

McPherson G 2011. Acoustic methods to mitigate bycatch and depredation by marine mammals on commercial fishing operations in Australian waters: Fishermen's options. Proceedings of ACOUSTICS 2011. Paper number 101: 8.

Monteiro-Neto C, Vila FJCA, Alves-Jr TT, Araüjo DS, Campos AA, Martins AMA, Parente CL, Manuel A, Furtado-Neto R, Lien J 2004. Behavioural responses of Sotalia fluviatilis (Cetacea, Delphinidae) to acoustic pingers, Fortaleza, Brazil. Marine Mammal Science 20(1): 145-151.

Northridge S, Kingston A, Mackay A, Lonergan M 2011. Bycatch of vulnerable species: Understanding the process and mitigating the impacts. Contract Reference: MF1003. Final Report, March 2011. By the Sea Mammal Research Unit for the Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs: 99.

Northridge S, Gordon J, Booth C, Calderan S, Cargill A, Coram A, Gillespie D, Lonergan M, Webb A 2010. Assessment of the impacts and utility of acoustic deterrent devices. Final Report to the Scottish Aquaculture Research Forum, Project Code SARF044. 34pp.

Northridge S, Vernicos D, Raitsos-Exarchopolous D 2003. Net depredation by bottlenose dolphins in the Aegean: first attempts to quantify and to minimise the problem. IWC SC/55/SM25, International Whaling Commission, Cambridge.

Orphanides C, Palka D 2013. Analysis of harbor porpoise gillnet bycatch, compliance, and enforcement trends in the US northwestern Atlantic, January 1999 to May 2010. Endangered Species Research 20: 251-269.

Palka D, Rossman M, Vanatten A, Orphanides C 2008. Effect of pingers on harbour porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) bycatch in the US Northeast gillnet fishery. Cetacean Resource Management 10: 217-226.

Petras E 2003. A review of marine mammal deterrents and their possible applications to limit killer whale (*Orcinus orca*) predation on Steller sea lions (*Eumetopias jubatus*). Alaska Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 7600 Sand Point Way NE, Seattle WA 98115. 49 p.

Ramm K 2010. Conservation Services Programme observer report. 01 July 2008 to 30 June 2009. Published by Marine Conservation Services, Department of Conservation, Wellington, New Zealand.

Ramm K 2011. Conservation Services Programme observer report. 01 July 2008 to 30 June 2009. Published by Marine Conservation Services, Department of Conservation, Wellington New Zealand

Read AJ, Waples D 2010. A pilot study to test the efficacy of pingers as a deterrent to bottlenose dolphins in the Spanish mackerel gillnet fishery. Bycatch reduction of marine mammals in Mid-Atlantic fisheries. Final report, Project 08-DMM-02, Duke University, Beaufort, SC.

Roberts JO, Webber DN, Roe WT, Edwards CTT, Doonan IJ. 2019. Spatial risk assessment of threats to Hector’s/Māui dolphins (*Cephalorhynchus hectori).* NZ Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 214. 168 p.

Shapiro A, Tougaard J, Jorgensen P, Kyhn L, Balle J, Bernardez C, Fjalling A, Karlsen J, Wahlberg M 2009. Transmission loss patterns from acoustic harassment and deterrent devices do not always follow geometrical spreading predictions. Marine Mammal Science 25: 53-67.

Snape RTE, Broderick AC, Cicek BA, Fuller WJ, Tregenza N, Witt MJ, Godley BJ 2018. Conflict between dolphins and a data-scarce fishery of the European Union. Human Ecology 46(3):423-433.

Soto A, Cagnazzi D, Everingham Y, Parra G, Noad M, Marsh H 2013. Acoustic alarms elicit only subtle responses in the behaviour of tropical coastal dolphins in Queensland, Australia. Endangered Species Research 20: 271-282.

Southall BL, Nowacheck DP, Miller PJO, Tyack PL 2016. Experimental field studies to measure behavioral responses of cetaceans to sonar. Endangered Species Research 31: 293-315.

Stone GS, Kraus S, Hutt A, Martin S, Yoshinaga A, Joy L 1997. Reducing bycatch: Can acoustic pingers keep Hector's dolphins out of fishing nets? Marine Technology Society Journal 31: 3−7

Stone G, Cavagnaro L, Hutt A, Kraus S, Baldwin K, Brown J 2000. Reactions of Hector's dolphins to acoustic gillnet pingers. Published client report of contract 3071, funded by Conservation Services Levy. 29 p.

Teilmann J, Tougaard J, Miller LK, T., Hansen K, Brando S 2006. Reactions of captive Harbour Porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*) to pinger-like sounds. Marine Mammal Science 22: 240-260.

Teilmann J, Sveegaard S, Dalgaard Balle J, Kyhn L, Carstensen J 2015. Porpoise monitoring in pinger-net fishery. Final baseline report. Technical Report from DCE – Danish Centre for Environment and Energy No. 68. 38.

Waples D, Thorne L, Hodge L, Burke E, Urian K, Read A 2013. A field test of acoustic deterrent devices used to reduce interactions between bottlenose dolphins and a coastal gillnet fishery. Biological Conservation 157: 163-171.

7. APPENDICES

Appendix 1. Summary of results of ADD literature review

Appendix 1 provides a summary of the results from the literature review. A short summary of all the papers and reports considered are shown in Appendix 2 and the full version of the summary spreadsheet is available from the Department of Conservation (DOC).

A1.1. Literature review methods

A1.1.1. Collation and analysis of ADD literature

The review of existing literature on ADDs covered the following source material: published international scientific literature, government agency commissioned reports, conference proceedings, commercial research, and results from industry and scientific trials. In this field of research, there is also a considerable body of grey literature that is difficult to source, but which is a large and valuable source of relevant information in this area. Electronic search engines and databases were used including: Web of Science, Current Contents, Google Scholar, and general internet searches, using keywords such as: dissuasive, deterrent (e.g. ADDs), gillnet, set net, trawl, mitigation, bycatch, acoustic harassment devices (e.g. Hector's dolphins), and pinger.

The results from the review of each reference were summarised in an Excel spreadsheet allowing fully searchable access to the records. Individual references were evaluated and reviewed against the following criteria:

1. level of scientific rigour – this assessment was undertaken through a consideration of how well the reference met accepted scientific norms for the following categories: (i) experimental design, (ii) appropriate statistical analysis, (iii) robust results and (iv) conclusions follow results. References were broadly grouped into low, medium or high depending on how well they met the four criteria identified above. While our assessment of rigour is subjective to a degree, it does provide high-level and consistent means in which to rank references' scientific standards and provides an indication of how well the reference follows scientific protocols.
2. level of proven efficacy - this assessment was undertaken through a consideration of how well the research method (e.g. ADD type) met the research question posed. The following aspects were considered: (i) ADD longevity and reliability, (ii) level of bycatch or interaction reduction achieved, (iii) whether the outputs address the research question, and (iv) impact on target fish catch. References were broadly grouped into low, medium or high depending on how well they met the four criteria identified above. While our assessment of rigour is subjective to a degree, it does provide high-level and consistent means in which to rank references' scientific standards and provides an indication of how well the reference follows scientific protocols.

3. fishing region and gear type – the gear type used noted in the reference was identified and listed.
4. caveats and uncertainties in methods – any caveats or uncertainties noted in the reference or apparent from a review of the reference were listed.
5. relevance to NZ inshore fishery methods by gear type – the fishing method in the reference was evaluated against how similar that fishery was to comparable NZ fisheries.
6. relevance to Māui and Hector's dolphins – the method and ADD in the reference was evaluated against how well that methods could be applied to Māui and Hector's dolphins.
7. costs and benefits - these considered a range of different types of costs and benefits including financial, animal welfare, conservation and management outcomes.

All of these criteria were then used to identify the papers and reports which appeared to be the most promising for understanding the potential mitigation potential of ADDs and for designing trials to demonstrate ADD efficacy.

A1.1.2. Hectors and Māui dolphin bycatch in set net and trawl fisheries

Analysis of existing NZ fishery data was undertaken using set net and trawl bycatch summaries collated on the Protected Species Bycatch website from data held by Fisheries NZ (FNZ; Abraham et al. 2016). These include fisheries effort data compiled by FNZ in the commercial fisheries (WAREHOU) database from Catch Effort forms filled out by commercial fishers.

Data from government observers on fishing vessels from 2003 to 2018 was used to assess Hector's and Māui dolphin bycatch rates in both set net and trawl fisheries as these represent the most robust data set available, although levels of coverage in some fisheries and/or areas can be low. Data were categorised by gear (e.g. set net and inshore trawl) across all fisheries (e.g. hoki and jack mackerel), and fishing areas, and also provided a total value of bycatch reported by fishing year (October 1st to September 30th, the latter year is used to label the period).

Modelled Hector's and Māui dolphin bycatch estimates from a spatial risk assessment (Roberts et al. 2019) are also available by species and gear for the entirety of the effort (i.e. not just the observed component). Upon request, the authors provided us with a summary of model bycatch estimates, and these were included in the current report as a time-series of mean predicted observed mortality by fishing year.

The following data were summarised:

- observed annual capture rates
- observed effort (e.g. km of set net, number of inshore trawls)

- % annual observer coverage
- mean predicted mortalities per fishing year.

These data were used to investigate and characterise important features of the fishery that were used in the development of trials (e.g. observer coverage and Hector's and Māui dolphin bycatch rate).

A1.1.3. Existing ADD use in NZ

Information on the use of ADDs in New Zealand was collated from web searches and discussions with fishers, fishing representatives, and technical experts involved in relevant research within New Zealand. These data were used to investigate and characterise important features of the fishery that were used in the development of trials (e.g. ADD models used and nature and extent of existing ADD use).

A1.2. Literature review results

A1.2.1. Summary results

Forty-three papers and reports relevant to ADDs were identified. Most were published scientific reports (77%) or government reports (16%). Other types of literature included reports from international governmental agencies (2%), non-governmental agencies (2%) or conference proceedings (2%; Figure A1.1). All documents were deemed relevant in understanding and characterising the issues associated with ADDs. A summary of these specific publications and the nature of the information contained within each is provided in Appendix 3 and within an electronic version of the full database available from the Conservation Services Programme (CSP[5]). The publications and studies reviewed spanned the period 1998 to 2019 with a majority undertaken between 2008 and 2014 (Figure A1.2).

[5] Database available from csp@doc.govt.nz



Figure A1.1. Proportion (%) of publications and reports by source (n = 43).



Figure A1.2 A breakdown of the number of publications and reports by year (n = 43).

A1.2.2. Level of scientific rigour

Of the 43 references reviewed, 10 were reviews or other references that did not include an element of scientific testing. The remaining 33 references had the following levels of scientific rigour:

- high level 3% (n = 1)
- moderate to high level 3% (n = 1)
- moderate level 21% (n = 7)
- low to moderate level 42% (n = 14)
- low level 30% (n = 10).

While the assessment of these values is subjective to a degree, they do provide a high-level overview of a reference's scientific rigour. This assessment is important in providing context to the results and how useful and accurate they are likely to be. For example, a significant result from a study with a high degree of scientific rigour is likely to be more robust (and useful) than one from a study with a low level of scientific rigour. However, while a significant result may have low rigour, it still could be relevant to Hector's dolphins as the result could reflect a positive outcome. Therefore, some studies, which showed positive effects from ADDs but had low rigour, could still be useful in assessing that study for use in Hector's dolphin mitigation. However, if it was decided to further test that effect, a different trial design would be necessary.

A1.2.3. Level of proven efficacy

There are many ways to measure efficiency of ADDs. The two main areas examined corresponded to 1) a direct reduction in bycatch levels and 2) any change in target fish catch. Of the 14 references with relevant data to the question of the efficacy of ADDs, and that also assessed a change in cetacean bycatch levels, 86% (n = 12) demonstrated a significant reduction in cetacean bycatch rates. The mean reduction in capture rates was 74% (SE = 6.2). Of the 13 references with relevant data to assess a change in target fish catch levels, 92% (n = 12) demonstrated no change. There were ten references that demonstrated both a decrease in bycatch levels and no change in target fish catch levels. When taking into account the scientific rigour of these ten studies, four were considered low, three were low to moderate, and three had a moderate level of scientific rigour. It is also important to note that while these studies found positive results, some had significant caveats or uncertainties associated with their study design, which made determination of study robustness challenging. For a list of caveats and uncertainties identified in the literature, please see Appendix 1, Section A1.2.5.

A1.2.4. Region and fishing gear type tested

There was a broad geographic range for the studies undertaken with most research in the United States (n = 8), Denmark (n = 5), and the United Kingdom (n = 3), but with some research undertaken in New Zealand (n = 2) and Australia (n = 2). Most of the literature was focused on set net or gill net fisheries 72% (n = 31) plus some had more than one target fishery (e.g. set net and trawl; 7% n = 3). Most of the references considered a wide variety of different types of set net and/or gill net operations including drift, demersal, artisanal, static and sink gill nets. While all these methods are broadly similar, the differences between them need to be considered when assessing their likely utility for NZ inshore fisheries. The remaining references covered a range of fishery methods including hand lining, shark control nets, trawl nets, long lines, and marine aquaculture farms.

While most of these studies will have some relevance to NZ fisheries, there can be some significant differences between the set up and operation of these overseas operations compared with NZ operations. These differences notwithstanding, several of the lessons and learnings from these operations can be applied to New Zealand. Most important is to be able to identify the mechanism by which improvements in bycatch were made so these lessons may be applied to NZ operations.

A1.2.5. Caveats and uncertainties in research methods

Given the wide breadth and scope of the literature reviewed, as well as the inherent challenges in undertaking full randomised experiments with appropriate controls, it is no surprise that a range of caveats and limitations were identified. The key message is that all of these issues need to be considered in the development of any future trials. While they do not necessarily invalidate the results found in all cases, they do make it more difficult to provide definitive conclusions to inform decision-making.

The caveats and uncertainties identified in each reference are identified in the full table of results (Appendix 3) by individual reference. Some of the key issues listed below:

- inadequate description of methods and results
- small sample sizes
- small effect size meaning that unrealistically large sample sizes would have been required to detect a statistically meaningful result (e.g. low statistical power)
- lack of a control in studies
- lack of a consistent application of an experimental approach including random elements to study design
- non-representative sampling of unrealistic situations (e.g. testing not undertaken on working fisheries, observer coverage not random or representative)
- low levels of observer coverage during sampling
- lack of independent monitoring
- inappropriate pooling of results

- lack of testing of seasonal and/or different behavioural states (e.g. breeding, migratory, feeding)
- confounding of the impacts of multiple management measures (e.g. implementing ADDs, closed areas, and seasons at the same time) and attributing all benefits to ADDs
- no investigation or monitoring of longer-term effects such as habituation, and cetacean behavioural changes around nets (e.g. reaction to presence/absence of fish in the net, boat noises etc.)
- sampling did not occur across a range of different densities of marine mammal locations so results may not be transferable.

A1.2.6. Relevance to Hector's and Māui dolphins

There was a wide range of different marine mammal species that were the focus of the ADD reports. The most common species was harbour porpoises, which were the study species in 30% (n = 30) of the literature with bottlenose dolphins (21%, n = 20) being the second most common species, and Hector's dolphins accounting for 5% (n = 2) (Figure A1.3).

While Māui and Hector's dolphins are taxonomically distinct from most other dolphin species (outside the *Cephalorhychus* genus at least), harbour porpoises could be considered as a useful proxy for them given the similarities in their acoustic capabilities (i.e. high frequency species). However, Dawson et al. (2013) investigated ADD studies and concluded that ADDs are more likely to be effective for neophobic (fear of anything new) or easily startled species (such as harbour porpoises) and are likely to be less effective for species showing adaptive behaviour, coastal distribution, and high site fidelity (such as bottlenose dolphins). Māui and Hector's dolphins are very neophilic (attraction to new things) and may respond quite differently to ADDs than harbour porpoises (Dawson et al. 2013). Therefore, any conclusions from harbour porpoise studies cannot be assumed to be directly relevant to Hector's dolphins. Regardless, results from these studies do highlight that ADDs can be effective for bycatch mitigation for some cetacean species and provide useful background that can be used to explore potential mechanisms for deterrence in Māui and Hector's dolphins.



Figure A1.3 Marine mammal target species of publications and reports (n = 43).

A1.2.7. Estimated project costs

An important consideration in any scientific study is cost. There were very few studies reviewed in the literature that presented actual costs associated with the research; therefore, we assessed the cost of ADD studies using relatively simple estimates (e.g. number of field days, number of observer days, and number of pingers required). There were some significant limitations to this approach as some studies were simple review articles, some studies used only pre-existing data, and others were fully designed and implemented experiments in operational fisheries. Nevertheless, there is some utility in exploring these costings to provide an idea of the range of likely costs, but these should be considered minimums and full and realistic costings should be a key part of any trial development.

Estimated costings ranged from < NZD$10,000 to projects in excess of NZD$1 million (Figure A1.4). Almost 20% of all studies had budgets that were estimated to be in excess of NZD$1 million and which generally reflected well-designed studies that were undertaken across an entire fishery using government and/or independent observers as the primary method for data collection. There were some small-scale field experiments that were undertaken for less than NZD$100,000 which provided useful data but were generally limited in their applicability due to small sample sizes (e.g. small numbers of ADDs and /or limited field effort).



Figure A1.4 Summary of estimated costing (NZD$) of ADD trials in publications and reports (n = 43). Note that few of the papers and reports estimated of the cost of the project and so these are broad estimates based on studies which did provide some information.

Appendix 2. Issues relevant to the design and implementation of field trials

We discuss in detail several issues specific to ADD testing and/or bycatch of Hector's and Māui dolphins that need to be fully considered prior to designing potential field trial methodologies. These issues are discussed below in order with summary boxes provided for each issue.

