UNITED NATIONS

EP

UNEP(DEPI)/MED WG.408/Inf.27

UNITED NATIONS
ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME
MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN

UNEP

6 May 2015
Original: English

Twelfth Meeting of Focal Points for Specially Protected Areas

Athens, Greece, 25-29 May 2015

Agenda item 8: Implementation of the Ecosystem Approach to the management of human activities that may affect the Mediterranean marine and coastal environment in the framework of the Mediterranean Action Plan (MAP)/Barcelona Convention (EcAp)

8.2. : Draft Integrated Monitoring and Assessment Programme

Monitoring guidelines to assess cetaceans' distributional range, population abundance and population demographic characteristics

UNEP/MAP
RAC/SPA - Tunis, 2015

Regional Activity Centre for Specially Protected Areas (RAC/SPA)

Boulevard du Leader Yasser Arafat

B.P. 337 - 1080 Tunis Cedex - Tunisia

E-mail: car-asp@rac-spa.org

The original version of this document was prepared for the Regional Activity Centre for Specially Protected Areas (RAC/SPA) by Mr Simone Panigada.

Introduction

The Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans of the Black Sea, Mediterranean Sea and contiguous Atlantic area (ACCOBAMS) has been working for several years on defining an exhaustive program for estimating abundance of cetaceans and assessing their distribution and habitat preferences in the Mediterranean Sea (the "ACCOBAMS Survey Initiative"). This initiative consists in a synoptic survey to be carried out in a short period of time across the whole Mediterranean Sea and it will combine visual survey methods (boat- and ship-based surveys) and passive acoustic monitoring (PAM).

This document was elaborated based on the documents prepared by the ACCOBAMS Scientific Committee that has worked for several years on the definition of the most appropriate methodologies for collecting data on cetaceans at the Mediterranean Sea scale, taking into account the protocols used in other regional contexts[1]. It presents specific information on monitoring by visual line transect surveys (conducted from boat and airplane) and by acoustic survey. It should be noted that it does not address all the tools and methods that could be used for cetacean survey, neither new technologies that are currently experimented (i.e. drones and satellite imagery). Significant information also comes from stranding networks. Lastly, this document is considering surveys using large ships, but the shipboard cetacean surveys conducted from small vessels would also make use of this document.

Monitoring cetaceans species may be addressed at two spatial scales:

1) **Regional monitoring** - if the requirement is to monitor the use of a specific area by a particular species, e.g. monitoring the status of relative abundance between and within years in national waters or marine protected areas.
2) **Population level monitoring** - if the requirement is to monitor the status of a whole population, e.g. estimate density and abundance of cetaceans in the whole ACCOBAMS area.

Before conducting any type of monitoring of animal populations, it is important to define the objectives. The main aim in both aerial and vessel-based surveys is to assess density and abundance and, if systematic monitoring programs are in place, assess potential trends over time. Monitoring at the regional level may require data collection throughout the year, to better understand seasonal patterns in distribution, whereas monitoring at the population level would mainly address inter-annual changes.

Cetaceans generally occur in low densities and are highly mobile. They are difficult to spot and to follow at sea, even during good survey conditions, because they typically only show part of their head, back and dorsal fin while surfacing and spend the majority of their time underwater.

There are a number of actions that need to be taken when initiating any type of monitoring, either for species distributional range or to estimate population abundance of selected species.

1. Select the target species (surveys can be multi-species or single-species).
2. Determine whether to monitor an entire population or a portion of it (in a given region).
3. Define the population or area to monitor and the time-window.
4. Define monitoring objectives.
5. Consider logistics for the monitoring (e.g. size of area, weather, depth of area, available survey platforms).
6. Conduct statistical power analysis to find the best method to meet the monitoring objectives.
7. Conduct a cost-benefit analysis.

---

[1] *e.g.* in the Atlantic waters within the framework of (i) the SCANS surveys undertaken to assess the populations of Small Cetaceans in the European Atlantic and North Sea, and (ii) the CODA surveys (Cetacean Offshore Distribution and Abundance in the European Atlantic) aiming to estimate cetacean abundance in European Atlantic waters.

Currently, there are at least five potential approaches to be used in monitoring cetaceans:

1. Visual surveys from ship, aircraft or land observation platforms (LOP).
2. PAM carried out during ship surveys with towed hydrophones.
3. PAM performed by means of static acoustic monitoring, e.g. using T-PODs.
4. Photo-identification and mark-recapture analysis.
5. Satellite telemetry to track individual animals.
6. A combination of all or some of the above methodologies.

When deciding which monitoring method to implement, it is important to consider the limitations of each approach and compare the different methodologies. In general, surveys from ship or aircraft have a low temporal resolution, ship surveys may have bias due to responsive movements of animals, stationary acoustic systems have low spatial resolution and logistical problems with deployment, photographic identification relies on visual differences between individuals to allow identification, and telemetry typically only allows small samples resulting in much inter-individual variation.

There are different types of platform and methods of detection that can be used for each approach, e.g. fixed observation points such as headlands or moving survey platforms such as ships and aircraft, or direct visual or acoustic detections of vocalizing animals, respectively. The methods can therefore range from very basic, yielding simple indices of abundance in limited areas, to very advanced providing accurate (how close the estimate is to the true value) and precise (the statistical variation in estimates generated from repeated samples) estimates of absolute abundance across wide areas.

Target species

Cetaceans

Eleven species of cetaceans are considered do regularly occur in the Mediterranean area: short-beaked common dolphin (*Delphinus delphis*), striped dolphin (*Stenella coeruleoalba*), common bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*), harbour porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*), long-finned pilot whale (*Globicephala melas*), rough-toothed dolphin (*Steno bredanensis*), Risso’s dolphin (*Grampus griseus*), fin whales (*Balaenoptera physalus*), sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*), Cuvier’s beaked whale (*Ziphius cavirostris*) and killer whale (*Orcinus orca*).