A2.1. Hector's dolphin encounter rates with inshore trawl and set net fisheries

Encounter rates can be considered in two different ways: (i) the rate that dolphins are actually caught in fisheries or (ii) the rate that live dolphins may be encountered by fisheries or research vessels (e.g. live interaction rate). Both types of rates are important to consider when developing field trials, but they must be estimated and considered separately. Obviously, if all the dolphins that encountered a fishing activity were caught then these two values would be equal, but this is unlikely to be the case in most fisheries. Māui dolphins were not considered as their encounter rates are so low that any robust statistical trial is considered improbable.

A2.1.1. Hector's dolphin encounter rate vs catch rate with inshore fisheries

Based on an analysis provided in Section 2.2, Hector's dolphins appear to have a low capture rate in commercial fisheries. By contrast, one of the few studies that was rated high for scientific integrity in our literature review (Mangel et al. 2013) estimated annual fleet-wide captures over 100 times higher than the comparable estimate for New Zealand, and the comparable catch rate was 67 times higher.

These very low encounter rates make it logistically problematic to design a robust experiment from fishing vessels that can detect the impact of ADDs on capture rates. This is simply because the existing rate of observed encounters is so low that the observed fishing effort would have to be extremely high to detect a statistical difference. For example, if ADDs were fully effective and a dolphin was never captured, it would still take many years before additional zero captures in the time-series could be statistically attributed to the positive impact of ADDs (reduced bycatch). Therefore, if there was only one or two years with zero captures, it might be considered a random effect.

A statistical power analysis can inform us the number of sets that would have to be observed to detect a decline in capture rates under treatment. However, as these data are not normally distributed (most of the observations are zeroes), a traditional statistical power analysis (i.e. one where the required sample size is calculated directly as a function of effect size, dispersion, and the desired rate of Type II error), would not give reliable results. A more robust approach would be to simulate captures from a negative binomial error distribution that mimics the properties of observed captures (e.g. high number of zeroes and occasional one or two captures). However, for this to provide useful insights to inform an experimental design, other factors would have to be taken into account, such as the distribution of fishing effort compared to Māui and Hector's dolphin habitat, and seasonal patterns in occupancy. This analysis has not been undertaken as part of the current project given the scope of the study aim, and the complexity of the task, although a detailed assessment of Hector's and Māui dolphin capture rates and fishery behaviour has been undertaken by Roberts et al. (2019) as part of the Hector's and Māui dolphin TMP process and would serve as a useful starting point.

Conclusion: The capture rate for Māui and Hector's dolphins is low compared with many overseas fisheries, which will make any statistically robust estimation of improvements from ADDs challenging. This is not to say that genuine improvements in capture rate cannot be measured, but it will be difficult to do so in the short term (e.g. < 2–3 years). Instead, it is likely to require a large sample size (e.g. much higher level of observer or electronic monitoring than currently) collected over multiple years. It is highly unlikely that any statistically meaningful result could be achieved for Māui dolphins given the extremely low capture rate and extremely low number of individuals remaining in the population. Discussion of specific areas in which encounter rates are likely to be high is provided in Section A2.1.1.

A2.1.2. Hector's dolphin encounter rates and study densities

The best available estimates of dolphin density (i.e. a reasonable proxy for occurrence) are provided from the modelling of aerial survey data by MacKenzie and Clement (2014; Figure A2.1) and Roberts et al. (2019; Figure A2.2). The following figures highlight areas with the highest relative dolphin density.

Conclusion: It is essential that any future ADD experiments be undertaken in marine areas where Hector's dolphin densities are likely to be consistently high throughout the year, such as Banks Peninsula and further south towards Timaru.



Figure A2.1. Relative density of Hector's dolphin rates within 5 x 5 km grid cells generated from Density Surface Models of aerial survey data. Reproduced from MacKenzie and Clement (2016).



Figure A2.2. Final predicted spatial density of Hector's and Māui dolphins in summer used for spatial risk assessment compared with the spatial distribution of public (left) and commercial fishery observer summer sightings (right). Figure 25 in from Roberts et al. (2019).

A2.2. Suitable ADD field trial sites

The identification of suitable marine areas to trial ADDs will be driven by the specific research question, and locations should be chosen to maximise statistical power. Selection criteria should include consideration of both dolphin density and fishing effort and must also include consideration of other factors such as the logistics involved in achieving adequate monitoring (e.g. observer programme or electronic monitoring).

There is a useful exploration of the spatial overlap and interaction of fisheries with Hector's dolphins in Roberts et al. (2019). One of the key findings was that areas of elevated bycatch risk from fishing were identified on the east coast of the South Island along the Kaikoura coast, immediately to the north of Banks Peninsula and in the South Canterbury Bight (Roberts et al. (2019); Figure A2.3). These are potentially useful sites for ADD trials as they represent areas where dolphin-net interactions are likely to be high and, therefore, empirical data collection will be more accessible.

The draft Hector's and Māui dolphin Threat Management Plan (TMP) is presently with the government for consideration with a range of different proposals released that include large increases in areas closed to fishing. Some of these decisions are still under further consideration (i.e. South Island trawling, marine mammal sanctuaries) and therefore, it is possible that additional areas will be closed (or even opened) to fishing. Without this knowledge, the development of any large-scale trial could be compromised or wasted due to future fishery restrictions.

Conclusion: To maximise the sample size required to investigate the effectiveness of ADDs as a bycatch mitigation tool, study design needs to include marine areas where (i) there are high number of dolphins and (iii) a high degree of overlap with inshore fisheries trawl and set net effort. As noted in Roberts et al. (2019), the highest dolphin density-fisheries interaction rate is around the Bank Peninsula region, potentially as far north as Kaikoura and as far south as Timaru.



Figure A2.3. Total annual risk ratio (the mean from 2014/15 to 2016/17) for Hector's dolphin bycatch in commercial set net and trawl fisheries. Observed captures in set nets between 2014/15 and 2016/17 are also shown as red points. The posterior distribution of the risk ratio is also displayed as the violin along the bottom with the median and upper 90% quantile indicated by the vertical lines within each violin plot. Figure A15.7 reproduced from Roberts et al. (2019).

A2.3. Development of a dolphin deterrence metric to assess ADD effectiveness

A robust trial of ADD effectiveness in dolphin bycatch reduction would need to measure a response variable and assess whether there is a statistical change in that response variable in the presence of ADDs. There are wide range of potential response variables to consider including:

1. capture rates: measured as the ratio of the number of captures (dead and/or alive) to the fishing effort observed
8. local abundance and/or density
9. sightings: as a measure of the number of dolphin sightings in an area and could be collected using sampling methods such as line transect surveys (e.g. aerial or boat), fisheries observer observations or even from land-based observations
10. vocalisations: vocalisation rates can be assessed using methods including hydrophones placed underwater measuring relative changes in acoustic vocalisation rates as an index of dolphin presence
11. dolphin interaction behaviour with ADDs: measured using passive acoustic monitoring devices to investigate variables including behavioural budgets, dive behaviour and habitat use
12. demographics: including survival rates or recruitment rates could be estimated to show change using long term genotype mark recapture.

These potential metrics vary between direct (capture rate) and indirect (abundance, habituation, vocalisations, and displacement) measures of an ADD effect on dolphins. Care must be exerted with indirect measures especially where it may be difficult to correlate any change seen in the metric with a change made to the fishery, since the change in metric could be driven by a range of factors. For example, it could be that ADDs significantly lower dolphin vocalisation rates within their vicinity, but they may not actually lower capture rates if the dolphins are still utilising the local environment in the same way. Making inference from such an effect (without understand this effect) would provide false positive support for the potential effectiveness of ADDs. Linking any changes to actual ADD effects is thus imperative if a real benefit is to be demonstrated.

Also, the appropriate variables to measure in an experiment will change depending on the inferred mechanism by which ADDs are thought to act. If ADDs are thought to decrease local abundance around trawl or set nets, then changes in capture rates and local abundance can both be used as response variables. If ADDs are thought to act by assisting Hector’s and Māui dolphins to detect and avoid trawl or set nets, but not displace them from habitat areas, than change in bycatch rates can be used as a response variable, but not local abundance as it should not be impacted by the presence of ADDs. In this situation, a change in behaviour would be the ideal response variable to measure as it is the direct result of the ADD's presence (under this model), and this is why it is critical that any study of ADD effectiveness as a by catch mitigation tool includes investigation of changes in dolphin behaviour in response to these devices.

Bycatch rates are potentially the easiest and cheapest response variable to monitor, assuming that all capture events are recorded by commercial fishers, and further assurance of this may come with increased observer coverage and the use of electronic monitoring on vessels. However, as discussed in Section 2.2, the low encounter rates of Hector's and Māui dolphins with trawl and set nets makes it impractical to rely solely on this variable to assess the ADD effectiveness. To maximise the sample size required to investigate the effectiveness of ADDs as a bycatch mitigation tool, study design needs to include marine areas where (i) there are high number of dolphins and (iii) a high degree of overlap with inshore fisheries trawl and set net effort (see additional discussion in Appendix 2, Section A2.5).

Ultimately direct metrics such as bycatch rates will always be preferred over indirect metrics for the simple reason that they actually measure the variable of interest. However, indirect metrics will be useful for preliminary trials to initially investigate dolphin behavioural responses, and the effectiveness of ADDs. This would be done before moving through the previously discussed project stages to full fishery trials where both direct and indirect measures will then be investigated concurrently. Spatial and temporal changes in fine-scale dolphin behaviour will need to be assessed over a long-time scale.

Conclusion: The best metric to measure the efficacy of ADDs is change in fisheries bycatch rates for the simple reason that it is the end goal. However, while changes in capture rates have been measured effectively overseas, this is likely to present a range of challenges for NZ fisheries including relatively low capture rates and difficulties with achieving high levels of observer coverage due to challenges placing observers on small inshore vessels[6]. Both these issues are going to provide challenges in accurately estimating baseline levels of bycatch rates accurately and robustly. Therefore, measuring any change (positive or negative) will also be difficult. Nevertheless, monitoring bycatch rates should be the ultimate goal for demonstrating the efficacy of ADDs. However, it is critical in the early project stages to first evaluate dolphin behavioural metrics, including abundance, habituation and displacement, in response to ADDs as this will provide valuable data to elucidate effectiveness of ADDs during preliminary trials prior to full fishery experiments. Ideally, a combination of direct and indirect metrics would be used in full fisheries trials, following a weight of evidence approach to provide a broad assessment across a range of variables.

A2.4. ADDs used in literature and presently available

There is a description of ADDs in published literature in the summary spreadsheet available in the full electronic database available from CSP[7]. There is considerable variation in the type, construction, frequency range, pulse interval and battery life between all ADDs covered. Many of these models, such as the Dukane NetMark 1000—the most often reported ADD in the literature—are no longer commercially available and there are some that did not progress past experimental models.

The only published study that has tested ADDs in New Zealand with Hector's dolphins is Stone et al. (2000), which used PICE (Black) and DUKANE (Red & White) ADDs, however, these models are no longer commercially available. The only ADDs currently commercially available for purchase in New Zealand are STM (Italy) products including the DiD-01, DDD-03H/U and DDDADD-03L, which are sold by Marintec Limited in Timaru. There are wide range of different ADDs available internationally including from FishTek Marine[8] (UK), Future Oceans[9] (USA), ETEC[10] (Germany) and AQUATECH[11] (UK) that can also be purchased for use in NZ.

The features of an effective ADD can be summarised from the investigation of the references considered 'successful studies' in our review, as summarised in Table 1. While these features are likely to be specific to fisheries and bycatch species for

[6] although this latter issue potentially could be resolved with the introduction of an effective and robust electronic monitoring programme onboard fisheries vessels.
[7] Database available from csp@doc.govt.nz
[8] See https://www.fishtekmarine.com/deterrent-pingers/
[9] See https://www.futureoceans.com/pingers/
[10] See https://www.etec.dk
[11] See http://www.aquatecgroup.com/11-products/25-aquamark-840

which they are aimed at reducing capture rates, there may be some useful characteristics than can be applied more widely. These include:

- ADD models: Dukane NetMark 1000 (3 studies), Aquatec AQUAmark 210 (1 study), and SaveWave White & Black (1 study)
- frequency ranges: 5–160 kHz or 10–12 kHz
- decibel level: 132, 135, and 155 dB RMS re: 1 µPa
- continuous pulses including a random selection of variable frequencies (e.g. to ensure that dolphins do not habituated to a single repetitive pulse)
- pulse rate: ~4 seconds
- pulse length: ~300 milliseconds
- battery life: highly variable between ADDs but generally in the order of 40–100 hours before requiring a recharge. Obviously, this would need to cover the entire soak time (including longer than expected soaks if the fishing gear cannot be recovered on schedule)[12].

Conclusions: As discussed in the Section 2.4 the only ADDs presently in use by commercial fishers in New Zealand are made by STM (Italy) (e.g. model DDD-03) and are therefore the obvious model of ADDs to test in the first instance. They also meet all the characteristics identified above including a pulse frequency range of 5–500 kHz which covers the full spectrum of Hector's and Māui dolphin vocalisations (and presumably also their audibility range).

A2.5. Social science considerations

Māui and Hector's dolphins have an extremely high public profile in New Zealand and are routinely the subject of media attention. There are various stakeholder groups that regularly use Māui and Hector's dolphins in advertising campaigns raising the profile further. In addition, Māui and Hector's dolphins are taonga species for many iwi, hapu and other New Zealanders. They are also formally listed in the Ngai Tahu Deed of Settlement.

Social science considerations are important with any research but are particularly relevant to studies that involve animal welfare. While the public would welcome any new effective bycatch mitigation options, they are likely to be fundamentally opposed to any experiment that carries a risk of potentially increasing bycatch rates. There is evidence provided in some of the ADD studies stating that bycatch rates have increased due to ADD malfunctions, inadequate ADD spacing and numbers on nets, or even the attraction of other marine mammal species such as sea lions (Bordino et al. 2002).

[12] An additional important factor is unit recharge times which can vary between 8–20+ hours and so consideration needs to be given to having enough units charged and available to cover units with longer recharge times.

While there is already an existing bycatch issue with Hector's and Māui dolphins, there needs to be careful consideration in any experimental study design to ensure that potential adverse effects from device trials are mitigated. This includes the use of a traffic light system, as previously discussed in the report, to introduce a mechanism by which the experiment is halted in response to a set of welfare criteria. We strongly support the strong need for a structured and staged approach to any testing to eliminate potential harm. A staged research approach could take the form of preliminary experiments outside of fisheries areas to demonstrate potential benefits without the risk of increased bycatch. Such a staged approach could begin with research on issues such as: (i) measuring ADD reliability (e.g. how well they survive being used in a commercial fishery) (ii) assessing battery life, (ii) confirming pulse frequencies, decibel levels and effective detection distance (to determine adequate line spacing on nets), (iii) assessing how well they can they be deployed/retrieved easily by fishers on all fishing systems, and (iv) systematically describing dolphin behaviour around active ADDs. Experiments of this nature are likely to require permits (e.g. a Marine Mammal Research Permit) and approvals (e.g. Animal Ethics Committee) of which public input is a key component and therefore, a social licence to operate will be essential.

Conclusion: Careful consideration of the potential implications from any ADD trials will be necessary to ensure stakeholders, the public and Treaty Partners are all aware of the research proposal and implications. Given the potential for possible increases in dolphin bycatch rates from an unsuccessful trial, it is essential that a structured and staged approach be taken towards any testing and thorough consideration of risks prior to any trial in a real-world fishery situation are identified and fully understood. Finally, there will need to develop a media and consultation plan around potential trials, although the existing DOC CSP and/or FNZ Aquatic Environment Working Group process would be an appropriate consultation vector.

A2.6. Elements of best practice methods for ADD trials

There were some common themes to studies which had a moderate or high degree of scientific rigour. These are the polar opposites of the caveats and biases that were identified in the poor studies as outlined in Appendix 1, Section A1.2.5.

Some of the best practice approaches from scientifically rigorous studies included the following components:

- strong experimental design including use of appropriate controls and double-blind experiments, including testing of continuous pulses including a random selection of variable frequencies
- use of independent government observers and/or independent scientists to provide robust and accurate monitoring data

- large sample sizes (e.g. > 25% of all fishing effort)
- consideration and monitoring of range of potential variables rather than only a single variable and fixing variables wherever possible to maximise the chance of detecting an effect (e.g. many studies considered only one dependent variable and found an affect that may have actually be due to a variable that wasn't monitored)
- formal necropsies of dead individuals for which cause of death was not able to be directly confirmed
- multi-year and multi-regional studies and consideration of issues such as habituation. In particular use of long-term, existing, robust data sets to establish base line bycatch rates is particularly useful
- calculation of statistical power for results to aid in accurate interpretation of any significant (and non-significant) results
- concurrent monitoring of commercial fish catches as an essential part of the trial to demonstrate any impact on catch
- clear instructions and communication provided to all parties involved in the trials (e.g. fishers, observers, managers) to ensure experimental designs are implemented accurately (e.g. to ensure comparability between vessels, areas, and years) including appropriate training
- well-funded; most of the research that provided a robust fishery level result utilised existing government observer programmes that were estimated as exceeding USD$1 million in value.

There are also some international ADD standards that have been applied in different parts of the world and can be considered to be best practice for those fisheries and target species (i.e. harbour porpoises). The two most common ADD standards are the EU standard (e.g. previously the EU standard 812/2004, now been replaced by EU standard 2016/0074[13] in 2019) and the US standard (e.g. as specified in the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) Harbour Porpoise Take Reduction Plan[14]). Both standards specify the requirements for the type, use and operation of ADDs that are required to be used in specific fisheries. While there is a considerable amount of high-level detail that this only relevant to these fisheries, there is also some excellent descriptions of ADD specifications, which are broadly consistent with the ADD characteristics identified in Section A2.4

[13] See https://eur-lex.europa.eu/procedure/EN/2016_74
[14] See https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/new-england-mid-atlantic/marine-mammal-protection/harbor-porpoise-take-reduction-plan

Conclusion: The components of existing trials that are identified in the list above should form the basis on any trial in New Zealand although there will need to be careful consideration of some of the elements (e.g. available funding, development of a large scale and robust monitoring programme). The elements identified above generally relate to large scale trials in operational fisheries, but most could be equally well applied to smaller, preliminary trials prior to a large scale roll out at fishery level.

A2.7. Research costings

It is difficult to provide reliable costings for ADD trials given the considerable variation in the scope, nature, and extent of a trial. There were some significant limitations to the approach undertaken in this report as some studies were simple review articles, some studies only used pre-existing data, and others were fully designed and implemented experiments in operational fisheries. Nevertheless, there is some utility in exploring these costings to provide an idea of the range of costings, but these costings should be considered minimums and full and realistic costings should be a key part of any trial development. Notwithstanding these issues, it is possible to summarise what was found in the literature review, as discussed in Appendix 1, Section A1.2.7.

As a general rule, robust ADD studies that provide extensive coverage of a fishery are likely to be very expensive (e.g. NZD$100,000s to NZD$1 million+) due to the large sample sizes that are likely to be required to achieve robust, statistically significant results. In general, the majority of costs in such a study are related to the provision of monitoring through the use of independent observers. We have broken costings down into the following sub-areas: monitoring, purchase, vessel charter and researches.

A2.7.1 Monitoring

For New Zealand, the approximate daily cost for a Government Observer is NZD$1,090 per day[15] so attempting to achieve high levels of observer coverage across multiple vessels is quickly going to run into thousands of dollars per day. While these costs can be high, they can be piggybacked with existing projects. For example, the CSP Draft Annual Plan for 2020/21 states that there are 598 days (e.g. with a total value of NZD$652,000) of observer effort proposed to cover South Island inshore set net effort for the 2020/21 fishing year. All of these days could be potentially be used in a trial of ADDs although it is important to note that: (i) this effort will be spread around the entire South Island so it would not all be available to cover a trial that only occurs in a single region (e.g. Banks Peninsula) and, (ii) while this number of days is estimated to achieve 25%, 35% and 65% coverage of three inshore set net fisheries,

[15] Cost based on the stated rate for observers working in inshore fisheries data provided in Table B of Appendix 1 of the Conservation Services Programme Draft Annual Plan 2020/21. May 2020

the highest level of coverage ever achieved in inshore set net fisheries has been 6% so these targets are considered optimistic.

Notwithstanding these potential limitations, if these coverage levels could be achieved, then they could form the foundation for a reasonable monitoring programme for any trial of ADDs. Following an appropriate power analysis developed for an ADD trial, it would then be possible to estimate the additional number of observer days that would be required to deliver a robust study and funding for these days would have to sought. In an ideal world, achieving 100% observer coverage in all the South Island inshore set net fisheries would require 1,857 days at a total cost in excess of NZD$2million for a single year.

While the focus here has been on monitoring using observer programmes, it may be possible to achieve the same level of scientific rigour from an electronic monitoring programme. If that were possible, then potentially costs could be significantly reduced for a monitoring programme.

A2.7.2 Purchase of ADDs

Another significant cost for a trial would be the purchase of ADDs with a price of approximately NZD$400-600 per unit. While the number of ADDs required per 100 m of net, based on minimum spacing distances, is likely to be species and fishery specific (and would require research to determine for Hector’s and Māui dolphins), a reasonable assumption is one ADD every 100-200 m of net (e.g. Northridge et al. 2011). With individual set netters likely setting up to several thousand metres of net each day, between 100 and 400 ADDs could be required to provide full coverage of a net. Therefore, costs for purchasing enough ADDs to cover 10,000 m of net would be in the order of NZD$50,000k or $100,000k depending on ADD spacing. Depending on type of ADD, it may also be necessary to have additional units if the recharging time is greater than the time between sets. While these are one off costs, as ADDs are reusable, it is a large up-front cost. One option might to design a trial that could work with NZ fishers who are already using ADDs (Section A2.4) so that purchasing them is not necessary.

A2.7.3 Vessel charter

Trial costs are likely to include vessel charters to deploy ADDs for a trial and also potentially to actually fish as part of the trial. This may be able to be negotiated with fishers interested in being involved in a trial. Charter costs could be significant if the experimental design requires a fishing vessel to change their normal fishing behaviour (e.g. fish in a trial that has lower catch rates than they might achieve elsewhere). Non-fishing vessels may also be used for trials depending on the nature of the trial being undertaken.

Most of the focus so far has been on large scale fishery trials but there is are also likely to be smaller, strictly experimental projects especially if a stage approach to research is used. Such smaller, more traditional research programmes are well represented in the literature review with costings ranging from low NZD$10,000 to NZD$500,000 depending on scale, although we believe that the studies at the lower end of this range are probably significant under-estimates.

A2.7.4 Researchers

Any trial will require input from biologists, statisticians, modellers, and other technical people whose time will also have to be covered. As an example, a relatively simple, small scale Stage 1 ADD trial could be approximately costed as follows for personnel time: (i) design and consultation (e.g. workshop) of study design = NZD$10,000, (ii) field work (e.g. deployment & retrieval trips, personnel time, travel = NZD$25,000, (iii) analysis, reporting and consultation (e.g. workshop) = NZD $20,000.

A2.7.3 Total costs

Based on the estimates above, the total cost of a relatively simple project, including purchase of equipment and vessel hire, is likely to be in the order of NZD $75,000+ for a fairly basic, small scale project. There are obvious savings that could be made if collaborations with fishers (e.g. vessel time), researchers (e.g. students) or others (e.g. government) could be developed. Again, it is important to note that these costings are very simple approximations, and full and realistic costings should be a key part of any trial development.

Conclusion: It is unhelpful to speculate about what an ADD trial may costs without knowing the structure of that trial. However, what is clear from the literature that there is a variety of research projects that range in scale from small strictly experimental projects to large scale projects embedded in existing fisheries. Estimated costs for projects in the literature review ranged from < NZD$10,000 to greater than $NZD1 million, but we consider the studies at the lower end of this range represent significant underestimates. Almost 20% of all studies had budgets that were estimated to be in excess of $NZD1 million and these generally reflected well designed studies that were undertaken across an entire fishery using Government and/or independent observers as the primary method for data collection. There were some small-scale field experiments which were undertaken for less than $NZD100,000 which provided useful data but were generally limited in their applicability due to small sample sizes (e.g. small numbers of ADDs and /or limited field effort). If a staged approach to research is undertaken, then the project could start off with modestly priced smaller studies and, based on positive results, progress through to larger, more expensive projects building on previous research findings.

A2.8. Key issues to consider for the experimental design of ADD efficacy trials with Hector's and Māui dolphins in NZ inshore fisheries

There is nothing particularly unusual about the experimental design required for an ADD trial in NZ inshore fisheries that differs from any other robust scientific study. Some of the key elements already identified in the previous section will of course be highly relevant. However, it is critical to consider some of the key features of both Hector's and Māui dolphin biology, the inshore trawl and set net fisheries, and what we know about the resulting dolphin-net interactions to develop a well targeted and robust trial.

Based on some of the previous findings in this report, the following issues need be considered:

1. **The relatively low capture rate of both Hector's and Māui dolphins compared to most fisheries bycatch issues overseas**. This is especially true for Māui dolphin which makes it highly unlikely that it would be possible to develop a robust trial to confirm a positive effect on bycatch reduction. For the more populous Hector's dolphins, the low capture rate will require a large sample size to robustly confirm any moderate to large effect and it is likely that the chance of detecting any small effect will be limited.

13. **Challenges with achieving high levels of robust monitoring**. Observer coverage in the inshore set net fishery has traditionally been very low (e.g. < 3%) although there are some promising signs that this is starting to increase (Figure 4) with a maximum level of 6% achieved in 2018. However, there are some inherent challenges with this fishery that will make it difficult to provide reliable and robust

coverage of the fishing fleet (e.g. small vessels with limited space for observers). Electronic monitoring offers a potential alternative to onboard observers.

14. **Hector's and Māui dolphins have complex spatial and temporal patterns**. These are detailed in Roberts et al. (2019). While this is not unusual for a marine mammal species, it adds complexity to the design of a robust trial requiring the experimental design to address potential seasonal and regional differences. This is not insurmountable as has been demonstrated in the recent spatial analysis presented in Roberts et al. (2019). This also relates to the issue identified in item 5 below.
15. **A trial should be both cost effective and adequately funded**. Any trial would need to be adequately funded to achieve its objectives as this is essential in order to meet the research aim. It is likely that any trial would be jointly funded commercial fishers and the Crown, but the cost of the trial should not be unreasonably burdensome on fishers. Given that the total amount of fishery effort in the set net fishery has been steadily declining over time, the cost of paying for a trial will likely fall to fewer and fewer fishers. This is also likely to be the case for trawl fishers. Unless the government is prepared to pick up a large component of the cost, then it is likely that the size of a trial will be constrained by the ability of fishers to contribute.
16. **Statistical power analysis**. As discussed in Section A2.1.1, a traditional power analysis is unlikely to provide reliable results due to low capture rates, and therefore, a more complex simulation-based approach would be required to support the experimental design. Again, while this is not insurmountable, it adds to the complexity required in the study design.
17. **Staged experimental approach**. While it could be possible to design and launch into a fully comprehensive experiment, we recommend taking a five-staged approach in a stepwise fashion as described in Section 3. For example, simple trials could be first conducted outside of a fishery to test device functionality and dolphin behaviour around ADDs factors to better understand the mechanism for reducing capture rates (e.g. displacement vs. awareness).
18. **Māui dolphins are critically endangered**. Given the critically endangered status of Māui dolphins, it would be unethical to undertake any trial where there was even a small possibility of an increase in bycatch rates. Considerable preliminary trial work would be required prior to any trial in a commercial inshore trawl or set net fishery to provide confidence that bycatch rates will not increase. A single additional capture is unsustainable for this sub-species. To mitigate potential risks, it is possible that results, if favourable, from trials on Hector's dolphins could be used as a proxy for risk assessments needed to extend studies to include Māui dolphin.
19. **Social licence to operate**. As discussed in Section A2.5, Hector's and Māui dolphins are taonga species for many iwi, hapu and other New Zealanders. While all groups would likely welcome any new, effective bycatch mitigation options, they are likely to be fundamentally opposed to any experiment in which bycatch rates

may have the potential to increase. While not strictly an experimental design issue, it is an important issue to consider when developing a trial.

20. **Ongoing uncertainty around the status of the Hector's and Māui dolphin Threat Management Plan (TMP)**. The Government has recently released a series of new protection and conservation measures for both Hector's and Māui dolphin TMP. While these measures have included some new protection areas, they also include further consultation on some issues (e.g. South Island inshore trawling) and is presently with the government for consideration with a range of options proposed, potentially including large increases in areas closed to fishing. While the government has yet to release its final decision on some key issues, it is possible that additional areas will be closed to fishing. Without this knowledge, the development of any large-scale trial could be compromised due to future fishery restrictions. It is also highly likely that fishing industry groups may seek to overturn some of these decisions through Court action which could also contribute further uncertainty to the process.

Conclusion: Consideration of the elements identified above coupled with the sources of uncertainty and bias identified in Section A1.2.5, will support the development of a robust experimental design to assess the efficacy of ADDs. Furthermore, there are some high-quality studies identified in the literature review (e.g. Appendix 3) which can provide useful templates to guide the development of NZ studies. In addition, the design and analysis of such research should include international experts experienced in working with ADDs and fisheries issues.

A2.9. Summary

This section covers a wide range of issues that must be considered when developing and designing a set of experimental trials to test the efficacy of ADDs in mitigating Hector's and Māui dolphin bycatch. A summary of the issues and recommendations for potential future trials is presented in Sections 3 and 4 above.

Appendix 3. Complete list of reports and publications reviewed including short summaries of key findings.

Note that many of the key findings in the following tables have been extracted verbatim from the original reference and, therefore, where 'we' is used, it is a quote from the authors of that particular reference and not the views of the authors of this review.

Number	1
Reference	Alfaro Shigueto 2010
Year	2010
Study name	Experimental trial of acoustic alarms to reduce small cetacean bycatch by gill nets in Peru
Fishing gear	Gill net
MM bycatch (test) species	Species caught: Dusky dolphin (*Lagenorhynchus obscurus*), bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*), common dolphin (*Delphinus capensis*), and pilot whales.
Key finding	The results of the study suggest that pingers may indeed be effective at reducing the bycatch of small cetaceans—fishing sets that used pingers had at least a 73% reduced rate of capture of dolphins and porpoises in relation to control sets. Catch rates of the target species were unchanged.
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	Not discussed
Level of scientific rigour	Low - moderate: Controlled experiment testing. Small sample size, different control, and test vessels, over three seasons.
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	Controlled experiment testing. Small sample size, different control, and test vessels, over three seasons.
Exhibited avoidance?	Y
Reduced bycatch?	Y
Maintained target catch	Y
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	Pingers may indeed be effective at reducing the bycatch of small cetaceans—fishing sets that used pingers had at least a 73% reduced rate of capture of dolphins and porpoises in relation to control sets. Catch rates of the target species were unchanged.
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment.
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment.
Costs	Cost of individual ADDs (approximately USD$80, or USD$800 to equip a 1 km long net). The UK based company Fishtek (fishtekmarine.com) is currently developing an ADD with an anticipated cost of £15-20. Such a device would go a long way to making ADDs economically feasible in small scale fisheries. Requires marine mammal mortalities to be able to determine success.
Benefits	Able to be performed on existing fisheries.

Number	2
Reference	Baker and Hamilton 2014
Year	2014
Study name	Technical review: Development and application of bycatch mitigation devices for marine mammals in mid-water trawl gear
Fishing gear	Various discussed, no nets used.
MM bycatch (test) species	Various
Key finding	Of the commercial ADDs available for use in gill nets, only the DDD type has shown some effect in pelagic trawl fisheries. ADDs should be fully charged and deployed on the lower wing ends or bridles of the trawl to ensure they continue to function correctly. Although ADDs appear to be effective in reducing dolphin bycatch, there are still challenges to address including determining the most effective configuration for mid-water trawls. Deployment of ADDs may interfere with normal fishing operations, and French fishermen prefer to use a softer ADD set on the rear part of the trawl rather than use a ADD set on the wings of the trawls because there is less interference with the netsonde.
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	Not discussed
Level of scientific rigour	NA
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	Not many papers reviewed
Exhibited avoidance?	Y
Reduced bycatch?	Y
Maintained target catch	NA
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	Of the commercial ADDs available for use in gill nets, only the DDD type has shown some effect in pelagic trawl fisheries
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	Lists issues with ADDs
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Issues listed are useful for developing test methods in New Zealand
Costs	Low costs for a literature review. ADDs are commercially available from a number of suppliers and are marketed under various trade names
Benefits	Indicative summary of ADD use.

Number	3
Reference	Barlow and Cameron 2003
Year	2003
Study name	Field experiments show that acoustic ADDs reduce marine mammal bycatch in the California drift gill net fishery
Fishing gear	Drift gill net
MM bycatch (test) species	Various cetacean and pinnipeds
Key finding	ADDs significantly reduced total cetacean and pinniped entanglement in drift gill nets without significantly affecting swordfish or shark catch, results also indicate a greater reduction with a greater number of ADDs. For species tested separately with this test, bycatch reduction was statistically significant for short beaked common dolphins (P = 0.001) and California sea lions (P = 0.02). Bycatch reduction is not statistically significant for the other species tested separately, but sample sizes and statistical power were low, and bycatch rates were lower in nets with ADDs for six of the eight other cetacean and pinniped species. For a net with 40 ADDs, the models predict approximately a 12-fold decrease in entanglement for short-beaked common dolphins, a 4-fold decrease for other cetaceans, and a 3-fold decrease for pinnipeds
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	Could not tell whether the observed ADD effect was caused by the sound produced by the ADDs or by the presence of something novel hanging from the net. We believe that the visual enhancement caused by the presence of the ADDs at night is trivial and that the sounds they emit almost certainly caused the reduction in bycatch; however, our design does not allow us to distinguish between these hypotheses. Given the relatively small number of nets and the huge area fished, habituation may be less of a concern for the California drift gill net fishery than for intensive, localized set gill net fisheries in the Gulf of Maine and in the North Sea. We believe that ADDs are unlikely to reduce the bycatch of all cetacean species or all pinniped species.
Level of scientific rigour	Moderate: moderate sample size, missing some information about vessels, only over a single year, good statistics, not all variables able to be controlled, but only robust data included in the analysis. Includes pinnipeds and cetaceans in the same experiment, uses real fisheries examples.
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	"An impractically large sample would be required to find a statistically significant result for rare species, even if their response was the same as for common dolphins." (authors) The actual number and configuration of ADDs varied due to differences in net length, ADD failures, and other uncontrolled factors. Experimental protocols were not followed on every set. Sometimes skippers chose not to employ ADDs in rough seas (18 cases), during the first set of a season or the first set with an inexperienced crew (seven cases), when ADDs were causing problems (two cases), or for other reasons (20 cases). Occasionally, skippers chose to employ ADDs even when the protocol called for none (because marine mammals were known to be present, five cases). Could not tell whether the observed ADD effect was caused by the sound produced by the ADDs or by the presence of something novel hanging from the net. Possible direct or inadvertent manipulation of the results by the observers or the fishermen. Study might not be long enough of a study to determine habituation.
Exhibited avoidance?	Y
Reduced bycatch?	Y
Maintained target catch	Y
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	ADDs significantly reduced total cetacean and pinniped entanglement in drift gill nets without significantly affecting swordfish or shark catch. We believe that ADDs are unlikely to reduce the bycatch of all cetacean species or all pinniped species.
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment. Similar taxa bycatch.
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment. Shows that it is inherently difficult to control differences in sampling protocol and data collection using real fisheries examples. Similar taxa bycatch (i.e. bottlenose dolphins and sealions).
Costs	Large amounts of ADDs used in real fishery example. Very expensive. Requires marine mammal mortalities to be able to determine success.
Benefits	Able to be performed on existing fisheries. Accounts for a lot of variables in sampling protocol associated with fishing.