Knowledge about the ecology, abundance and habitat preferences of some of these species, including the most abundant ones, is in part scant and limited to specific sectors of the Mediterranean region, due to the uneven distribution of research effort during the last decades. In particular, the south-eastern portion of the basin, the coasts of North Africa and the central offshore waters are amongst the areas with the most limited knowledge on cetacean presence, occurrence and distribution.

Other marine endangered species
Even if cetacean species are the first targets of this monitoring effort, the observations of other marine endangered species, such as marine turtles, giant devil rays, monk seals and sea birds, and other elements such as marine debris, could be reported during the surveys. Specific protocols have to be designed for these opportunistic observations, bearing in mind that the primary objective is to collect data on cetaceans.

Dedicated vessel or aircraft visual surveys

For monitoring programmes involving dedicated visual surveys both ship-based and aerial methods are well established. Although in some situations the choice of platform will be determined by logistical constraints, and despite the fact that a full and comprehensive comparison of aerial and vessel-based surveys has not yet been carried out, generally the method which provides an estimate with the required precision for the lowest cost should be chosen.

For visual surveys, it is important to consider observer skill and experience. Observers may vary in sighting efficiency and observer training is important to obtain consistent results. Furthermore, consistency in data collection protocols, observers, survey design and planning is essential to guarantee reliable and robust results in the long term, especially when systematic monitoring programmes are scheduled.

Line transect sampling is typically used to estimate abundance and assess density. In line transect sampling, a survey area is defined and surveyed along pre-determined transects. The distance to each detected animal is measured and consequently used to obtain a detection function, from which an estimate of the effective width of the strip that has been searched can be calculated. This is necessary because the probability of detecting an animal decreases the further away it is from the transect line. Abundance is then calculated by extrapolating estimated density in the sampled strips to the entire survey area. The calculated number is therefore an estimate of abundance in a defined area at a particular time.

On ships, distances are either estimated by naked eye (observers should be trained in distance estimation and use individually calibrated tools) or using binoculars with distance calibrated reticules. Video range measuring methods allow distance to be accurately measured. To calculate the perpendicular distance to a sighting the radial angle should be recorded using an angle board. If an aircraft is used, an inclinometer reading, taken when the sighting is abeam of the aircraft, and the altitude of the aircraft allow precise calculation of the perpendicular sighting distance to the transect. Animals occur in groups in many cetacean species so the target for detection in a line transect survey is often a group rather than individuals. Hence, data on the group size and composition must also be accurately collected.

When estimating absolute abundance using the line transect distance sampling method, it is assumed that all animals on the track line are detected, ie. the probability to detect an animal or a group of animals is maximum ($g(0)=1$).
There are two potential categories of bias that may invalidate the assumption that $g(0)=1$:

- availability bias (when the animal is underwater or, in general, not available to be seen during the period it is within visual range) and
- perception bias (when for whatever reason an observer misses a whale that is available at the surface).

To address the availability bias, data on diving behaviour of the target species could be taken into consideration and used as a correction factor. With trained observers and large cetaceans, perception bias can be considered equal to or approximately equal to 1. However, if $g(0)$ is significantly lower than one (as is often the case for small cetaceans) then this will result in a considerably negatively biased estimate and the true value of $g(0)$ must be estimated. For shipboard surveys, the double-platform approach has been successfully used to address this problem. Availability bias is a particular problem for animals with very long dives; in the case of the sperm whale, acoustic techniques can overcome this problem.

The logistics of aerial surveys often prevent the use of two independent platforms to allow estimation of the proportion of animals missed on the transect line, however, recently Partenavia P-68 planes have been equipped with two sets of bubble windows, to allow double-platform data collection by means of independent observers on board of the same aircraft. Data collection protocols implementing aircraft circling back after a sighting to simulate the second research platform can be also used.

Relative abundance using only one platform may be sufficient for detecting population trends, reducing surveys cost considerably and may be used to monitoring the status of the target population between large-scale absolute abundance surveys based on larger budgets.

Another assumption for line transects methodology is that animals do not move prior to detection. This is not a problem for aerial surveys, but may bias shipboard surveys that typically survey at speeds around 10 knots. Evasive movements lead to negative bias in estimates of abundance, while attractive movements lead to positively biased estimates. Double-platform methodology can be applied to assess responsive movements. According to this method, observations are carried out from two platforms. Observers from the secondary or ‘tracking’ platform search an area ahead of the ‘primary’ survey area and sufficiently wide to ensure that animals are detected prior to any responsive movement to the ship, and to allow the tracking of animals until they are detected by the primary platform. The observers from the primary platform search independently of the tracking platform.

To assist in planning a line transect survey and to analyse the data there is a comprehensive analysis program available called DISTANCE.
DISTANCE provides software for estimating detection functions, density and abundance, and can be used to design the surveys. The latest version also includes mark-recapture distance sampling which allows analysis of dual observer distance sampling surveys, where the probability of detection on the trackline can be estimated. All versions of DISTANCE can be downloaded free from http://www.ruwpa.st-and.ac.uk/distance/.

It is clear from the above examples that proper design of the survey is critical to address monitoring issues of cetacean populations, and in particular that a large enough area is covered so that shifts in distributions can be accounted for when analyzing the data.

The areas to be surveyed are usually divided into survey blocks and the transects are designed to ensure equal coverage probability, using the dedicated software.

Survey design
The basic requirement for a line transect survey is that it provides representative coverage of the area for which an abundance estimate is desired *(i.e.* each point in the area has an equal or quantifiable probability of being sampled). A common design for vessel-based surveys at sea is a set of zig-zag lines following a regular pattern, starting from a random point along one edge of the survey area. In aerial surveys, ‘parallel transects’ are to be preferred and the coverage should be allocated according to target species’ density: more coverage where their density is higher.