Number	4
Reference	Berrow et al. 2008
Year	2008
Study name	Effect of acoustic deterrents on the behaviour of common dolphins (*Delphinus delphis*)
Fishing gear	Discusses gill nets and pelagic trawling, but no nets used.
MM bycatch (test) species	Short beaked common dolphin
Key finding	Significant modification of the signal type or source level may be more effective, but our results suggest that ADDs, at their current state of development, may not provide a consistently effective deterrent signal for common dolphins. Although both devices were only tested on one dolphin group in the present study, the contrasting results suggest that intra-specific differences occur in the reaction of common dolphins to acoustic stimuli, which may be due to differences in spatial, temporal or other variables
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	-Acoustic devices permit animals to associate an escape route with the acoustic signal at the mouth of the trawl
Level of scientific rigour	Low: small sample size, low level of sampling/testing effort, no statistical tests. Many uncontrolled variables.
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	No statistical tests used. The RP did not always log its own activation, not a reliable estimate of dolphin clicks… or activation -vessel was moving when acoustic alarms were being used - this means the depth of water could have varied and the acoustic properties of the area. Could have created acoustic interference. -No estimates of ambient noise. -trial 1 and 2 used a different method (ADDs and hydrophone on moving vessel), Trial 3 attached the ADD to a RIB, which was stationary (while the other vessel with the dolphins moved towards the RIB). -Dolphins are attracted to the vessel for bow wave riding. Not foraging behaviour... -controls were not deployed consistently (none in second trial) - controls only collected for short time periods (< 2 min per recording). -Although the same group of dolphins were sometimes subjected to a number of consecutive tests, up to 14 different dolphin groups, ranging in size and in composition, including adults, juveniles and calves were exposed to ADDs or acoustic deterrent signals over the course of the study. -controlled exposure experiments presented here are in stark contrast to the noisy, complex environment around an active fishing trawl
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	N
Reduced bycatch? Y/N	N
Maintained target catch Y/N	NA
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	ADDs did not provide a consistently effective deterrent signal for common dolphin
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Methods useful for developing testing NZ assemblages.
Costs	Low
Benefits	Local, investigates taxa of concern.

Number	5
Reference	Bordino et al. 2002
Year	2002
Study name	Gillnet
Fishing gear	Reducing incidental mortality of franciscana dolphin *Potoporia blainvillei* with acoustic warning devices attached to fishing nets
MM bycatch (test) species	Franciscana dolphin *Potoporia blainvillei*
Key finding	"A highly significant reduction in bycatch for this species. However, sea-lions (*Otaria javescens*) damaged the fish in active pinger nets significantly more than silent nets, and the damage increased over the course of the experiment. 61% of entangles dolphins were females and 56% of the females were immature. Necropsies also revealed that 5 of 17 retrieved females were pregnant. Among males 90% were immature. Entangled dolphins were not eating the target species of the fishery." (authors)
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	61% of entangled dolphins were females and 56% of the females were immature. Necropsies also revealed that 5 of 17 retrieved females were pregnant. Among males 90% were immature.
Level of scientific rigour	Moderate
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	Entangled dolphins were not eating the target species of the fishery.
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	Two mechanisms could account for a dolphin's
Reduced bycatch?	Entanglement in this case: (1) dolphins do not detect the net or do not perceive it as dangerous, or (2) dolphins are not using echolocation while traveling between feeding areas
Maintained target catch	No (higher sealion depredation)
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	The alarms were effective at reducing the incidental mortality of the franciscana dolphin in bottom-gillnets in the study area. Entangled dolphins were not eating the target species of the fishery, but sea lion depredation increased.
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	-dinner bell effect
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	-habituation
Costs	Moderate: medium sized dataset. Data on fishing gear, environmental variables and bycatch rates were recorded by fishery observers. Some trends that perhaps should have been discussed.
Benefits	-considers historic fisheries capture rates.

Number	6
Reference	Brotons et al. 2008a
Year	2008
Study name	Do ADDs reduce interactions between bottlenose dolphins and nets around the Balearic Islands?
Fishing gear	Demersal gill net
MM bycatch (test) species	Bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*)
Key finding	Net interaction rates were significantly reduced by 49% with active ADDs, but not all brands were equally effective. Catch yields were increased by 9% with active ADDs, though not significantly. The largest increase in PPUE was seen in the conditions where ADDs were inactive. As previous work on this fishery has shown that there is a strong seasonal effect on both dolphin-net interaction rates and, PPUE (Brotons et al. 2008b). While all brands showed some reduction in the active condition compared to the no-ADD control, only the reduction for Aquatec ADDs was significant (P = 0.0064, Table 3). These ADDs reduced the net interaction rate by 70% in active nets. We have shown that ADDs may have potential as an effective mitigation measure, but our results are not conclusive and additional research must be conducted. If ADDs are introduced, a long-term study will be absolutely essential to monitor the impact of ADDs on mortality levels and to monitor the possibility of habituation and/or sensitisation to the ADD stimuli. Furthermore, the widespread introduction of ADDs into this fishery would significantly change the acoustic ecology of Balearic coastal waters and monitoring the effects of this change on the dolphin population would be important.
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	Reasons for avoidance were not discussed. ADDs represented a novel stimulus to the dolphins and we are unable to predict whether and how rapidly they may habituate to these sounds, especially under varying motivational conditions, such as increased hunger if fish stocks become further reduced. If animals learn to associate the ADD sounds with the presence of fish, then the interaction may even be worsened by ADD use. The cognitive abilities of bottlenose dolphins suggest that habituation may occur readily.
Level of scientific rigour	Moderate: Some uncertainties and assumptions, comparable to other ADD studies, power analysis, many variables controlled (identical nets for 59 ships) and multiple contributing factors included in PPUE measure.
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	-Although vessels were assigned to treatments at random within cooperatives, treatments were distributed as equally as possible across localities to minimise the effect of geographic area, as we have previously found net interactions rates to vary considerably across areas (Brotons et al. 2008b). -There was no attempt to verify the accuracy of the acoustic properties of the ADDs. -Since interaction with the net through depredation is a prerequisite for entanglement in it, we used the frequency of net interaction as a measure of bycatch risk, so that our results were not dependent on actual mortality for interpretation. - power calculations assumed a balanced design, which there was not. -sample sizes must be adequate with respect to the natural variability of the response measure, so we note that the variability inherent in both our response measures is such that future studies of ADD effectiveness will require substantial sampling effort, at least equivalent to that we report here. Of course, the observed effect size should be considered against observed bycatch rates and reduction targets if they exist. Ideally, results from bycatch mitigation experiments would be compared to baseline bycatch data. -All types of dolphin interactions with nets were used as a proxy for risk of fatal entanglement.
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	Y
Reduced bycatch? Y/N	Y
Maintained target catch	NA
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	Shows potential for reducing net interactions, but requires further research
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	Performed in depths up to 60 m
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Bottlenose dolphin is in NZ also.
Costs	Net interactions represented an economic cost, from fish loss and net damage, of 6.5% (95% CI: 1.6 to 12.3% of the total landed catch value (Brotons et al. 2008a). Bycatch mortality may reach between 30 and 60 dolphins annually, although there are no reliable current estimates (for more information see Brotons et al. 2008b). Requires marine mammal deaths to be able to determine success.
Benefits	Defined by PPUE. Catch yields were increased by 9% with active ADDs, though not significantly. The largest increase in PPUE was seen in the conditions where ADDs were inactive.

Number	7
Reference	Buscaino et al. 2009
Year	2009
Study name	ADD affects fish catch efficiency and damage to bottom gill nets related to bottlenose dolphins
Fishing gear	Demersal gill net
MM bycatch (test) species	Bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*)
Key finding	The net equipped with ADDs contained 28% more fish biomass and was less damaged (though this was not the case on a haul by haul basis but averaged over the course of the year).
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	- fish exposed to excessive sound conditions may suffer reduced fitness [refer references 31 and 32]. This reduced fitness could potentially impact by hampering their ability to sense their entire acoustic environment, though the results of this study suggest otherwise (larger catch with ADDs). '-, it is not still clear how the ADD exerts this effect [refer references 19, 38, and 39]. Indeed, the ADD may have a startling, annoying or alerting [refer references 14 and 38] effect on dolphins.... they did not show any escape behaviour (G. Buffa et al., unpublished data), leading us to consider that the effect of the ADD is that of annoyance as they are detecting entangled fish in the ADD net. Raised two questions: (1) are dolphins able to adapt their behaviour to the acoustic devices, and (2) what is the magnitude of acoustical pollution generated by a wide use of ADDs?
Level of scientific rigour	Low: small sample size, unbalanced design, low statistical power, not a true fishery, interannual /seasonal variables not controlled, high level of uncertainty/caveats.
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	-Low sample size and statistical power. '-Non-fishery experiments to assess ADD effectiveness. '-Twenty-nine hauls in total, each consisting of an ADD net and control net. '-Cause of net damage assessed subjectively. '-Fishermen determined whether holes were caused by dolphins, rather than fish, vessel or seafloor contact, or other operational factors. '- the nets became more hole-filled (and ribbon covered) throughout the study. '-Only one ADD tested.
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	Y
Reduced bycatch? Y/N	Y
Maintained target catch Y/N	Y
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	The net equipped with ADDs contained 28% more fish biomass and was less damaged (suggesting less dolphin bycatch).
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	Performed in depths from 15 to 40 m
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Bottlenose dolphin is in NZ also.
Costs	Four ADDs per net.
Benefits	The results from this study show that ADDs fitted to bottom gill nets have a significant effect on the fish biomass of the catch (e.g. 28% more catch) and damage inflicted by dolphins on the nets (e.g. 31% less damage), therefore reducing the economic loss suffered by fishermen.

Number	8
Reference	Carretta & Barlow 2011
Year	2011
Study name	Long-term effectiveness, failure rates, and "dinner bell" properties of acoustic ADDs in a gillnet fishery
Fishing gear	Drift gill net
MM bycatch (test) species	Common dolphin (*Delphinus delphis*), California sea lion (*Zalophus californianus*) Northern elephant seal (*Mirounga angustirostris*), Pacific white-sided dolphin (*Lagenorhynchus obliquidens*), Northern right whale dolphin (*Lissodelphis borealis*) + all cetaceans and all pinnipeds
Key finding	The proportion of sets with cetacean bycatch was significantly lower ($p = 6.7 \times 10^{-7}$) in sets with ≥ 30 ADDs (4.4% of sets with bycatch) than in sets without ADDs (8.4% of sets). Common dolphin bycatch rates on sets with ≥30 ADDs were nearly 50% lower than those without ADDs. Bycatch of other cetaceans was not significantly affected by ADD use; however, sample sizes were small. Beaked whales were not observed as bycatch for a year prior to ADD use. Bycatch was 10x greater when >1 ADD failed. Over 14 years there was no evidence of habituation.
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	-Habituation '-Dinner bell effect '-Failure rates
Level of scientific rigour	Moderate to high: large dataset. Data on fishing gear, environmental variables and bycatch rates were recorded over 8,000 sets by fishery observers over a period of 19 years. Some uncertainties.
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	-It is not practical to observe every vessel in the fishery, because some smaller vessels lack berthing space for observers. '-analyses of sets with ADDs include only those that were a minimum of 1,500 m in length with ≥30 ADDs. '-excluded species with fewer than 10 total bycatch events from the analysis. '-ADDs were not used in this fishery prior to the 1996–1997 experiment and ADDs have been used in > 99% of all observed sets since 1998. For these reasons, we are unable to assess the potential year effect on bycatch rates and ADD effectiveness (can only compare pre-post data, not interannual changes). '-Beginning in 2001, fishery observers were instructed to listen to each ADD during the first set retrieval of a fishing trip. ...small sample set. '-Large dataset. Data on fishing gear, environmental variables and bycatch rates were recorded over 8,000 sets by fishery observers over a period of 19 years. During the last 14 years, over 4,000 sets were fitted with ADDs. Sample size for examining the effect of ADD failure was small. Attempts were made to standardise sets used in analyses for variables such as mesh size, net length and soak time. '-More than one ADD failed in 3.7% of observed sets. In those where ADD failure rate was recorded, this was found to occur for ~18% of deployed ADDs. Observers sometimes failed to detect non-functioning ADDs, so this failure rate is likely greater than recorded. '-An increasing fraction of fishing Is conducted by vessels too small to accommodate observers. ADD compliance and effectiveness could not be evaluated for this portion of the fishery, potentially biasing results. '-Depth considered as a variable factor. Distance from shore not considered. '-'-background population decline needs to be considered.
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	Y
Reduced bycatch? Y/N	Y
Maintained target catch	NA
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	The proportion of sets with cetacean bycatch was significantly lower in sets with ≥30 ADDs (4.4% of sets with bycatch) than in sets without ADDs (8.4% of sets).
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	100–1,902 m. Distance from shore not considered.
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Common dolphin is in NZ also. Considers influence from pinnipeds and other relevant marine mammal community members also.
Costs	Low cost investigation, using existing data, and augmenting existing observer program. Requires marine mammal mortalities to be able to determine success.
Benefits	Shows dramatic improvement, though population decline needs to be considered.

Number	9
Reference	Carretta et al. 2008
Year	2008
Study name	Acoustic ADDs eliminate beaked whale bycatch in a gill net fishery
Fishing gear	Drift gill net
MM bycatch (test) species	Beaked whales
Key finding	Beaked whale bycatch dropped from 33 beaked whales in 3303 sets during the first six years of the observer program, to none in 4381 sets over the last 10 years while ADDs were in use. Results suggest beaked whales may be among the most sensitive cetacean taxa to ADD frequencies. The difference in beaked whale entanglement rates with and without ADDs is so large that it cannot be explained as a sampling artifact (though population decline of toothed whales needs to be considered). In contrast, bycatch rates of all cetaceans (mostly dolphins) decreased by only 50% over the same period.
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	-Three significant regulatory changes have occurred in this fishery since 1996: the introduction of acoustic ADDs, a mandatory increase in minimum fishing depth to 11 m, and a seasonal area closure implemented in 2001 that shifted fishing effort to the south (Figure 3). Of these changes, the introduction of ADDs is the most likely factor in the reduction of beaked whale bycatch.
Level of scientific rigour	Moderate: Some uncertainties and assumptions, large dataset, low level of statistical analysis used.
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	-the nets are at 11–22 m depth and the bottoms are at 75–90 m depth. Regulations require that acoustic ADDs be attached every 91 m and within 9 m of the floatline, and every 91 m and within 11 m of the leadline. Thus, the average net contains approximately 40 ADDs. '-Survey-specific estimates of beaked whale abundance declined by 62% over this period, but some of that apparent decline is attributed to rougher weather during later surveys. '-background population decline needs to be considered.
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	Y
Reduced bycatch? Y/N	Y
Maintained target catch	NA
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	Beaked whale bycatch dropped 100%, bycatch rates of all cetaceans (mostly dolphins) decreased by only 50% over the same period
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	Distance from shore/depth did not appear to have been considered, but the bottom net depth is between 11 m to > 90 m (100–1,902 m provided in subsequent paper)
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Captures pre-ADD: 21 Cuvier's beaked whales (*Ziphius cavirostris*), 5 Hubb's beaked whales (*Mesoplodon carlhubbsi*), one Stejneger's beaked whale (*M. stejnegeri*), one Baird's beaked whale (*Berardius bairdii*), two unidentified *Mesoplodon* species, and three "unidentified ziphiids"
Costs	Low cost investigation, using existing data Requires marine mammal mortalities to be able to determine success.
Benefits	Shows dramatic improvement, though population decline needs to be considered.

Number	10
Reference	Cox et al. 2001
Year	2001
Study name	Will harbour porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*) habituate to ADDs?
Fishing gear	Gillnet discussed; static mooring used
MM bycatch (test) species	Harbour porpoises
Key finding	These results indicate that porpoises habituated to the Dukane NetMark™ 1000 ADD and are not alerted to echolocate in the presence of nets by ADDs. The proportion of intervals in which echolocation events occurred was significantly reduced when the ADD was activated, suggesting that porpoises echolocate less frequently in the vicinity of an active ADD.
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	This study was not designed to test hypotheses of the mechanism by which ADDs reduce harbour porpoise bycatch but was able to reject the hypothesis that ADDs stimulate harbour porpoises to echolocate and thus detect a gillnet.
Level of scientific rigour	Low to moderate: controlled experiment testing. Small sample size, though good statistical methods used. Not a fishing trial, difficult to compare. Multiple exposure for same porpoises. Only tested one ADD.
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	-Poor weather forced truncation of the second trial. Thus, the sample size was small, so both experiments were pooled to increase the power and test the mean-fit model. Results of the mean-shift model for both experimental trials and the pooled trials are presented in Table 2. '-individual porpoises likely experienced multiple exposures to the ADD over the course of the experiment '-The experimental protocol involved only a single ADD on a mooring, so it is not possible to say with certainty that porpoises will habituate to ADDs attached to a gill net.
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	Y, but exhibited habituation
Reduced bycatch? Y/N	Y
Maintained target catch	NA
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	The analysis suggests that porpoises habituated to the presence of the ADD.
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment
Costs	Low
Benefits	Local, investigates taxa of concern. No bycatch required.

Number	11
Reference	Cox et al. 2003
Year	2003
Study name	Behavioural responses of bottlenose dolphins, *Tursiops truncatus*, to gill nets and acoustic alarms
Fishing gear	Gill net
MM bycatch (test) species	Bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*)
Key finding	We conclude that ADDs are unlikely to reduce bycatch of bottlenose dolphins in gill net fisheries along the US east coast because of the limited behavioural responses we observed in our experiment. Dolphins entered the zone of vulnerability significantly more frequently when the ADDs were off than when they were on. Fish catch did not vary with treatment. Bottlenose dolphins diverted their travel around the net only slightly when the ADDs were active, often traveling just inshore or offshore of the buoys demarcating the ends of the net. This result is markedly different from that exhibited by harbour porpoises. Dolphins may learn to associate the ADD with the presence of a gillnet that contains fish. This is supported by the behaviour of the dolphins around the fishing boat and net in this experiment. On several occasions when we started hauling the net, dolphins moved very rapidly towards the boat from over 300 m away. We can identify four types of interactions: (1) dolphins taking fish from the net, (2) dolphins begging fish from fishing vessels, (3) dolphins using the net as a barrier to herd fish as a foraging tactic, and (4) dolphins transiting around the net without interacting with it.
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	Dinner bell effect Habituation
Level of scientific rigour	Low - moderate: Controlled experiment testing. Small sample size, though reasonable statistical methods used. Imitates a fishing trial, difficult to compare to true fisheries. Only tested three ADDs and one net.
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	-Terminated tracking and field effort if the Beaufort Sea State exceeded 3 '-Short seasonal investigation. '-Only a single net tested and three ADDs. '-Uses zone of vulnerability as a proxy for bycatch.
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	N
Reduced bycatch? Y/N	N
Maintained target catch	Y
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	ADDs are unlikely to reduce bycatch of bottlenose dolphins in gill net fisheries along the US east coast. Fish catch did not vary with treatment.
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment
Costs	Moderate costs could result in marine mammal deaths to be able to determine success.
Benefits	Mimics real fisheries without as much bycatch risk. No dolphins caught in trials.

Number	12
Reference	Cruz et al. 2014
Year	2014
Study name	Risso's dolphin depredation in the Azorean hand-jig squid fishery: assessing the impacts and evaluating effectiveness of acoustic deterrents
Fishing gear	Hand-jig
MM bycatch (test) species	Risso's dolphins (*Grampus griseus*)
Key finding	The use of ADDs had no significant effect on the catch per unit effort of squids. Depredation rates were similar for the control (0.20), inactive (0.19), and active (0.19) ADD conditions. Models indicated no significant effect of ADD brand and condition on cetacean depredation.
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	NA
Level of scientific rigour	Low: small sample size, low level of sampling/testing effort, low levels of significance in statistical tests. Many uncontrolled variables.
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	Compares previous studies from multiple gill net ADDs to this study that only had a single ADD located on the vessel itself. Not comparable methodologies. Effective ADD distance was not considered. On several occasions, it was not possible to carry out the five trials during a fishing trip due to degradation of sea state or shifts in fishing area. The ADD was attached to a rope and deployed from the bow of the fishing boat Risso's dolphins were responsible for all depredation events. Risso's dolphins depredated on average three squids per trip—very low depredation rate? Depredation was not responsible for significant decreases in squid catches or for a significant decrease in CPUE. Frequency and magnitude of depredation varied considerably between months, but levels of observer coverage were low and insufficient to accurately capture this variability. This maybe the reason ADDs don't appear to be working to reduce depredation. What is the background noise in a squid fishery, would the dolphins be able to hear the ADD? Fishing activity was generally concentrated close to coast, with fishers starting their activity at dawn at shallower depths and moving to deeper waters as the day progresses. This could influence the ADD sound? Models explained a low percentage of variability in the data. We suspect this was mainly caused by lack of information on some important factors driving Risso's dolphin interaction on the squid fishery, including squid abundance and patchiness and Risso's dolphin abundance. Most of the fishery observer data were collected during spring and summer when depredation was lower, thus underestimating depredation rates. Estimates of depredation rates assume that dolphins did not select larger or smaller squids and that squids captured during a fishing event were representative of depredated squids
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	N
Reduced bycatch? Y/N	N
Maintained target catch	Y
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	The dolphins were not deterred by the sound produced by the ADDs used. The use of ADDs had no significant effect on the catch per unit effort of squids.
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment
Costs	Low ADD costs Could result in marine mammal deaths to be able to determine success.
Benefits	Able to be performed on existing fisheries.

Number	13
Reference	Dawson and Lusseau 2012
Year	2012
Study name	Pseudo-replication confounds the assessment of long-distance detection of gillnets by porpoises: Comment on Nielsen et al. (2012)
Fishing gear	Gillnet discussed, but no nets used.
MM bycatch (test) species	Harbour porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*)
Key finding	They claimed to provide evidence that porpoises detected gillnets at distances > 80 m, much farther than was thought possible. We show, however, that their results are undermined by pseudo-replication, and hence that their conclusion is unreliable. Mixed-effects modelling can be used to avoid this problem
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	NA
Level of scientific rigour	NA
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	NA
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	NA
Reduced bycatch? Y/N	NA
Maintained target catch	NA
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	NA
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	NA
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	NA
Costs	NA
Benefits	NA

Number	14
Reference	Dawson and Slooten 2005
Year	2005
Study name	Management of gill net bycatch of cetaceans in NZ
Fishing gear	Gill net
MM bycatch (test) species	Hector's/Māui dolphin (*Cephalorhynchus hectori*), bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*)
Key finding	It is impossible to say whether ADDs are effective in reducing entanglements of Hector's dolphin, for two reasons. Firstly, because ADDs are used in combination with several other measures intended to reduce entanglement rate, their effect (if any) is hidden. Secondly, there has been insufficient observer coverage to determine whether these measures, even in combination, are effective. More observer coverage is needed to determine whether ADDs significantly reduce incidental capture. If a target of 80% reduction in bycatch is set and a nominal value of a=0.10 is accepted, it would take approximately 320 observed sets to detect a significant difference with 80% power.
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	NA
Level of scientific rigour	Low: simplistic statistics
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	-small sample size for power analysis, no area or season effects considered.
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	Indeterminate
Reduced bycatch? Y/N	Indeterminate (e.g. no clear effect either way)
Maintained target catch	NA
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	More observer coverage is needed to determine whether ADDs significantly reduce incidental capture. Given that fishermen have implemented several changes simultaneously.
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	Specific to NZ
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Māui dolphin, Hectors dolphin, and bottlenose dolphin discussed.
Costs	Low
Benefits	Local, investigates taxa of concern.

Number	15
Reference	Dawson et al. 1998
Year	1998
Study name	ADDs, porpoises and power: Uncertainties with using ADDs to reduce bycatch of small cetaceans
Fishing gear	Gill net discussed; no nets used.
MM bycatch (test) species	Dolphins (*Delphinidae*) and porpoises (*Phocoenidae*)
Key finding	Statistical power analyses indicate that field-based bycatch studies are feasible only in areas of high entanglement rate. Kraus et al. (1997) study was exemplary in its design and execution. Importantly, the experiment took place in an area of high bycatch rates. Neither fishers nor independent observers knew which ADDs were active. The experiment was designed following a statistical power analysis of the scale needed to detect a 50% difference, and the design was balanced (equal numbers of control and experimental sets). These basic aspects of good experimental design have been lacking in most previous studies (Dawson 1994). While ADD study costs could certainly be reduced, scientists and managers must realise that robust tests of ADD effectiveness will be expensive. Such studies may need to be continued over many seasons to produce a reliable result.
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	Recommends that experiments should test whether the success of the 1994 experiment was mediated via the behaviour of the prey of harbour porpoises. Anecdotal reports suggest that ADDs reduce the catch of target species in fisheries for alosids and clupeids (IWC, in press). Detailed experimental observations are required to confirm or refute these reports and provide information on the mechanism(s) by which porpoise bycatch was reduced in the 1994 experiment.
Level of scientific rigour	Has recommendations to improve scientific rigour: 1. Replication of results in time and space. 2. Research on habituation. 3. Research on causation. 4. General issues (e.g. sound overloading in the ocean, effects to target catch, wider effects)
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	-Practical constraints include the size, cost, and battery life of current ADDs, and whether their use could be monitored cost-effectively. '-Influence of ADDs on other pinniped taxa should also be considered alongside cetacean bycatch reduction success, as they could become attracted.
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	Y
Reduced bycatch? Y/N	Y
Maintained target catch	NA
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	Although we are cautiously enthusiastic about their promise, there is currently no justification for adopting ADDs as a mitigation method for the problem of incidental mortality of small cetaceans in gill nets.
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Methods useful for testing NZ assemblages.
Costs	Low costs for a literature review
Benefits	Summarises all available literature to 1998

Number	16
Reference	Dawson et al. 2013
Year	2013
Study name	To ping or not to ping: the use of active acoustic devices in mitigating interactions between small cetaceans and gillnet fisheries
Fishing gear	Gill net, drift net
MM bycatch (test) species	Various small cetaceans
Key finding	Overall, ADDs show promise for neophobic species with large home ranges. Significant reductions in bycatch of harbour porpoise, franciscana, common dolphin, striped dolphin and beaked whales have been demonstrated. Two long-term studies show no sign of habituation. Studies on depredation mitigation show small, inconsistent improvements in fish catch and some reduction in net damage. There is no evidence that ADDs that are specifically designed to reduce depredation (and hence are louder) are any more effective in reducing entanglement than the quieter devices designed to reduce entanglement of porpoises. It seems that bottlenose dolphins are likely to tolerate even high-output ADDs if there is a food 'reward'. Have been particularly successful for harbour porpoise, with large reductions in bycatch over much of the species' range using a variety of ADD types. Unreasonable however, to expect similar success for all species. Several risks remain, such as habitat exclusion for species with restricted ranges. Delphinids, particularly those showing very flexible behaviour, coastal distribution and high site fidelity, such as bottlenose dolphins, would seem among the least appropriate candidate species. Small-scale fisheries in the developing world are also unlikely to have economic resources to implement this mitigation method. Necessary to have a target for bycatch reduction as without a quantitative goal it is not possible to assess efficiency. Power analyses should be used to determine sample size needed to detect meaningful effects. Non-compliance of ADD functioning and spacing can lead to an increase in marine mammal bycatch. Most ADD types showed significant operational problems, including time taken in attachment, difficulty of checking functionality, propensity for tangling the gear and unreliability. For some ADD types failure rates exceeded 50%. We recommend that a well-designed observational study of the behavioural reactions to ADDs be conducted, in as realistic a situation as feasible (e.g. Cox et al. 2001), before employing ADDs in full-scale field trials with any novel species.
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	Most likely a combination of: -Avoidance/aversive sound -Management tools (high levels of compliance) -Bycatch species type (more easily startled species) Considered: Reductions in depredation (Dinner bell effect) Habitation Less effective in real fisheries (where compliance is low). Stimulating echolocation increasing net detection Indirect prey effects. ADD spacing
Level of scientific rigour	NA
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	-Some literature reviewed was unpublished, though data were critically assessed before inclusion in this review. '-The theodolite is used to estimate the position of individual animals or groups of animals at the surface. This allows researchers to compare closest approach distances when ADDs are active and silent and, thus, to determine whether animals are displaced by the sound of the device. Unfortunately, several studies have considered each surfacing as an independent event, when in fact they are auto-correlated. This inflates sample size and can result in a falsely significant statistical test. The simplest way around this problem is to use only the closest observed approach distance for each group of dolphins or porpoises (Dawson & Lusseau 2005). '-In at least two cases, however, trials with ADDs have not shown any reduction in bottlenose dolphin depredation of gill nets in the Mediterranean. Neither study has been formally published, which underscores the problem that negative results are less likely to be published. In some cases it may be impractical, or even unethical, to attempt to demonstrate the effectiveness of ADDs in reducing bycatch. This may be because bycatch rates are very low, resulting in a requirement for extremely large (and costly) sample sizes (Dawson et al. 1998), or because the mortality of even a few individuals in a controlled experimental trial is unwarranted or unacceptable (e.g. Māui dolphin). Quality control in ADD manufacture needs to improve. In addition to the reliability issues addressed earlier, there can be substantial variation in sound pressure level among ADDs of the same brand and model. Displacement from key habitat could be an issue at smaller scales/restricted ranges.
Number	16, continued

Caveats or uncertainties to methods, cont.	We note that the sound field generated by ADDs will vary across locations (Shapiro et al. 2009), and behavioural responses will not be uniform. Spacing of ADDs has generally been shown to be effective at < 92 m spacing. More investigation required. Continued lack of compliance has led scientists on the Take Reduction Team to conclude that it is time to look for alternative mitigation strategies in New England
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	Y
Reduced bycatch? Y/N	Y
Maintained target catch	NA
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	Generally effective in reducing larger and more easily startled cetacean bycatch.
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	Distance from shore/depth did not appear to have been compared between studies, other than saying they are controlled in most experiments.
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Māui, Hectors, and bottlenose dolphins discussed.
Costs	Low cost investigation, reviewing existing studies.
Benefits	Low cost, develops good questions for future investigation.

Number	17
Reference	Erbe & McPherson 2012
Year	2012
Study name	Acoustic characterisation of bycatch mitigation ADDs on shark control nets in Queensland, Australia
Fishing gear	Shark control nets
MM bycatch (test) species	Humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*), Indo-Pacific bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops aduncus*), bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*), Indo-Pacific humpback dolphin (*Sousa cinensis*), common dolphin (*Delphinus delphis*), Australian snubfin dolphin (*Orcaella heinsohni*), dugong (*Dugong dugon*)
Key finding	This study: (1) measured the acoustic output of Fumunda F3 and F10 ADDs used on shark nets by the QSCP, (2) modelled sound propagation, (3) measured ambient noise off the Queensland coast and (4) reviewed the literature to derive the hearing sensitivities of local marine mammals. ADDs tested were found to be detectable by all species and were installed at appropriate spacing to highlight the net to all animals travelling parallel or perpendicular to the net. While Fumunda ADDs are amongst the quietest ADDs commercially available, we showed that they are a feasible choice in this environment and for these specific species. The advantage of using such quiet ADDs is their minimal contribution to the overall noise budget. Beyond 1.5 km, ADDs no longer contributed significantly to the ambient noise budget. Ultimately, impact is determined by more than a noise budget and must include an animal's sensitivity to the sound.
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	Audible sound (though the study does not try to predict animal behaviour, just that specific animals can hear the ADDs.
Level of scientific rigour	Low: between ADD variability, small sample size, low level of sampling/testing effort. Many uncertainties/limitations.
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	-Not directly applicable to fisheries applications (this was a shark net study). '-Small sample size of ADDs. Deployed seasonally for one type. '-ADD output varied with individual ADDs and with direction; the mean levels were used in the model of detectability. '- Sound propagation was modelled based on typical Gold Coast conditions, but will vary with e.g. temperature, time of day, and season. '-Hearing sensitivity has not been measured for humpback whales, dugongs and some of the local dolphin species, and had to be estimated based on reported behavioural responses, anatomical studies and measurements on related species. '-Our study focussed on ADD detectability in the specific ambient noise and sound propagation environment of the Gold Coast. In other environments, and for other target species, the ADDs likely require a different arrangement and perhaps different frequencies and SLs. '-This study is a feasibility study, showing that specific ADDs in a specific arrangement within a specific environment are audible to specific species. They did not attempt to predict animal behaviour. For a sound to induce a behavioural change, the received level might have to be somewhat larger than the detection level. '-It would also be useful to measure at what time into a deployment the battery power becomes inadequate to sustain sufficient output levels, in order to advise on recovery times. '-For potential future studies on behavioural responses of marine mammals to ADDs, the received sound level should be measured in the field at the time, rather than relying on the manufacturers' specifications in combination with a simple (e.g. geometrical) sound propagation model.
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	Y
Reduced bycatch? Y/N	Y
Maintained target catch	NA
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	While Fumunda ADDs are amongst the quietest ADDs commercially available, we showed that they are a feasible choice in this environment and for these specific species.
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	Some bycatch taxa relevant to NZ—not fisheries related. Different type of net used.
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Same species as found in NZ
Costs	Low (cost of ADDs, data extraction and interpretation, modelling and ADD deployment to existing nets)
Benefits	The advantage of using such quiet ADDs is their minimal contribution to the overall noise budget.

Number	18
Reference	FAO 2018
Year	2018
Study name	Report of the expert workshop on means and methods for reducing marine mammal mortality in fishing and aquaculture operations.
Fishing gear	Various discussed, no nets used.
MM bycatch (test) species	Various
Key finding	The workshop agreed that acoustic deterrents such as ADDs can be effective but should not be considered as the 'go-to' mitigation measure or a 'quick fix' to the problem because their effectiveness may be spatially, temporally and fishery dependent, and species-specific. Further, acoustic deterrents may reduce bycatch, but they usually do not eliminate bycatch. Summaries of studies using ADDs are available through a search of the https://www.bycatch.org database by using the search term "acoustic deterrents." Gives a good outline of when evaluation for ADD use should be carried out, for example is it critical habitat? Will it cause the marine mammal to aggregate in a habitat that puts them at greater threat? Lethal sub-lethal effects? Low population size. Will the ADD increase other marine mammal interactions, habituation, and consequences to other species?
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	Not discussed
Level of scientific rigour	Discusses the successes and failures of ADD investigations.
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	NA
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	Y
Reduced bycatch? Y/N	Y
Maintained target catch	Indeterminate (e.g. no clear effect either way)
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	ADDs can be effective but should not be considered as the 'go-to' mitigation measure or a 'quick fix' to the problem because their effectiveness may be spatially, temporally and fishery dependent, and species-specific.
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment/provides information on considerations.
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment
Costs	Low cost
Benefits	Summarises findings from key investigations but refers to https://www.bycatch.org for all available literature to 2018.

Number	19
Reference	Gazo et al. 2008
Year	2008
Study name	ADDs as deterrents of bottlenose dolphins interacting with trammel nets
Fishing gear	Trammel net
MM bycatch (test) species	Bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*)
Key finding	No significant differences were observed between the catch of red mullet by the three monitored boats. This result was independent of the setting condition used. The use of ADDs had no significant incidence on the catch of red mullet. Nets equipped with ADDs received less damage (87% fewer holes) than nets with non-functional devices or without ADDs. Predation in nets equipped with operative ADDs appeared to be reduced by about 50% from those equipped with either non-operative ADDs or no ADDs.
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	Discusses: -Annoyance -Habituation -Dinner bell effect -Failure rates -Prey species avoidance Also discussed: -Habitat loss through overuse. -Overall increases in noise pollution in an already noisy location.
Level of scientific rigour	Low: small sample size, low level of sampling/testing effort, simplistic statistics.
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	- Small sample size, low level of sampling/testing effort, simplistic statistics. - Observers counted and identified holes in this study, but it was noted that damages to the gear are more likely to be caused by operational factors, particularly interaction with the rocky seafloor. Fishermen were not consistent either in the identification of the holes that they attributed to dolphin interaction or in the cause of the damage to some of the fish caught. Thus, assessment of dolphin interaction that only considers the presence of holes or of spoiled fish is likely to be misleading. -Not clear how other environmental variable were controlled.
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	N
Reduced bycatch? Y/N	Y
Maintained target catch	Y
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	ADDs did not prevent dolphins approaching nets, but those nets equipped with active ADDs received 87% less damage. Predation in nets reduced by ~50% with ADD use. No significant effect on target species catch.
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	Fisheries operated in an area of about 340 km^2. Testing locations were at approx. 50 m depth.
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Same species as found in NZ
Costs	Moderate costs Requires marine mammal deaths to be able to determine success.
Benefits	Able to be performed on existing fisheries.