Survey blocks
The development of appropriate survey blocks is a combination of biological factors (species, distribution/stock structure and abundance, habitat types etc.) and pragmatism associated with the logistics (numbers of vessels/planes; port/airport facilities; transit times; national boarders etc.).

Effort required per block
The effort required per block is determined as a function of ship/airplane time available in each block, available information on density of species and logistical constraints. The higher the level of coverage the better, as it allows for a larger sample size and therefore for more precise and robust abundance estimates.

There are some practical points needing attention when designing a survey. Transects should, as far as possible, run perpendicular to any density gradient; for example, coastal surveys typically have transects that run more or less perpendicular to the shore line.

Closing mode versus passing mode
In order to confirm certain information (species identification, group size and, historically, distance to sighting), cetacean surveys could be operated in ‘closing mode’. In this mode, once a sighting has been made and the initial distance and angle been recorded, the vessel then approaches the animal(s) to identify the species and group size. It is also used if, for example, it is desired to obtain biopsy samples or photographs.

Nevertheless, operating in ‘closing’ mode can result in biased abundance and estimates. The preferred approach is thus to operate in ‘passing mode’ whenever possible (*i.e.* once a sighting is made the vessel remains on the designated course). However, this too has its problems, if, for example, many sightings are unidentified to species (the use of cameras with large stabilized zoom lenses may facilitate species identification).

Deciding between vessel and aerial surveys
Visual line transects surveys can be operated from a ship and from an aircraft. When deciding which platform to use, the relative merits of each approach for the species and areas to be covered must be considered. These include:

- aerial surveys are usually more cost-efficient per area than large vessel surveys, provided that the area to be covered is within the range of the aircraft from an airport and taking safety considerations into account (this often means not travelling more than 200 nautical miles or so offshore);
- aerial surveys can take better advantage of good weather conditions, in that they can cover much larger areas in the same period;
- aerial surveys are more efficient (and trackline design is easier) if the area to be covered has complex coastlines, many islands or large areas of shallow waters;
- aerial surveys can be more tolerant of swell but less tolerant of sea state and low cloud – they can also be affected by poor weather at the airport even if survey conditions are acceptable at sea;
- animals are less disturbed (if at all) by aircraft at normal flying altitudes and thus the problem of responsive movement is minimal;
- for multispecies aerial surveys, compromises must be made in terms of the optimum altitude for flying e.g. flying at the optimum altitude for a harbour porpoise survey means that the searching area for larger species such as fin whales is considerably reduced;
- vessels are generally better platforms for photo-identification and aircraft are unsuitable for biopsy sampling and acoustic recording;
- availability bias is much greater for aerial surveys;
- it is generally easier to obtain a suitable vessel than a suitable aircraft.

Platforms of opportunity
Platforms of opportunity are a potentially valuable resource for monitoring but it is usually not possible to choose the time or area of operation. Survey coverage is therefore typically extremely uneven and some areas, crucial for the presence of a target species, may not be covered; such unrepresentative coverage may introduce bias into assessment of distribution and abundance.

Platforms of opportunity using visual and/or acoustic methods are the cheapest way to monitor cetaceans. However, the success of using such vessels depends on finding the right platform that can cheaply and effectively accommodate observers and equipment and that cover appropriate areas at suitable speeds. These criteria are seldom fulfilled, especially since long term monitoring ideally requires the conditions to be consistent. Ferries may be suitable in some areas but spatial coverage is likely to be poor because of the fixed routes covered. Research vessels conducting annual monitoring of e.g. oceanography or fish resources have the potential to be valuable platforms of opportunity for monitoring if they take place at the right time(s) in the right place(s).

Acoustic surveys

The collection of acoustic data for cetaceans has some significant advantages over visual methods. Acoustic methods can be automated, data can be collected 24-hrs a day, data collection is not dependent on observers skill, are less sensitive to weather conditions and can detect the presence of diving animals not available for visual observations. Disadvantages are that these methods rely on animals making sounds within a useful detection range and are identifiable to the species level. Furthermore, with exception of some species such as the sperm whale, methods to estimate abundance are not well established yet.

All odontocetes (toothed whales) have the ability to echolocate by producing and listening to particular “click” sounds. This allows them to navigate during night time or in murky waters, and to find and catch preys. Most toothed whales such as most dolphins (e.g. bottlenose and common dolphins) also produce other frequency modulated sounds (whistles) used for intraspecific communication. The monitoring of these sounds allows for the collection of information on spatial and temporal habitat use, as well as estimation of relative density.

Ship-board line transect acoustic survey is the most effective way of surveying sperm whales in the open sea and to collect the data required for accurate and robust estimation of absolute abundance in these waters. Visual-only survey techniques could introduce biases due to the long dive duration abilities demonstrated by the species and the little time generally spent at the surface, which makes them mostly unavailable for visual detection.

Acoustic data from sperm whales can be used to assess both relative and absolute abundance provided that the appropriate equipment and survey design is followed. Sperm whales produce loud regular clicks, which can be detected at ranges of tens of kilometres. Sperm whale click characteristics are generally easily recognisable. Thus, software automatization has been developed and used on a number of surveys resulting into real-time tracking and location to single animals or groups. By tracking a whale for a period of time, crossed bearings to successive clicks give a position for each whale, which can be used in a distance-based analysis.

A major task in this type of analysis is the assignment of clicks to individual whales when many animals are vocalizing simultaneously. Often, clicks from different whales are easily resolved using bearing information with dedicated software implementing beamforming . The regularity of the click train on each bearing indicates that they represent a single whale. On occasions where more than one whale is on the same bearing, clicks can be assigned to individuals using spectral and amplitude information, inter-click intervals and inter-pulse intervals. By identifying the most obvious whale in a group and removing those clicks from the analysis, identification of successive whales becomes progressively easier until all clicks are assigned.

Since acoustic detection ranges are generally ~10 km, a survey vessel travelling at 18 km per hour (10 knots) will be in acoustic range of a sperm whale close to the track line for over an hour. Typically, sperm whales dive for approximately 30-50 minutes followed by 10-15 minutes at the surface. Clicking is generally continuous when the whales are submerged and they are silent while resting at the surface.