Number	20
Reference	Gonener & Bilgin 2009
Year	2009
Study name	The effect of ADDs on harbour porpoise, *Phocoena* bycatch and fishing effort in the turbot gill net fishery in the Turkish Black Sea coast
Fishing gear	Gill net
MM bycatch (test) species	Harbour porpoise
Key finding	ADDs significantly reduced bycatch. Target fish catch rate increased with ADD use though fish size was not affected.
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	Habituation recommended for further investigation
Level of scientific rigour	Low: small sample size, low level of sampling/testing effort, simplistic statistics. Not all variables managed.
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	- Variable water depth for testing - sea trials were conducted from 17.2 to 183.2 m water depth. - Variable soak times (168-288 hours) - Damage to nets was not considered. - Not clear if the fishermen collected the data, or observers. -Two test trips were performed on the same date.
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	Y
Reduced bycatch? Y/N	Y
Maintained target catch	Y
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	ADDs significantly reduced bycatch. Target fish catch rate increased with ADD use though fish size was not affected.
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	Sea trials were conducted from 17.2 to 183.2 m water depth
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Similar inshore fishing depths
Costs	Moderate costs Requires marine mammal mortalities to be able to determine success.
Benefits	Able to be performed on existing fisheries.

Number	21
Reference	Hamer et al. 2012
Year	2012
Study name	Odontocete bycatch and depredation in longline fisheries: A review of available literature and of potential solutions
Fishing gear	Longline discussed, but no nets used
MM bycatch (test) species	Various odontocete
Key finding	Recent developments in acoustic and physical mitigation technologies have yielded mixed results. Acoustic mitigation technologies have no moving parts, although require complex electronics. To date, they are insufficiently developed, and their efficacy has been difficult to assess.
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	NA
Level of scientific rigour	NA
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	NA
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	Indeterminate (e.g. no clear effect either way)
Reduced bycatch? Y/N	Indeterminate (e.g. no clear effect either way)
Maintained target catch	Indeterminate (e.g. no clear effect either way)
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	To date, they are insufficiently developed, and their efficacy has been difficult to assess.
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment
Costs	Low
Benefits	Summarises all available literature to 2012

Number	22
Reference	Hamilton and Baker 2019
Year	2019
Study name	Technical mitigation to reduce marine mammal bycatch and entanglement in commercial fishing gear: lessons learnt and future directions
Fishing gear	Trawl and gill net (also reviews a range of other fishing methods)
MM bycatch (test) species	Multiple reviews
Key finding	Successfully implemented mitigation measures include acoustic deterrent devices (ADDs) which reduced the bycatch of some small cetacean species in gillnets. Substantial development and research of mitigation options is required to address the bycatch of a range of species in many fisheries. No reliably effective technical solutions to reduce small cetacean bycatch in trawl nets are available, although loud ADDs have shown potential. Solutions are also needed for species, particularly pinnipeds and small cetaceans, that are not deterred by ADDs and continue to be caught in static gillnets. Future mitigation development and deployment requires rigorous scientific testing to determine if significant bycatch reduction has been achieved, as well as consideration of potentially conflicting mitigation outcomes if multiple species are impacted by a fishery. Although outside the scope of this review, it was apparent that effective bycatch mitigation strategies often comprise a suite of management measures in conjunction with technical mitigation. These include traditional input and output controls, operational adjustments through 'codes of practice' protocols (e.g. 'move-on' provisions, handling, and release protocols) and implementation of appropriately designated spatial and/or temporal closures. Instigation of multi-jurisdictional agreements, regulations and/or legislation to facilitate mitigation implementation are also likely to be important.
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	-Loud ADDs -A suite of management tools (along with ADDs) reduces bycatch rates.
Level of scientific rigour	NA
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	NA -Distance from shore/depth considered?
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	NA
Reduced bycatch? Y/N	Y
Maintained target catch	NA
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	Successfully implemented mitigation measures include acoustic deterrent devices (ADDs) which reduced the bycatch of some small cetacean species in gillnets. No reliably effective technical solutions to reduce small cetacean bycatch in trawl nets are available, although loud ADDs have shown potential.
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	NA
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Discusses Hector's dolphin species. Includes references to relevant NZ papers (Dawson and Slooten 2005, Laverick et al. 2017)
Costs	Low
Benefits	Summarises all available literature to February 2019

Number	23
Reference	Hardy et al. 2012
Year	2012
Study name	An investigation of acoustic deterrent devices to reduce cetacean bycatch in an inshore set net fishery
Fishing gear	Demersal gill net, trammel net (tangle net)
MM bycatch (test) species	Harbour porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*), Bottlenose dolphin (*Delphinus delphis*)
Key finding	Functioning ADDs are likely to reduce harbour porpoise bycatch rates in this inshore tangle net fishery. ADDs resulted in a 35-51% decrease in harbour porpoise echolocation. Cycling ADD trials (static mooring), with a longer activity cycle, could identify recovery time, the possible effects of ambient noise, habituation, and the response of dolphins more accurately.
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	It has been a source of quite widespread concern that ADDs might impede the movement of porpoises or exclude them from critical habitat. No evidence was seen of habituation to the ADD which is consistent with the findings of Palka (2008).
Level of scientific rigour	Low to moderate: weight of evidence approach. Moderate click sample size, low level of static mooring sampling/testing effort, simplistic statistics. Reliance on fishermen to collect data. Not all variables managed or considered in statistics.
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	-Moderate sample size. Only four porpoise and no dolphin bycatches recorded. C-POD acoustic detectors used to passively assess the response of cetaceans to ADDs. -Each skipper was entirely responsible for deploying and recovering the equipment with their fishing gear while continuing with normal fishing activity in order to test the practical aspects of using ADDs during normal working conditions. - Some problems of tangling effecting fishing at the beginning of the trial. -The placement of ADDs on the footrope rather than the head rope of the set nets used in this trial has the following advantages: the head rope is not pulled down by the weight of the ADD; the ADD contributes usefully to the weight of the footrope; it may reduce the risk of 'button-holing' during deployment; and there is usually less tension on the footrope during hauling, putting less stress on the ADD. There has been concern that ADDs on the bottom will be less audible to porpoises, but as these nets are deployed on a predominantly even seabed a major effect is unlikely.
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	Y
Reduced bycatch? Y/N	Y
Maintained target catch	NA
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	Functioning ADDs are likely to reduce bycatch rate in harbour porpoises
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	They are set for approximately five days' 'soak time' depending on weather conditions at depths ranging from 20 to 100 m. The fishery operates throughout the year.
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Similar inshore fishing depths
Costs	Concerns raised by the skippers taking part in the trial were mainly about the battery life of the ADD and the cost of putting them on all their fishing gear, rather than any other practical problems. These concerns were confirmed when ADDs were recovered at the end of the trial and seven out of 23 were found to be inactive, most likely due to flat batteries as no external damage was observed. Skippers found some difficulties in deploying the C-PODs on working nets because of their large size (90–800 mm), but despite these difficulties they did obtain a substantial volume of useful data. The cycling ADD trial design used here proved to be an efficient and very low cost method of assessing responses to man-made sounds. Requires marine mammal mortalities to be able to determine success.
Benefits	Able to be performed on existing fisheries.

Number	24
Reference	Kastelein et al. 2006
Year	2006
Study name	Differences in the response of a striped dolphin (*Stenella coeruleoalba*) and a harbour porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) to an acoustic alarm
Fishing gear	Gill net discussed, but no nets used.
MM bycatch (test) species	A female striped dolphin (*Stenella coeruleoalba*) and a male harbour porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*).
Key finding	The porpoise reacted strongly to the alarm by swimming away from it and increasing his respiration rate. The striped dolphin, however, showed no reaction to the active alarm.
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	It is difficult to determine whether differences in reaction to sound are due to hearing differences or differences in behaviour in relation to sound, unless two species have similar hearing. When audible, the SPL of a sound received by animals probably plays a role in whether sound is perceived as a threat or as an interesting novelty.
Level of scientific rigour	Low: small sample size, low level of sampling/testing effort, no statistical tests. Many uncontrolled variables.
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	-Sessions were not carried out during rainfall or when wind speeds were above force 4 on the Beaufort Scale. -The present study was limited by animal welfare considerations. The animals were not exposed to the alarms' sounds for very long time periods to test potential habituation to the sounds, and the sound level tested was limited by the maximum distance the animals could swim away from the alarms. -Only one animal per species was available for the present study. It is not clear how representative each study animal was for its species. Age, sex, location, and experience may influence the behaviour of individuals. In addition, the two study animals may have influenced one another. Also, the fact that no effect of the alarm was seen in the striped dolphin does not mean that there was no effect, only that no effect was detected with the methods used in the present study. -It is difficult to determine whether differences in reaction to sound are due to hearing differences or differences in behaviour in relation to sound, unless two species have similar hearing.
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	Y: harbour porpoise, N: striped dolphin
Reduced bycatch? Y/N	NA
Maintained target catch	NA
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	The porpoise in the present study reacted strongly to the alarm by swimming away from it and increasing his respiration rate. The striped dolphin, however, showed no reaction to the active alarm.
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	The audiogram of the striped dolphin (Kastelein, Hagedoorn, Au, & de Haan, 2003) was of the animal in the present study, and is believed to be normal, as it resembles the audiogram of the bottlenose dolphin (Johnson, 1967). When audible, the SPL of a sound received by animals probably plays a role in whether sound is perceived as a threat or as an interesting novelty
Costs	The present study was limited by animal welfare considerations - requires captured animals to test.
Benefits	Able to be performed on captive marine mammals.

Number	25
Reference	Kraus et al. 1997
Year	1997
Study name	Acoustic alarms reduce porpoise mortality
Fishing gear	Gill net
MM bycatch (test) species	Harbour porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*)
Key finding	The acoustic alarms reduced the incidental catch of harbour porpoises in sink gill nets by an order of magnitude. Two harbour porpoises were captured in active strings and 25 in control strings. In six control strings, two porpoises were caught in the same string; in all other cases only, a single porpoise was taken. We captured similar quantities of two target species of the fishery in control and active strings, as well as other commercial species. Herring (non-target species) were the only fish to show a significant difference in catch rate between active and control strings, with fewer herring taken in strings with active alarms. Clupeoid fishes have an unusual capacity for high-frequency hearing and it is possible that herring reacted to the alarms by avoiding the nets, thus reducing the number of porpoises becoming entangled while attempting to capture prey.
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	Discusses: -Annoyance -Prey species avoidance
Level of scientific rigour	Low - moderate: Controlled experiment testing. Large sample size, multiple vessels, over only one season. Background ambient noise considered. Two harbour porpoises were captured in active strings and 25 in control strings.
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	Doesn't discuss background population level changes. Only one season of sampling. Doesn't discuss if outer environmental variables were controlled or investigated for correlations and significance. Unclear if there was variability between alarms outputs. Article doesn't provide much detail on field methodologies or statistical methods used.
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	Y
Reduced bycatch? Y/N	Y
Maintained target catch	Y
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	The acoustic alarms reduced the incidental catch of harbour porpoises in sink gill nets by an order of magnitude. Two harbour porpoises were captured in active strings and 25 in control strings. We captured similar quantities of two target species of the fishery in control and active strings, as well as other commercial species (thought there was a reduction in a non-target species (herring).
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	Acoustic alarms reduced the incidental catch of harbour porpoises in sink gill nets by an order of magnitude
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	The use of acoustic alarms would seem to be a promising method of reducing the number of harbour porpoises killed in sink gill nets in the Gulf of Maine and offers hope for alleviating the bycatch problem for small cetaceans worldwide.
Costs	High cost - approximately USD$500,000 (figure obtained from Dawson et al. 1998). Requires marine mammal mortalities to be able to determine success.
Benefits	Shows a dramatic improvement and is a rigorous study.

Number	26
Reference	Kyhn et al. 2015
Year	2015
Study name	ADDs cause temporary habitat displacement in the harbour porpoise *Phocoena phocoena*
Fishing gear	Gill net discussed; static mooring used
MM bycatch (test) species	Harbour porpoises
Key finding	During the periodic-exposure scenario, the porpoise detection rate was reduced by 56% when ADDs were active. The reduction was larger for the SaveWave ADDs (65%) than for the Airmar ADDs (40%). There was a tendency for the encounter rate to increase after the first 2−4 periodic exposures, which could indicate gradual habituation. During the continuous-exposure scenario, the detection rate was reduced by 65% throughout the 28 d with no sign of habituation. In the control areas (2.5, 3 and 5 km distant), neither a decrease nor an increase in detection rate was observed, suggesting that porpoises were displaced either < 2.5 km or > 5 km away. If ADDs are used as deterrent devices, the impact of habitat exclusion must therefore be considered concurrently with mitigation of bycatch, especially when regulating fisheries in Marine Protected Areas.
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	Both ADD types had a significant negative effect on the number of acoustic porpoise encounters. The encounter decrease was larger for the SaveWave ADDs (65%) than the Airmar ADDs (40%). The difference in deterrence effect is likely explained by the higher source level, more variable sounds and higher frequencies of the SaveWave ADDs. The results of this study lend weight to the most parsimonious explanation, the deterrence hypothesis, rather than to the porpoises remaining silent in the area for several days followed by a gradual increase in echolocation rate.
Level of scientific rigour	Low - moderate: controlled experiment testing. Small sample size, different locations used, different spacing of ADDs, ADDs influencing each other. Good statistical modelling and probability methods. Great figure (figure 2) that explain the porpoise encountered per month/treatment.
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	- Not excluded that some individuals were exposed to the sounds several times and that these sounds were not associated with any negative reinforcement, indicates habitation. -Seasonal effects not considered. -Were ADDs influencing each other?
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	Y
Reduced bycatch? Y/N	NA
Maintained target catch	NA
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	Both SaveWave and Airmar ADDs effectively reduced harbour porpoise presence. However, exposure to the ADDs led to a habitat displacement around each ADD site
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Exposure to the ADDs led to a habitat displacement around each ADD site.
Costs	Large amounts of ADDs used. Moderately expensive.
Benefits	No marine mammal mortalities, mimics real fishing.

Number	27
Reference	Larsen et al. 2013
Year	2013
Study name	Determining optimal ADD spacing for harbour porpoise bycatch mitigation
Fishing gear	Gill net
MM bycatch (test) species	Harbour porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*)
Key finding	The results of the present trial support the argument that ADDs are effective at longer ranges than the manufacturer's recommended spacings would suggest. When ADDs were spaced 455 m apart, the harbour porpoise bycatch was reduced to 0, and even when spaced 585 m apart the bycatch was reduced to 22% of that in the control group of nets. The results presented in this report suggest that in the Danish hake gill net fishery, the maximum spacing of AQUAmark100 ADDs can be increased to at least 455 m without reducing their effectiveness. No statistical difference in target species catch, though limited data on this.
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	Not discussed
Level of scientific rigour	Low - moderate: controlled experiment testing. Relatively small sample size of one vessel, five fishing trips over 21 days, with a total of 108 hauls observed. A total of 50 porpoises were caught during the trial. Infers results to other Danish gill net fisheries.
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	-Direction/methods of net setting? Most fleets were set east−west, but a few were set along seabed contours. -Target species catches were only recorded for 27 hauls (12 without ADDs, 14 with a ADD spacing of 455 m and one with a ADD spacing of 585 m). Consequently, only the mean catch rates for control nets and nets with 455 m spacing could be calculated and tested statistically for differences.
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	Y
Reduced bycatch? Y/N	Y
Maintained target catch	Y
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	When ADDs were spaced 455 m apart, the harbour porpoise bycatch was reduced to zero, and even when spaced 585 m apart the bycatch was reduced to 22% of that in the control group of nets. No statistical difference in target species catch, though limited data on this
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	Depth not discussed.
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Methods useful for testing NZ assemblages.
Costs	Moderate costs Requires marine mammal mortalities to determine success.
Benefits	Able to be performed on existing fisheries.

Number	28
Reference	Leeney et al. 2007
Year	2007
Study name	Effects of ADDs on the behaviour of bottlenose dolphins
Fishing gear	Discusses gill nets, static mooring and boat-based trials used.
MM bycatch (test) species	Bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*)
Key finding	Both models of ADD tested in this preliminary study appear to have the potential to exert a displacement effect on bottlenose dolphins, but habituation may occur. In the static trials, overall detection rates of dolphin vocalizations on the T-POD were significantly lower in the presence of active continuous ADDs (CPs), but this was not the case for responsive ADDs (RPs). Mean inter-click interval values were longer for click trains produced in the presence of inactive RPs than for active RPs, active or inactive CPs. In boat-based trials, both active CPs and RPs appeared to affect bottlenose dolphin behaviour, whereby dolphins immediately left the area at speed and in a highly directional manner, involving frequent leaps.
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	Not discussed
Level of scientific rigour	Low: small sample size. Simplistic statistics. Many uncontrolled variables.
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	-In studying the behaviour of cetaceans from a survey vessel, it can be difficult to separate the effects of disturbance caused by the vessel itself, from other behaviours being observed in the field. -Small sample size. -The lack of an evasive response, on two occasions, to active ADDs is difficult to explain. It may be that the ADDs failed to activate, or to elicit a response on these occasions. The use of a hydrophone in future trials would allow verification that ADDs have indeed gone off and that the time of the alarm corresponds to the observed reactions of the dolphins. -As this study was limited by time and funding, they were unable to carry out all possible ADD, T-POD-site combinations during the static mooring or boat-based trials. -Assumes vocalisation = dolphin presence, also assumes they are bottlenose dolphins.
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	Y
Reduced bycatch? Y/A	NA
Maintained target catch	NA
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	In the static trials, overall detection rates of dolphins was significantly lower in the presence of active continuous ADDs, but this was not the case for responsive ADDs (movement or sound activated). In boat-based trials, both active CPs and RPs appeared to deter bottlenose dolphins.
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Bottlenose dolphin is in NZ also.
Costs	Low to moderate costs - study was limited by time and funding.
Benefits	The static mooring trials had the advantage of eliminating any effect boats may have on the behaviour of the dolphins; however, these fixed arrays had only limited access to dolphins. Boat-based trials offer the advantage of enabling dolphin groups to be actively located and record any immediate effect of ADDs on dolphin behaviour. No marine mammal mortalities

Number	29
Reference	Maccarrone et al. 2014
Year	2014
Study name	Economic assessment of dolphin depredation damages and ADD Use in artisanal fisheries in the Archipelago of Egadi Islands (Sicily)
Fishing gear	Discusses artisanal fishing (long line, gillnet, and trammel nets) with small-size (< 12 m) boats is mainly practiced, uses two experimental monofilament bottom gill nets.
MM bycatch (test) species	Bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*)
Key finding	Results have shown that, during the experimental fishing, the ADD net exhibited a production advantage compared with the control net, which improved the efficiency and effectiveness of the fishing activities. In addition, in 29 fishing days, the ADD net, based on the PPUE, reaches the production levels obtained with the control net five days in advance.
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	Not discussed
Level of scientific rigour	Low: small sample size. Simplistic statistics. Many uncontrolled variables.
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	-small sample size -close proximity to an MPA (could influence marine mammal results) - designed as an economic evaluation of the ADD efficiency and the depredation phenomenon (rather than bycatch reduction)
Exhibited avoidance?	Y (depredation)
Reduced bycatch?	Y
Maintained target catch	Y
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	During the experimental fishing, the ADD net exhibited a production advantage compared with the control net, which improved the efficiency and effectiveness of the fishing activities.
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	Rationale for fishers to use ADDs
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Bottlenose dolphin is in NZ also.
Costs	Each ADD had a cost of 200 Euro. Could result in marine mammal deaths to be able to determine success.
Benefits	Shows the economic benefits to mitigating against bycatch.

Number	30
Reference	Mackay and Knuckey 2013
Year	2013
Study name	Mitigation of marine mammal bycatch in gill net fisheries using acoustic devices, literature review
Fishing gear	Shark gill nets operating under the gill net hook and trap fishery
MM bycatch (test) species	Common dolphins (*Delphinus delphis*), bottlenose dolphins (Tursiops sp.).
Key finding	Controlled experimental trials of ADDs have significantly reduced the bycatch rates of harbour porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*), franciscana dolphins (*Pontoporia blainvillei*), common dolphins (*Delphinus delphis*) and beaked whales (*Ziphius* and *Mesoplodon* sp.). Long-term deployment of ADDs in commercial fisheries has shown a continued reduction in bycatch rates of harbour porpoises in bottom set gill nets, and for common dolphins and beaked whale species in a drift gill net fishery. However, the level of bycatch reduction seen in long-term fishery use is of an order of magnitude lower than reported from controlled experimental trials. This apparent reduced mitigation effect is likely due to a number of factors, most notably lack of compliance and issues with ADD functionality. The spacing at which ADDs are deployed along a net has been shown to affect the efficacy of reducing bycatch.
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	Concerns of ADD use: Habituation (unlikely) Habitat displacement (inconclusive) Low compliance rates for ADD use = more bycatch.
Level of scientific rigour	NA
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	-The results of a number of trials investigating the practical use of ADDs in bottom set gill net and tangle net fisheries have raised concerns over their robustness, the time needed for deployment or removal from gear, fouling of gear, unreliability in source output and failure rates. Carretta and Barlow (2011) noted that reasons for ADD failure in the California-Oregon drift gill net fishery included expired batteries, water intrusion and physical damage to the ADDs caused during fishing operations
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	Y
Reduced bycatch? Y/N	Y
Maintained target catch	NA
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	Some ADD varieties work for reducing common dolphin bycatch. Depredation on nets has been reduced from bottlenose dolphins using some varieties of ADDs. Not clear if this relates to bycaught dolphins.
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Bottlenose and common dolphins
Costs	Low cost
Benefits	Summarises all available literature to 2013

Number	31
Reference	Mangel et al. 2013
Year	2013
Study name	Using ADDs to reduce bycatch of small cetaceans in Peru's small-scale driftnet fishery
Fishing gear	Drift net fishery – sharks and rays
MM bycatch (test) species	Five species of small cetaceans were observed captured, including common dolphins (n = 545), dusky dolphins *Lagenorhynchus obscurus* (n = 520), bottlenose dolphins (n = 525), Burmeister's porpoises *Phocoena spinipinnis* (n = 58), and pilot whales (n = 52).
Key finding	We have shown that ADDs were effective at reducing bycatch of small cetaceans in the Peruvian small-scale driftnet shark fishery. Given the vast size of this fishery and its current levels of bycatch of small cetaceans (Alfaro-Shigueto et al. 2010; Mangel et al., 2010) appropriate use of ADDs could result in mortality reductions of thousands of individuals per annum and would represent an important step for the conservation of small cetaceans in the south-eastern Pacific. There was no statistically significant difference in catch rates of sharks and rays, the primary target species in this fishery, between control and experimental sets
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	How ADDs work to reduce small cetacean captures in nets is still unclear.
Level of scientific rigour	Moderate: modelling and statistics, moderate sample size, obsolete ADDs, but comparable to past studies.
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	-The urgent need to begin this research (because of high reported bycatch rates) and logistical constraints, meant that ADDs available for the trial were limited, and were therefore spaced at 200 m intervals (more widely spaced than recommended) -In addition to bycatch, 23 common dolphins and two dusky dolphins were observed to be harpooned, for use as bait on subsequent sets. Continued harpooning would offset some of the gains made through ADD use. -Seasonality?
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	Y
Reduced bycatch? Y/N	Y
Maintained target catch	Y
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	ADDs reduced bycatch of small cetaceans in the Peruvian small-scale driftnet fishery. Most dramatically for the common dolphins. There was no statistically significant difference in catch rates of sharks and rays, the primary target species in this fishery, between control and experimental set.
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment.
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Common, dusky, and bottlenose dolphins, and pilot whales also common in NZ
Costs	The current unit cost of commercially available ADDs is around $USD130 per unit and the recommended spacing between ADDs is generally 200 m (Northridge et al., 2010). To equip a 2 km length net in this fishery would require an investment of around $USD1,100–1,500. Requires marine mammal mortalities to be able to determine success.
Benefits	Able to be performed on existing fisheries. Accounts for a lot of variables in sampling protocol associated with fishing.

Number	32
Reference	McPherson 2011
Year	2011
Study name	Acoustic methods to mitigate bycatch and depredation by marine mammals on commercial fishing operations in Australian waters: Fishermen's options
Fishing gear	Various discussed, no nets used.
MM bycatch (test) species	Marine mammals
Key finding	Monitoring real fishery conditions using Marine Mammal Observer visual techniques is increasingly being shown to be inadequate relative to acoustic methodologies, especially for the hours of darkness when most fishing occurs. Incorporation of acoustic monitoring into marine mammal interaction fisheries as is the case internationally would expedite the capability of industry to defend its activities from inappropriate criticism, erroneous advice to fisheries regulatory agencies and to achieve appropriate biodiversity targets.
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	NA
Level of scientific rigour	Discusses the successes and failures of ADD investigations.
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	-A 'real-world' commercial net features colour and shape, it would generate sound when anchored in a strong current. Of significance to a dolphin echolocating at night around nets associated with ADDs is that the net would feature an echo return from the dolphins' own sonar. No such return echo would occur from the 'simulated net'. At best, the simulated net experimental situations could be described as unlike any fishing net situation ever experienced anywhere, and the results would in no way be relevant to fishing operations. AEC approved 'simulated nets' with visual and sonar responsive attributes have been documented since the early 1990s although 'real world' testing using acoustic localisation around commercial gear is still preferred.
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	Y
Reduced bycatch? Y/N	Y
Maintained target catch	Indeterminate (e.g. no clear effect either way)
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	Supports ADD investigation.
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment
Costs	Low cost
Benefits	Summarises all available literature to 2011

Number	33
Reference	Northridge et al. 2010
Year	2010
Study name	Assessment of the impacts and utility of acoustic deterrent devices.
Fishing gear	Aquaculture
MM bycatch (test) species	Harbour porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*)
Key finding	• Porpoises avoid areas where ADDs are active. • Porpoises return to areas almost immediately after ADDs are switched off. • Porpoises are not totally excluded from areas where ADDs are being used. • Porpoises were detected (feeding) even at about 200 m from an Airmar ADD source. • Porpoises, dolphins, and seals are most sensitive to the 10 kHz peak in the Airmar ADD signal. • ADD signals are not uniform. • Acoustic signals from ADDs can be detected at more than 14 km from the sound source. • Acoustic propagation losses are site specific and quite variable. • Porpoises appeared to avoid one area where ADDs had recently been installed. • Porpoises appeared to be less averse to other areas where ADDs had been used for several years. • Within the Sound of Mull area, habitat modelling links porpoise distribution most closely to water depth and seabed slope, while ADD received levels were not a significant predictor of porpoise distribution.
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	Annoyance avoidance
Level of scientific rigour	Low to moderate: controlled experiment. Small sample sizes. Uses modelling and basic statistics, likely to have low statistical power though (not discussed)
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	-Difficult report to read, some uncertainty to level of sampling effort.
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	Y
Reduced bycatch? Y/N	NA
Maintained target catch	NA
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	Porpoises avoid areas where ADDs are active
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment
Costs	Moderate costs - similar to a static moored experiment
Benefits	Able to be performed at existing aquaculture sites. No marine mammal mortalities required.

Number	34
Reference	Northridge et al*.* 2011
Year	2011
Study name	Bycatch of vulnerable species: understanding the process and mitigating the impacts
Fishing gear	Static net fisheries (set nets, pair trawl)
MM bycatch (test) species	Harbour porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*), Common dolphin (*Delphinus delphis*)
Key finding	Initial analyses suggest that ADDs may be heard 2 km away while other ADDs only reach 100-200 m. Nets with ADDs caught significantly fewer porpoises (63–66%) but no significant difference in bycatch rate of dolphins. This reduction in porpoise bycatch is less than reductions reported for ADDs (80-95%), however ADDs were more widely spaced. None of the bycatch in nets occurred within 1.2 km from the nearest ADD. There is no significant difference in the observed bycatch rate of dolphins when ADDs are used with set nets, though sample numbers are too small to be confident that this reflects no real difference. It appears that dolphin bycatch rates reduced with use of ADDs in a single paired trawl fishery, however, ADD battery failure in 2010 meant that the data were not robust enough to test (also only one vessel pair investigated). ADDs appear to offer a viable and effective means of reducing porpoise bycatch in static net fisheries. We expect they will also result in reduced dolphin bycatch; however this has not yet been proven as current sample sizes are too small to provide statistically robust evidence. optimal positioning of ADDs inside the trawl and battery management to ensure that they continue to function correctly. Some evidence of decreased cetacean activity when a single ADD was in the water out to at least 1.2 km from the device and possibly as far as 3 km or more. The Aquamark appeared to have an effect up to about 400 m, though this particular result is preliminary pending further analysis. Other fleet characteristics (net height and twine diameter), emerged from the analyses as being potentially more interesting in terms of developing bycatch mitigation measures. Porpoise click frequency was similar at sites with a net present and at sites without a net, though there was a higher proportion of faster echolocation click-trains at sites with nets present, suggesting that either the nets provided an improved foraging area, or that the animals were actively examining the nets with their sonar. ADDs should not be used for longer than three seasons in this fishery (due to sealed battery degradation).
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	- Other fleet characteristics. - ADDs may have improved foraging area, or animals were examining the net with sonar
Level of scientific rigour	Low - moderate: small sample size, unbalanced design, interannual variables not controlled, high level of uncertainty/caveats.
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	-Calculations were described in the paper as 'crude'. -We caution that there are some extreme assumptions implicit in these calculations and that the exercise is most useful simply to highlight the fact that a ‘mix and match’ approach to ADD six deployment – by using different models and different spacings in different fleet segments can radically alter both the financial costs to the industry and the potential impacts in terms of habitat exclusion. -Distance from shore/depth considered? -The Aquamark appeared to have an effect up to about 400 m, though this particular result is preliminary pending further analysis. -Three seasons of data, but using different methods (2008 used multiple ADD/ 2009 & 2010 single ADD). -Some data collected by skippers rather than observers. -The effects of ADDs on dolphin bycatch rates cannot yet be fully determined because we only observed five dolphin bycatches during the course of the trials. Continued monitoring will eventually clarify this point. The closest dolphin bycatch event was 1.3 km from a ADD. -Some vessels outside the normal foraging depth range of most small cetaceans. -One skipper thinks that when bycatch does occur the animals are caught as the gear is being shot, rather than when the net is lying on the seabed, and suggested that a more sensible approach for this fleet might involve having a powerful ADD attached to the boat to deter animals from the vicinity during shooting operations. -No consideration of target fish or species caught when bycatch event occurred. -Historic batch catch data not compared. -Different ADDs used in the bass fishery study. Only two consistent vessels over time. -PADDs deployed at different depths. -A number of hauls recorded in the observer database contained missing values (for looking at other fishing related factors to bycatch events) - data was extrapolated from past data (to use in the model).
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	Y
Reduced bycatch? Y/N	Y
Maintained target catch	NA
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	Reduces porpoise bycatch, but not clear if it reduces dolphin bycatch.

Number	34, continued
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	Distance from shore/depth did not appear to have been considered so not sure if relevant to NZ conditions.
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Common dolphin is in NZ also.
Costs	We also calculated the likely financial costs to the relevant vessels, firstly if only the > 12 m vessels were to use ADDs, and also if each of three other size categories of vessel (10–12 m, 8–10 m and < 8 m) were also required to use ADDs at some point in the future. The total costs ranged from roughly GBP113,000 to over GBP2.5 million, depending on the ADD model used and the spacing chosen. ADDs can damage nets. Liable to malfunction/break frequently. Requires marine mammal mortalities to be able to determine success.
Benefits	Although these devices are known to be effective at minimising porpoise bycatch, they are not always practical to use. Trials by Seafish in the UK and similar trials conducted by the relevant authorities in Ireland and France have shown that none of the devices described by the regulation are suitable for fisheries that use long fleets of gill or tangle nets. High levels of damage to and loss of ADDs was reported, as were potential dangers to crew members when devices broke during deployment or retrieval.

Number	35
Reference	Orphanidea and Palka 2013
Year	2013
Study name	Analysis of harbour porpoise gill net bycatch, compliance, and enforcement trends in the US north-western Atlantic, January 1999 to May 2010
Fishing gear	Gill nets
MM bycatch (test) species	Harbour porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*)
Key finding	Changes in fishing effort and distribution of key fisheries played a large role in decreasing the bycatch in much of the Mid-Atlantic and also in increasing bycatch in Southern New England and off the coast of New Jersey. The pattern in compliance levels had an inverse relationship with bycatch levels, with better compliance and lower bycatch in early and late years, though compliance was generally poor even when at its best. Given poor compliance with ADD requirements, these requirements have not resulted in the expected reduction in bycatch.
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	Not discussed
Level of scientific rigour	Low: sample size not defined but appears large. Simplistic statistics. Significant uncontrolled variables.
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	-Even though the ADD functionality sample size from 1999 to 2010 is relatively small, the data suggest that even when the proper number of ADDs was used, they may not have all been functional. This makes estimating true compliance (when all ADDs were functional and also present in the required numbers) challenging. It also makes it difficult to quantify the effectiveness of ADDs in reducing bycatch. -Estimating bycatch for the Mid-Atlantic is challenging because it is on the southern end of the harbour porpoise range, and, thus, bycatch can vary substantially between seasons and years, depending on the extent to which harbour porpoise occupy the area. -Inter-annual variability, both in the mid-Atlantic and in New England, may have been related to natural variability of environmental factors associated with harbour porpoise distribution.
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	Y
Reduced bycatch? Y/N	Y
Maintained target catch	NA - discussed how targeted fish effects the bycatch rate.
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	This review suggests that ADDs are still an effective way to deter harbour porpoise bycatch, though they will have a reduced effect if they are not all working and are not present in the required numbers. This review suggests that, for ADD management actions to be effective, steps must be taken to ensure compliance with the management actions
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment and management
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment and managing ADD use.
Costs	Low cost
Benefits	Uses existing data.

Number	36
Reference	Palka et al. 2008
Year	2008
Study name	Effect of ADDs on harbour porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) bycatch in the US Northeast gill net fishery
Fishing gear	Not specified but mostly sink gill nets in area
MM bycatch (test) species	Harbour porpoise
Key finding	Bycatch rates in hauls without ADDs were greater than those with the required ADDs. Unexpectedly, when hauls had an incomplete set of ADDs, bycatch was greater than those without ADDs altogether. As mesh size increased so did bycatch rate, despite the presence of ADDs. All observed bycatch was in nets of > 15 cm mesh size. No evidence of temporal trends in bycatch, suggesting no habitation so far.
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	The increased bycatch in hauls with incomplete ADDs could be due to several potential confounding factors. By chance, there may have been different environmental/gear characteristics. Harbour porpoise may interpret a gap in ADDs as a gap in the net.
Level of scientific rigour	Moderate: modelling and statistics, large sample size, comparable to past studies.
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	-Environmental factors and mesh size appear to influence the bycatch rate, in addition to the use of ADDs.
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	Y
Reduced bycatch? Y/N	Y
Maintained target catch	Indeterminate (e.g. no clear effect either way)
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	Support that ADDs can reduce harbour porpoise bycatch, even in an operational fishery. Uses fishing effort as a proxy for target catch rates, but not clear if this was maintained or not.
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment
Costs	High cost
Benefits	Able to be performed on existing fisheries.