On occasion, whales cease clicking regularly for periods of 2-3 hours, but evidence from tagging and observational studies suggests this is infrequent. The probability of a whale to remain silent for the entire time that the vessel is in range is therefore considered to be small, indicating that g(0) for acoustic surveys is close to 1. However, calves (which may represent up to 20% of the population) do not make long foraging dives and are not clicking regularly. Consequently, their detection may have low efficiency and a correction factor calculated from existing data should be applied.

Acoustic survey data for sperm whales can generally be collected simultaneously with visual data for other species particularly if the survey is operating primarily in passing mode. Survey vessels can also continue acoustic sampling in conditions unsuitable for visual survey (bad weather and night time).

Abundance estimates, based on acoustic methods, are only possible for sperm whales. Potentially, information on distribution can be obtained from acoustic data for all species, although with much more uncertainties for common and striped dolphins, given the difficulties in distinguishing their vocalizations.

A hydrophone array is towed behind each vessel. The equipment consists of a desktop computer running automatic detection software, the towed hydrophone, and various interface cards for getting sounds into the computer. The computer is running all the time, and one scientist is in charge of the acoustic system on each vessel.

Photo-identification

Photo-identification is a widely used technique in cetacean research that can provide estimates of abundance and population parameters e.g. survival and calving rate. It has been used for monitoring purposes for common bottlenose dolphins and killer whales since the 1970s. The technique relies on being able to obtain good quality photos of animals’ body parts that constitute unique recognizable markings.
This method can be used for population level monitoring of species with appropriate markings, if data can be collected across the distribution of the population. This approach cannot be applied to species that lack suitable individual identification marks.

Using photo-identification, it is sometimes possible to census the whole population when all individuals can be encountered at any given time in an area, all are well marked and no individuals seem to be moving in or out of the population. This is however unusual and has only been accomplished for a few populations of bottlenose dolphin, e.g. Sado Estuary, Portugal and Doubtful Sound, New Zealand, and for killer whales off Vancouver Island. More commonly, mark-recapture models must be applied to photo-identification data to estimate abundance (rather than a census the whole population) for specific areas that populations or part of populations occupy during one or more seasons of the year.

Information on the proportion of the population possessing recognisable markings is also required to allow estimation of population size.
The standard software program for mark-recapture analysis is program MARK (http://www.cnr.colostate.edu/~gwhite/mark/mark.htm), which includes a wide range of models to estimate population size and survival rates. There are models that can take account of heterogeneity of capture probabilities, a common problem in mark-recapture studies. These include program CAPTURE, a widely used multi-sample closed population model. If animals are believed to emigrate temporarily from the study area, there are also methods available for taking this into account in analysis.

Satellite tracking

Information on the movements and distribution of individual animals can help to identify important habitats, migration routes and to define boundaries between populations. Effective conservation of animal populations is enhanced by this information, which can also be valuable when designing monitoring programmes. In recent years satellite tagging of cetaceans has been increasingly used to obtain information on seasonal movements, distribution and diving behaviour.

To make inferences about large populations ranging over a wide area, many animals must be tagged, especially in species with high individual variation in behaviour. For some areas and species this would be a significant logistical challenge.

Many kinds of tags have been used in studies of cetaceans, including VHF transmitters, satellite tags and GPS data loggers. Satellite telemetry has the advantage that because data are transmitted to an earth based station via a satellite, it is possible to follow animals all over the world without retrieval of the tag.

Each tagged animal can provide a wealth of information but the limitation is that typically only a few animals can be tagged in a study due to limited funding or access to live animals. General conclusions are therefore often difficult especially if all members of the population are not equally available for tagging.

Power analysis

For any type of monitoring it is necessary to ensure that the chosen method and the study design will be able to provide an answer to the question posed with a useful level of precision. A power analysis can indicate the ability of the statistical procedure and the available or planned data to reveal a certain level of change i.e. the ability to detect a trend of a given magnitude. Power analysis can be used in two situations: firstly for interpretation of results of analysis of existing data; and secondly to plan studies to calculate the necessary sample size e.g. the length of time series of abundance estimates, or the coefficient of variation (CV) of those estimates, needed to detect specified rates of population change in a trend analysis.

TRENDS is a freely available program designed to carry out a power analysis of linear regression, particularly in the context of monitoring populations in wildlife studies (http://swfsc.noaa.gov/textblock.aspx?Division=PRD&ParentMenuId=228&id=4740). TRENDS summarises the power analysis in five parameters: duration of study, rate of change, precision of estimates, Type 1 error rate, and power (1 - Type 2 error rate). The value of any one of these can be estimated if the other four are specified. TRENDS is therefore designed to help answer such questions as:

- How many years are required to detect a trend?
- How much effort would be required to detect a certain level of change in a certain time period? What is the probability of detecting a trend?

Annex 1 – Ship and aircraft specifications

Ship specifications presented hereafter are for surveys using large ships but it should be considered that smaller vessels could also be used for carrying out cetaceans surveys. In this case, methodologies applied present some differences (it is not possible to apply the double-platform approach).