Number	37
Reference	Petras 2003
Year	2003
Study name	A review of marine mammal deterrents and their possible applications to limit killer whale (*Orcinus orca*) predation on Steller sea lions (*Eumetopias jubatus*)
Fishing gear	Briefly discusses gill nets, longline depredation, and aquaculture sites, as well as minimising predation in migrating salmon.
MM bycatch (test) species	NA
Key finding	Based upon a thorough review of the literature, lack of previous long-term success and high degrees of uncertainty, it is unlikely that deterrents would be successful in this application. The standard ADD emits a signal of 10 kHz (with harmonics to at least 60 kHz) with a source level of 132 dB re 1 micro Pascal at 1 m, which is within the hearing range of most cetaceans and pinnipeds. Different ADDs can emit sounds differently, with regular pulse intervals, random intervals or frequency sweeps. Most experiments to test the effectiveness of ADDs have been done with porpoise interacting with gillnet fisheries and have shown them to be generally effective in reducing porpoise bycatch Though, there is evidence that porpoise may habituate to ADDs suggesting that variable sounds and monitoring are important to maintaining effectiveness. Tests done in the field showed that while harbour porpoise avoided nets equipped with ADDs, they approached and became entangled in, unequipped nets 100–200 m away. Incorporating time and area closures may also be important to reducing porpoise bycatch. It's still unclear if the ADD sound serves to alert the marine mammals to the presence of the net, or if the sound may simply be annoying to the animal and therefore repel it from the area, or if the sound may be aversive to the prey of marine mammals. Based on the relatively few rigorous studies, it appears most likely that ADDs work with porpoise through aversion (IWC 2000). Where the ADDs may cause an aversion response in the prey of porpoise such as herring that have unusually high hearing sensitivity. The porpoise may move in response to movements in their prey and thus avoid nets. Hector's dolphins (*Cephalorhynchus hectori*) were most consistently deterred with a ADD with pulse lengths of 400 milliseconds and fundamental frequency at approximately 9.6 kHz with strong harmonics up to, and probably over, 150 kHz, although other ADDs were reported to be ineffective. Other experiments indicated no significant deterrence of dolphins in response to ADDs. Different species of marine mammals respond differently to ADDs. Despite years of trials, more experiments are needed to better understand the effectiveness and possible impacts of ADDs. One issue of particular concern with ADDs is the exclusion of marine mammals from areas where they typically forage.
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	-Alerts to the presence of the net, -The sound may be annoying to the animal and therefore repel it -The sound may be aversive to the prey of marine mammals (reducing foraging) -May affect (mask) an animal's echolocation, stimulating the porpoise to echolocate more and detect the net. -ADDs + management tools might be the reason they are effective/not effective. -Need variable sounds and monitoring to maintain effectiveness (they get used to the sound). -Species biology -Need to consider all variables: The received level of sound is dependent upon the effects of spherical and cylindrical spreading, water depth, and absorption (Johnston and Woodley 1998) as well as water temperature, salinity, and movement (i.e., tides and waves). Weather and ambient noise including anthropogenic and biological sounds also have an effect.
Level of scientific rigour	NA
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	Not clear if the author thinks ADDs create sonar scrambling or effect predation/foraging? Some contradictory statements. Between last paragraph on page 11 and 2nd paragraph page 10. The need for research on the life history, ecology, abundance, and distribution of transient killer whales is important for determining the possible impacts
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	Y
Reduced bycatch? Y/N	Y
Maintained target catch	NA
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	Generally effective in reducing porpoise bycatch
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	NA
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Refers to Hector's dolphin
Costs	NA
Benefits	NA

Number	38
Reference	Shapiro et al. 2009
Year	2009
Study name	Transmission loss patterns from acoustic harassment and deterrent devices do not always follow geometrical spreading predictions
Fishing gear	Not specified
MM bycatch (test) species	Marine mammals
Key finding	Superimposed onto an overall trend of decreasing sound exposure levels with increasing range were large local variations in the sound level for all sources in each of the environments. Animals may encounter difficulties when trying to determine the direction to and location of a sound source, which may complicate or jeopardize avoidance responses. e.g. a steadily reliable decrease with increasing range would not occur since the levels fluctuate dramatically. The variability in the sound exposure level (SEL) may be an important factor to consider when evaluating the implementation of acoustic mitigation devices in fishery regimes.
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	Pain or annoyance
Level of scientific rigour	Low: sample timing over the day not described but appear to have tested each ADD type at each location. Simplistic statistics.
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	-Probability/significance or correlations are not provided. -Sample timing over the day not described
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	Y (site specific)
Reduced bycatch? Y/N	NA
Maintained target catch	NA
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	The success of ADDs at deterring marine mammals likely depends on how the signal propagates in a coastal environment, which appears to be a lot more variable than previously assumed.
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment and management
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment and managing ADD use.
Costs	Low cost, minimal field days and modelling.
Benefits	Able to be performed at multiple locations/environments to estimate the efficacy of ADDs. No marine mammal mortalities necessary.

Number	39
Reference	Soto et al. 2013
Year	2013
Study name	Acoustic alarms elicit only subtle responses in the behaviour of tropical coastal dolphins in Queensland, Australia
Fishing gear	Discusses gillnets, vessel mounted ADD used.
MM bycatch (test) species	Australian snubfin dolphin (*Orcaella heinsohni*), Indo-Pacific humpback dolphin (*Sousa chinensis*)
Key finding	The movements and behaviour of both species changed subtly when the ADDs were active, but the likelihood of the animals leaving an area was not significantly different from the controls. Our results suggest that this technological approach may not be effective in reducing the bycatch of these species. We suggest that further experimentation is unlikely to be cost effective and that government agencies should work with fishers and scientists to explore alternative mitigation measures. Snubfin dolphins slightly decreased the time they spent vocalising, while humpback dolphins slightly decreased the time they spend foraging and their rates of both active surfacing and clicks. These changes occurred once the ADD was introduced and remained after it was removed.
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	This reaction may be a component of an alertness response, in which the animal reduces vocalisation to better listen for the acoustic source. Animals may reduce echolocation rates and time vocalising as a response to perceived danger, to reduce e.g. predation risk, although doing so may increase the likelihood of a potential entanglement.
Level of scientific rigour	Low to moderate: Controlled experiment. Small sample sizes. Good statistical explanations, likely to have low statistical power though (not discussed)
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	-Not mimicking a real fishery (no net used). -Calculating the sound propagation of acoustic alarms and deterrents is extremely complex, as the sound field is highly dependent on factors such as habitat morphology and depth of source and receiver. -We assumed Baldwin's (2002) estimates of ADD propagation in a shallow silty-clay environment (60 m) to be a reasonable approximation of the sound field for the Fumunda ADD in Keppel Bay, an environment similar to the Hinchinbrook region. This assumption was not tested empirically. -The duration of each treatment was 10 min for humpback dolphins and 5 min for snub-fin dolphins. This difference reflected the difficulties in approaching the elusive snubfin dolphins. -Treatments used 1-3 ADDs only. -Thousands of trials would be required to have the power to detect a significant result for Queensland populations of humpback and snubfin dolphins. -One site lacked a high observation point from which to take long-distance readings through traditional theodolite tracking such as that conducted by Cox et al. (2004). -Snubfin dolphins were much more difficult to find and observe than humpback dolphins -ADDs were tested from a research vessel. The presence of the vessel may have affected results, compared with testing on independent nets.
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	N
Reduced bycatch? Y/N	N
Maintained target catch	NA
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	ADDs not considered effective. 10 kHz frequency acoustic alarms should not be implemented to reduce MM bycatch in coastal Queensland waters. Funding would be better spent working with fishers and scientists to develop practical solutions to this bycatch problem, rather than conducting further trials of technology-based solutions such as ADDs.
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment
Costs	A comprehensive study of the efficacy of acoustic alarms to reduce bycatch in Queensland would require a significant number of ADD types to be tested in a range of different inshore habitats across all marine mammals of conservation concern. Our research took over 300 h of fieldwork to complete tests for only one ADD type and two species of dolphins. Assuming 10 types of acoustic alarms, we estimate that it could take up to 3000 h to test them all, costing millions of dollars in labour, equipment and transport, and the active collaboration of the commercial gillnetting industry for extensive periods of testing. Even if some ADDs were found to be effective in reducing dolphin bycatch and their use were mandated, the required enforcement would be extremely expensive for a relative low-value fishery worth USD$20 to $30 million per year (Department of Primary Industries & Fisheries QLD 2006), especially as this fishery operates largely from small boats in remote areas with few observers.
Benefits	No marine mammal deaths, lower cost than real fishing.

Number	40
Reference	Stone et al. 2000
Year	2000
Study name	Reactions of Hector's dolphins to three acoustic gill net ADDs
Fishing gear	Gill net
MM bycatch (test) species	Hector's dolphin *(Cephalorhynchus hectori hectori)*
Key finding	Dolphins generally avoided ADDs (significance not tested). The White Dukane ® ADD with steady evenly spaced harmonic peaks at approximately 10, 40 60, 80, 100, 110, 130, 150 kHz was significantly more effective than the Black Pice ® ADD, and the Red Dukane ® ADD at deterring dolphin groups. No change in echolocation under the four conditions, indicating that avoidance of ADDs may not be related to the echolocation habits of the dolphins (or that ADDs do not interfere with dolphin echolocation)
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	-Avoidance. -ADDs do not appear to interfere with dolphin echolocation
Level of scientific rigour	Low - moderate: simplistic statistics, missing some probability analysis, high level of uncertainty/caveats.
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	-Used from vessel (attracts dolphins?). -No gillnets used, so no way to determine how the ADD + net might change behaviour. -Only performed in fine/calm weather (very wind affected). -Akaroa dolphins mix groups, possible repeat exposure to some group members. -Click only detectable 10-25 m (estimated) from the hydrophone. -Difficult to determine the direction of the dolphins clicks, except by observation of the head orientation. -Does not consider cumulative noise effects (resonant frequency with surrounding ambient noises). -Doesn't mention at what level of thermocline would it start to isolate the ADD sounds? -Sea temperature profiles were only done on two days in January, during summer. -Clicks per dolphin were calculated by dividing the total number of recorded clicks by the number of dolphins in the group, and assumes all dolphins are producing clicks evenly (see footnote, Table 4). -The summary says the avoidance behaviour was significantly higher using the White Dukane ADD, however there was no actual P values provided (it incorrectly refers to Figure 5 for 'Significance' information). -Undefined error bars in Figure 6. -Only one type of each variety of ADD was tested, so instrumentation variability wasn't able to be taken into consideration. -Akaroa dolphins are accustomed to set nets. -Distance from shore/depth considered? -Doesn’t consider spacing of ADDs/or multiple ADDs being used on nets.
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	Y
Reduced bycatch? Y/N	NA
Maintained target catch	NA
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	63% of dolphin groups (21/32 events) exhibited avoidance when the white ADD was in the water. No nets used in the study so no information relating to reductions in bycatch and maintenance of target species.
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	Low (region specific)
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Investigates native, endangered Hector's dolphin species to NZ
Costs	Moderate - high: 19 attempted days using multiple staff, a vessel + hydrophone and computing software. Data analyses in Australia. Est NZD$6000 per day = NZD$114,000
Benefits	Local, investigates taxa of concern.

Number	41
Reference	Teilmann et al. 2006
Year	2006
Study name	Reactions of captive harbour porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*) to ADD-like sounds
Fishing gear	Discusses gill nets, ADD tested on confined porpoises.
MM bycatch (test) species	Harbour porpoise
Key finding	The animals responded most strongly to the initial presentations of a sound. Surface time decreased, the heart rate dropped below the normal bradycardia, and echolocation activity decreased. The reactions of both animals diminished rapidly in the following sessions. Should the waning of responsiveness apply to wild animals, porpoises may adapt to the sounds but still avoid nets, or the bycatch may increase after some time. The success of long-term use of ADDs may then depend on the variety of sounds and rates of exposure.
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	Annoyance avoidance
Level of scientific rigour	Low: small sample sizes. Uses basic statistics, with uncertainties and test violations, likely to have low statistical power though (not discussed)
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	-Ten to 15 min before each session the dorsal pack was placed on the female (none on the male). The dorsal pack had an effect on the behaviour of the female. - An important prerequisite for the X2 test is violated. As each of the individual observations (the sector in which the animal was in a given second) was, without doubt, strongly influenced by where the animal was in the previous second. Thus, the observations were not independent. This, however, does not prohibit the use of the X2 statistic as a relative measure of difference between the mean pre-sound period and individual sound periods. -The bimodal nature of marine mammal heart rate (tachycardia/bradycardia) also makes it difficult to estimate average values. - Measures of average distance to the sound source to quantify avoidance reactions, is probably a more accurate measure of displacement than the X2 statistic used in the present study. -because of the narrow-beam nature of the harbour porpoise sonar, a complete record of echolocation activity can never be recorded by poolside hydrophones. -The two captive harbour porpoises were used in earlier studies to evaluate the effects of aversive ADD-like sounds, which may have influenced the magnitude of responses we report here. - There were limitations on pool size and depth, as well as external noise from harbour traffic—mostly small, diesel driven fishing vessels and small boats with outboard motors—potentially influenced the results. -Caution is required when extrapolating our results to a natural situation or to experiments performed in other facilities.
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	Y
Reduced bycatch? Y/N	NA
Maintained target catch	NA
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	The general aversive response of harbour porpoises to acoustic stimuli is to swim away from the sound source, spend less time at the surface, increase acceleration, deepen the bradycardia below normal, and reduce echolocation in the vicinity of the sound source.
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment.
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment.
Costs	High-costs, requires live captured marine mammals. Many variables to control.
Benefits	No marine mammal mortalities, perhaps lower cost than real fishing examples. Can more easily determine behavioural reactions.

Number	42
Reference	Teilmann et al. 2015
Year	2015
Study name	Porpoise monitoring in ADDnet fishery. Final baseline report.
Fishing gear	Discusses gillnets, collects baseline data.
MM bycatch (test) species	Harbour porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*)
Key finding	The four years of data collected so far constitutes a baseline for assessing the potential effect of employing ADDs in the impact area. Power analysis show that the current baseline data and a continuation of the monitoring program during the employment of ADDs for one year, would allow for detecting relative changes of density (PPM) around 22% and echolocation behaviour (CPPM) around 42%. If monitoring continues for up to four years the relative changes that can be detected is reduced gradually to 14% and 25%, respectively.
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	NA
Level of scientific rigour	High: addresses seasonal effect, determines effect size before using ADDs, characterises background variables.
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	-BACI design, where the implicit assumption is that the porpoise detection activity in the control and the impact area are essentially governed by the same mechanisms over time, such that a potential effect of using ADDs can be traced as a deviation in the impact area compared to the control area after the ADDs have been employed.
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	NA
Reduced bycatch? Y/N	NA
Maintained target catch	NA
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	NA
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment/provides background information on species behaviour and distribution required before ADD use can be tested.
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment
Costs	High costs - four years baseline + 14 C-PODs used.
Benefits	No marine mammal mortalities, perhaps lower cost than real fishing examples. Can more easily determine behavioural reactions.

Number	43
Reference	Waples et al. 2013
Year	2013
Study name	A field test of acoustic deterrent devices used to reduce interactions between bottlenose dolphins and a coastal gillnet fishery
Fishing gear	Demersal gill net
MM bycatch (test) species	Bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*)
Key finding	Fish catch was significantly lower when dolphin interactions were observed. ADDs did not affect fish catch, but dolphin interaction decreased, and echolocation increased with active ADDs. The durability of ADDs however, is not sufficient for effective deployment in this fishery.
Assumed causal agent for avoidance?	We conclude that dolphins used echolocation to investigate the nets equipped with active SaveWave devices, which would enhance their ability to detect and avoid these nets.
Level of scientific rigour	Moderate: reasonable modelling and statistics, moderate fishing set sample size (though low for focal follows), testing carried out over same season (summer) each year, some uncertainties.
Caveats or uncertainties to methods	-Number of focal dolphins follows is fairly low. Dolphin depredation of catch not observed often enough to determine whether ADD use affects depredation rates. -Not blind tested. The fishermen were not informed whether active or control alarms were to be used, but once the devices were deployed on the first set and the saltwater switches were activated, the devices with white cores were audible. -observations didn't use a theodolite. -ADDs not deployed in 2003. -inter-annual variation in frequency of depredation, population changes need to be considered for interannual investigations.
Exhibited avoidance? Y/N	Y
Reduced bycatch? Y/N	Y
Maintained target catch	Y
Level of efficacy (reducing bycatch, maintaining target catch)	SaveWaves were effective in deterring dolphins from interacting with Spanish mackerel gill nets, although our observations from the research vessel indicate that the ADDs did not eliminate this behaviour entirely. ADDs did not affect fish catch, but dolphin interaction decreased, and echolocation increased with active ADDs
Application to NZ inshore fisheries	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment - though difficult to do follow observations from shore in NZ.
Relevance to protected dolphin species assemblages in NZ	Relevant for designing a NZ experiment Bottlenose dolphin is in NZ also.
Costs	The SaveWave devices were not sufficiently physically robust to be used effectively in the Spanish mackerel gillnet fishery, where gear is deployed and retrieved with a hydraulic net reel system. When the fishermen attempted to wind nets onto their reels with the SaveWaves attached, the device housings cracked under the weight and tension of the nets. Fishermen instead had to attach and remove the devices by hand each time a net was deployed or retrieved, which proved to be very time consuming.
Benefits	Able to be performed on existing fisheries. High depredation levels but low bycatch rates (no dolphins caught during study).