Ship specifications

- Ships need to be able to accommodate at least 10 observers (8 for the cetacean and turtle work; 2 for the seabird work).
- There must be two observation platforms (permanent or temporary), one at least 5m above sea level (often at the level of the bridge) and one at least 9-10m above sea level (often on the flying bridge or a temporary construction) – see Figures 1 and 2.
- The two platforms must:
  - be audibly and visually isolated from each other.
  - be able to accommodate at least 3 observers – see Figure 3.
  - have an unobstructed view (from 270° to 90° with direction of sailing 0°).
- Power supplies for computers and other equipment must be available (ideally this should be independent from the ship electric system, to avoid interferences).
- The ship must carry appropriate navigational equipment.
  - Accurate information on location (GPS) and other information (e.g. wind speed) should be available through NMEA outputs from the ship's instruments.
- The ship must hold valid certification and comply with current safety regulations.
- Standard cruise speed: no less than 10 knots..
- Endurance: ideally at least 25-30 days.
- Good stability.
- Capability for acoustic surveying (hydrophone array with a 200m cable).
- Safe area for deployment and storage of hydrophone.
- Power supply for hydrophone and computer.
- Cable route between computer and hydrophone.
- Preference for vessels that introduce least amount of noise into the sea at survey cruise speed (objective information on such noise levels can only be obtained by measurement at sea, however, the noise produced is likely to be more for larger vessels, vessels with variable pitch propellers and older vessels).

- Capability for continuous oceanographic data collection (desirable but not necessary).

Fig. 1 - A 43m long vessel equipped with a temporary observation platform at about 9m above sea level.

Fig. 2 - A 60 m long vessel equipped with a temporary observation platform at over 10 m on the sea level.

Fig. 3 - Inside a platform.

Fig. 4 - Hydrophone.

Aerial survey

Survey aircraft must:

- hold valid certification, comply with current safety regulations and be equipped with the following safety equipment: an emergency rescue boat, life vests (manual release) and two emergency satellite locator transmitters (one fixed in the plane, one portable);
- provide a list of countries in which they are not able to operate;
- be twin engine;
- be able to fly at a speed of between 80 and 100 knots (ground speed) at an altitude of about 180-200m when undertaking the survey;
- have bubble windows on each side of the aircraft for two observers and good viewing conditions for the navigator in the front seat (preferable double bubble windows to apply double-platform data collection and analysis);
- be high winged to allow for full downward view from the bubble windows on the track-line;
- be equipped with GPS and a radar altimeter (geographical position, survey altitude, speed should be available through NMEA outputs from the aircraft instruments);
- have enough fuel capacity to allow a minimum endurance of 5 hours;
- have an intercom system that allows clear communication between all observers and the pilot;
- have a power supply (12V or 24V) to connect a laptop and other appliances;
- The seats should be located parallel to or facing the windows to allow the seating to be as comfortable as possible during visual observations. There needs to be the option to darken the upper part of the bubble windows to reduce sun reflection on the window.
- Pilots should have relevant experience of survey flying, especially at low altitudes over water.

Fig. 5 - Partenavia P-68 Observer aircraft with bubble windows.

Relevant bibliographic references and selected case studies

- Abadi, F., Gimenez, O., Arlettaz, R. & Schaub, M. (2010). An assessment of integrated population models: bias, accuracy, and violation of the assumption of independence. *Ecology* **91**, 7–14.
- Abbot, T.A., Premus, V.E. & Abbot, P.A. (2010). A real-time method for autonomous passive acoustic detection-classification of humpback whales. J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 127, 2894–2903.
- Adler-Fenchel, H.S. (1980). Acoustically Derived Estimate of the Size Distribution for a Sample of Sperm Whales (Physeter catodon) in the Western North Atlantic. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 37, 2358–2361.
- Akamatsu, T., Ura, T., Sugimatsu, H., Bahl, R., Behera, S., Panda, S., Khan, M., Kar, S.K., Kar, C.S., Kimura, S. & Sasaki-Yamamoto, Y. (2013). A multimodal detection model of dolphins to estimate abundance validated by field experiments. J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 134, 2418–2426.
- Alex Shorter, K., Murray, M.M., Johnson, M., Moore, M. & Howle, L.E. (2014). Drag of suction cup tags on swimming animals: Modeling and measurement. Mar Mam Sci 30, 726–746.
- Amaral, A.R., Beheregaray, L.B., Bilgmann, K., Freitas, L., Robertson, K.M., Sequeira, M., Stockin, K.A., Coelho, M.M. & Möller, L.M. (2012). Influences of past climatic changes on historical population structure and demography of a cosmopolitan marine predator, the common dolphin (genus Delphinus). Mol. Ecol. 21, 4854–4871.
- Ansmann, I.C., Lanyon, J.M., Seddon, J.M. & Parra, G.J. (2013). Monitoring dolphins in an urban marine system: total and effective population size estimates of Indo-Pacific bottlenose dolphins in Moreton Bay, Australia. PLoS ONE 8, e65239.
- Antunes, R., Rendell, L. & Gordon, J. (2010). Measuring inter-pulse intervals in sperm whale clicks: consistency of automatic estimation methods. J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 127, 3239–3247.
- Antunes, R., Schulz, T., Gero, S., Whitehead, H., Gordon, J. & Rendell, L. (2011). Individually distinctive acoustic features in sperm whale codas. Animal Behaviour 81, 723–730.
- Araabi, B.N., Kehtarnavaz, N., McKinney, T., Hillman, G. & Würsig, B. (2000). A string matching computer-assisted system for dolphin photoidentification. Ann Biomed Eng 28, 1269–1279.
- Arcangeli, A., Marini, L. & Crosti, R. (2013). Changes in cetacean presence, relative abundance and distribution over 20 years along a trans-regional fixed line transect in the Central Tyrrhenian Sea. Marine Ecology 34, 112–121.
- Arnbom, T. (1987). Individual identification of sperm whales. Rep. Int. Whal. Comn. 37, 201–204.
- Arrigoni, M., Manfredi, P., Panigada, S., Bramanti, L. & Santangelo, G. (2011). Life-history tables of the Mediterranean fin whale from stranding data. Marine Ecology 32, 1–9.
- Ashton, K.G., Tracy, M.C. & Queiroz, A. de. (2000). Is Bergmann's Rule Valid for Mammals? The American Naturalist 156, 390–415.
- Au, W. & Lammers, M. (2007). Cetacean Acoustics. In Springer Handbook of Acoustics: 805–837. Prof, T.D.R. (Ed). . Springer New York.
- Au, W.W.L. & Hastings, M.C. (2008). Principles of Marine Bioacoustics. New York, NY: Springer US.
- Au, W.W.L. (1993). The Sonar of Dolphins. New York, NY: Springer New York.
- Au, W.W.L., Fay, R.R. & Popper, A.N. (Eds.). (2000). Hearing by Whales and Dolphins. Springer Handbook of Auditory Research. New York, NY: Springer New York.
- Azzellino, A., Gaspari, S., Airoldi, S. & Nani, B. (2008). Habitat use and preferences of cetaceans along the continental slope and the adjacent pelagic waters in the western Ligurian Sea. Deep Sea Research Part I: Oceanographic Research Papers 55, 296–323.
- Bailey, H., Benson, S.R., Shillinger, G.L., Bograd, S.J., Dutton, P.H., Eckert, S.A., Morreale, S.J., Paladino, F.V., Eguchi, T., Foley, D.G., Block, B.A., Piedra, R., Hitipeuw, C., Tapilatu, R.F. & Spotila, J.R. (2012). Identification of distinct movement patterns in Pacific leatherback turtle populations influenced by ocean conditions. *Ecological Applications* **22**, 735–747.

- Bailey, H., Hammond, P.S. & Thompson, P.M. (2014). Modelling harbour seal habitat by combining data from multiple tracking systems. Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology, Charismatic marine mega-fauna 450, 30–39.
- Balmer, B.C., Schwacke, L.H. & Wells, R.S. (2010). Linking Dive Behavior to Satellite-Linked Tag Condition for a Bottlenose Dolphin (<I>Tursiops truncatus</I>) along Florida’s Northern Gulf of Mexico Coast. Aquatic Mammals 36, 1–8.
- Balmer, B.C., Wells, R.S., Howle, L.E., Barleycorn, A.A., McLellan, W.A., Ann Pabst, D., Rowles, T.K., Schwacke, L.H., Townsend, F.I., Westgate, A.J. & Zolman, E.S. (2014). Advances in cetacean telemetry: A review of single-pin transmitter attachment techniques on small cetaceans and development of a new satellite-linked transmitter design. Mar Mam Sci 30, 656–673.
- Bearzi, G., Agazzi, S., Bonizzoni, S., Costa, M. & Azzellino, A. (2008). Dolphins in a bottle: abundance, residency patterns and conservation of bottlenose dolphins Tursiops truncatus in the semi-closed eutrophic Amvrakikos Gulf, Greece. Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems 18, 130–146.
- Bearzi, G., Bonizzoni, S., Agazzi, S., Gonzalvo, J. & Currey, R.J.C. (2011a). Striped dolphins and short-beaked common dolphins in the Gulf of Corinth, Greece: Abundance estimates from dorsal fin photographs. Marine Mammal Science 27, E165–E184.
- Bearzi, G., Pierantonio, N., Affronte, M., Holcer, D., Maio, N. & Notarbartolo Di Sciara, G. (2011b). Overview of sperm whale Physeter macrocephalus mortality events in the Adriatic Sea, 1555–2009. Mammal Review 41, 276–293.
- Bearzi, G., Reeves, R.R., Notarbartolo-Di-Sciara, G., Politi, E., Cañadas, A., Frantzis, A. & Mussi, B. (2003). Ecology, status and conservation of short-beaked common dolphins Delphinus delphis in the Mediterranean Sea. Mammal Review 33, 224–252.
- Benson, S.R., Eguchi, T., Foley, D.G., Forney, K.A., Bailey, H., Hitipeuw, C., Samber, B.P., Tapilatu, R.F., Rei, V., Ramohia, P., Pita, J. & Dutton, P.H. (2011). Large-scale movements and high-use areas of western Pacific leatherback turtles, Dermochelys coriacea. *Ecosphere* **2**, art84.
- Besbeas, P. & Freeman, S.N. (2006b). Methods for joint inference from panel survey and demographic data. *Ecology* **87**, 1138–1145.
- Bestley, S., Jonsen, I.D., Hindell, M.A., Harcourt, R.G. & Gales, N.J. (2014). Taking animal tracking to new depths: synthesizing horizontal–vertical movement relationships for four marine predators. *Ecology* **96**, 417–427.
- Bilgmann, K., Möller, L.M., Harcourt, R.G., Kemper, C.M. & Beheregaray, L.B. (2011). The use of carcasses for the analysis of cetacean population genetic structure: a comparative study in two dolphin species. PLoS ONE 6, e20103.
- Bombosch, A., Zitterbart, D.P., Van Opzeeland, I., Frickenhaus, S., Burkhardt, E., Wisz, M.S. & Boebel, O. (2014). Predictive habitat modelling of humpback (Megaptera novaeangliae) and Antarctic minke (Balaenoptera bonaerensis) whales in the Southern Ocean as a planning tool for seismic surveys. Deep Sea Research Part I: Oceanographic Research Papers 91, 101–114.
- Bombosch, A., Zitterbart, D.P., Van Opzeeland, I., Frickenhaus, S., Burkhardt, E., Wisz, M.S. & Boebel, O. (2014). Predictive habitat modelling of humpback (Megaptera novaeangliae) and Antarctic minke (Balaenoptera bonaerensis) whales in the Southern Ocean as a planning tool for seismic surveys. *Deep Sea Research Part I: Oceanographic Research Papers* **91**, 101–114.
- Borchers, D.L., Buckland, S.T., Goedhart, P.W., Clarke, E.D. & Hedley, S.L. (1998). Horvitz-Thompson Estimators for Double-Platform Line Transect Surveys. Biometrics 54, 1221.
- Braithwaite, J.E., Meeuwig, J.J. & Jenner, K.C.S. (2012). Estimating Cetacean Carrying Capacity Based on Spacing Behaviour. *PLoS ONE* **7**, e51347.
- Breed, G.A., Costa, D.P., Goebel, M.E. & Robinson, P.W. (2011). Electronic tracking tag programming is critical to data collection for behavioral time-series analysis. *Ecosphere* **2**, art10.
- Brito, C. & Sousa, A. (2011). The Environmental History of Cetaceans in Portugal: Ten Centuries of Whale and Dolphin Records. *PLoS ONE* **6**, e23951.

- Broekema, J.W., Schokkenbroek, J.C.A., Pierce, G.J. & Evans, P.G.H. (2009). Marine mammals in time: past, present and future. Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom 89, 869.
- Brown, M.R., Corkeron, P.J., Hale, P.T., Schultz, K.W. & Bryden, M.M. (1995). Evidence for a Sex-Segregated Migration in the Humpback Whale (Megaptera novaeangliae). Royal Society of London Proceedings Series B 259, 229–234.
- Buckland, S.T. (1982). A note on the Fourier series model for analysing line transect data. Biometrics 38, 469–477.
- Buckland, S.T. (1985). Perpendicular distance models for line transect sampling. Biometrics 41, 177–195.
- Buckland, S.T. (2004). Advanced distance sampling: estimating abundance of biological populations. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Buckland, S.T., Goudie, I.B. & Borchers, D.L. (2000). Wildlife population assessment: past developments and future directions. Biometrics 56, 1–12.
- Buckland, S.T., Handerson, D.R., Burnham, K.P., Laake, J.L., Borchers, D.L. & Thomas, L. (2001). Introduction to Distance Sampling: Estimating Abundance of Biological Populations. Oxford University Press, Incorporated.
- Buckland, S.T., Laake, J.L. & Borchers, D.L. (2010). Double-Observer Line Transect Methods: Levels of Independence. Biometrics 66, 169–177.
- Cañadas, A. & Hammond, P.S. (2006). Model-based abundance estimates for bottlenose dolphins off southern Spain: implications for management. Journal of Cetacean Research and Management 8, 13–27.
- Cañadas, A. & Hammond, P.S. (2008). Abundance and habitat preferences of the short-beaked common dolphin Delphinus delphis in the southwestern Mediterranean: implications for conservation. Endang Species Res 4, 309–331.
- Cañadas, A., Sagarminaga, R., De Stephanis, R., Urquiola, E. & Hammond, P.S. (2005). Habitat preference modelling as a conservation tool: proposals for marine protected areas for cetaceans in southern Spanish waters. Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems 15, 495–521.
- Canese, S., Cardinali, A., Fortuna, C.M., Giusti, M., Lauriano, G., Salvati, E. & Greco, S. (2006). The first identified winter feeding ground of fin whales (Balaenoptera physalus) in the Mediterranean Sea. Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom 86, 903–907.
- Casalone, C., Mazzariol, S., Pautasso, A., Di Guardo, G., Di Nocera, F., Lucifora, G., Ligios, C., Franco, A., Fichi, G., Cocumelli, C., Cersini, A., Guercio, A., Puleio, R., Goria, M., Podestà, M., Marsili, L., Pavan, G., Pintore, A., De Carlo, E., Eleni, C. & Caracappa, S. (2014). Cetacean strandings in Italy: an unusual mortality event along the Tyrrhenian Sea coast in 2013. Diseases of Aquatic Organisms 109, 81–86.
- Cheney, B., Thompson, P.M., Ingram, S.N., Hammond, P.S., Stevick, P.T., Durban, J.W., Culloch, R.M., Elwen, S.H., Mandleberg, L., Janik, V.M., Quick, N.J., ISLAS-Villanueva, V., Robinson, K.P., Costa, M., Eisfeld, S.M., Walters, A., Phillips, C., Weir, C.R., Evans, P.G.H., Anderwald, P., Reid, R.J., Reid, J.B. & Wilson, B. (2013). Integrating multiple data sources to assess the distribution and abundance of bottlenose dolphins Tursiops truncatus in Scottish waters. Mammal Review 43, 71–88.
- Childerhouse, S.J., Dawson, S.M. & Slooten, E. (1996). STABILITY OF FLUKE MARKS USED IN INDIVIDUAL PHOTOIDENTIFICATION OF MALE SPERM WHALES AT KAIKOURA, NEW ZEALAND. Marine Mammal Science 12, 447–451.
- Clark, J.S. & Bjørnstad, O.N. (2004). Population time series: process variability, observation errors, missing values, lags, and hidden states. *Ecology* **85**, 3140–3150.
- Corrigan, C.M., Ardron, J.A., Comeros-Raynal, M.T., Hoyt, E., Notarbartolo Di Sciara, G. & Carpenter, K.E. (2014). Developing important marine mammal area criteria: learning from ecologically or biologically significant areas and key biodiversity areas. Aquatic Conserv: Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst. 24, 166–183.
- Damgaard, C. (2012). Trend analyses of hierarchical pin-point cover data. *Ecology* **93**, 1269–1274.

- De Boer, M.N., Simmonds, M.P., Reijnders, P.J.H. & Aarts, G. (2014). The Influence of Topographic and Dynamic Cyclic Variables on the Distribution of Small Cetaceans in a Shallow Coastal System. PLoS ONE 9, e86331.
- De Valpine, P. & Hastings, A. (2002). Fitting population models incorporating process noise and observation error. *Ecological Monographs* **72**, 57–76.
- Dennis, B. & Ponciano, J.M. (2014). Density-dependent state-space model for population-abundance data with unequal time intervals. *Ecology* **95**, 2069–2076.
- Dennis, B., Ponciano, J.M. & Taper, M.L. (2010). Replicated sampling increases efficiency in monitoring biological populations. *Ecology* **91**, 610–620.
- 323–341.
- Dennis, B., Ponciano, J.M., Lele, S.R., Taper, M.L. & Staples, D.F. (2006). Estimating density dependence, process noise, and observation error. *Ecological Monographs* **76**, 323–341.
- Dornelas, M., Magurran, A.E., Buckland, S.T., Chao, A., Chazdon, R.L., Colwell, R.K., Curtis, T., Gaston, K.J., Gotelli, N.J., Kosnik, M.A., McGill, B., McCune, J.L., Morlon, H., Mumby, P.J., Ovreås, L., Studeny, A. & Vellend, M. (2013). Quantifying temporal change in biodiversity: challenges and opportunities. Proc. Biol. Sci. 280, 20121931.
- Double, M.C., Andrews-Goff, V., Jenner, K.C.S., Jenner, M.-N., Laverick, S.M., Branch, T.A. & Gales, N.J. (2014). Migratory Movements of Pygmy Blue Whales (Balaenoptera musculus brevicauda) between Australia and Indonesia as Revealed by Satellite Telemetry. PLoS ONE 9, e93578.
- Dowd, M. & Joy, R. (2010). Estimating behavioral parameters in animal movement models using a state-augmented particle filter. *Ecology* **92**, 568–575.
- Doyle, T., Houghton, J., O'Súilleabháin, P., Hobson, V., Marnell, F., Davenport, J. & Hays, G. (2008). Leatherback turtles satellite-tagged in European waters. *Endangered Species Research* **4**, 23–31.
- Drouot-Dulau, V. & Gannier, A. (2007). Movements of sperm whale in the western Mediterranean Sea: preliminary photo-identification results. Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the UK 87, 195.
- Druon, J., Panigada, S., David, L., Gannier, A., Mayol, P., Arcangeli, A., Cañadas, A., Laran, S., Di Méglio, N. & Gauffier, P. (2012). Potential feeding habitat of fin whales in the western Mediterranean Sea: an environmental niche model. Marine Ecology Progress Series 464, 289–306.
- Duffy, M.A., Hall, S.R., Cáceres, C.E. & Ives, A.R. (2009). Rapid evolution, seasonality, and the termination of parasite epidemics. *Ecology* **90**, 1441–1448.
- Eckert, S.A., Moore, J.E., Dunn, D.C., van Buiten, R.S., Eckert, K.L. & Halpin, P.N. (2008). Modeling loggerhead turtle movement in the mediterranean: importance of body size and oceanography. *Ecological Applications* **18**, 290–308.
- Edrén, S.M.C., Wisz, M.S., Teilmann, J., Dietz, R. & Söderkvist, J. (2010). Modelling spatial patterns in harbour porpoise satellite telemetry data using maximum entropy. Ecography 33, 698–708.
- Eitzel, M., Battles, J., York, R., Knape, J. & de Valpine, P. (2013). Estimating tree growth from complex forest monitoring data. *Ecological Applications* **23**, 1288–1296.
- Embling, C.B., Gillibrand, P.A., Gordon, J., Shrimpton, J., Stevick, P.T. & Hammond, P.S. (2010). Using habitat models to identify suitable sites for marine protected areas for harbour porpoises (Phocoena phocoena). Biological Conservation 143, 267–279.
- Engelhaupt, D., Hoelzel, A.R., Nicholson, C., Frantzis, A., Mesnick, S., Gero, S., Whitehead, H., Rendell, L., Miller, P., De Stefanis, R., Cañadas, A., Airoldi, S. & Mignucci-Giannoni, A.A. (2009). Female philopatry in coastal basins and male dispersion across the North Atlantic in a highly mobile marine species, the sperm whale (Physeter macrocephalus). Mol. Ecol. 18, 4193–4205.
- Fay, G. & Punt, A.E. (2013a). Methods for estimating spatial trends in Steller sea lion pup production using the Kalman filter. *Ecological Applications* **23**, 1455–1474.

- Fay, G. & Punt, A.E. (2013b). Methods for estimating spatial trends in Steller sea lion pup production using the Kalman filter. *Ecological Applications* **23**, 1455–1474.
- Fewster, R.M., Buckland, S.T., Burnham, K.P., Borchers, D.L., Jupp, P.E., Laake, J.L. & Thomas, L. (2009). Estimating the encounter rate variance in distance sampling. Biometrics 65, 225–236.
- Fewster, R.M., Laake, J.L. & Buckland, S.T. (2005). Line transect sampling in small and large regions. Biometrics 61, 856–859; discussion 859–861.
- Forcada, J., Aguilar, A., Hammond, P., Pastor, X. & Aguilar, R. (1996). Distribution and abundance of fin whales (Balaenoptera physalus) in the western Mediterranean sea during the summer. Journal of Zoology 238, 23–34.
- Forcada, J., Hammond, P.S. & Aguilar, A. (1999). Status of the Mediterranean monk seal Monachus monachus in the western Sahara and the implications of a mass mortality event. Marine ecology. Progress series 188, 249–261.
- Forester, J.D., Ives, A.R., Turner, M.G., Anderson, D.P., Fortin, D., Beyer, H.L., Smith, D.W. & Boyce, M.S. (2007). State–space models link elk movement patterns to landscape characteristics in yellowstone national park. *Ecological Monographs* **77**, 285–299.
- Fossette, S., Corbel, H., Gaspar, P., Le Maho, Y. & Georges, J. (2008). An alternative technique for the long-term satellite tracking of leatherback turtles. *Endangered Species Research* **4**, 33–41.
- Fretwell, P.T., Staniland, I.J. & Forcada, J. (2014). Whales from Space: Counting Southern Right Whales by Satellite. PLoS ONE 9, e88655.
- Fukaya, K. & Royle, J.A. (2013). Markov models for community dynamics allowing for observation error. *Ecology* **94**, 2670–2677.
- Gauthier, G., Besbeas, P., Lebreton, J.-D. & Morgan, B.J.T. (2007). Population growth in snow geese: a modeling approach integrating demographic and survey information. *Ecology* **88**, 1420–1429.
- Geertsen, B.M., Teilmann, J., Kastelein, R.A., Vlemmix, H. & Miller, L.A. (2004). Behaviour and physiological effects of transmitter attachments on a captive harbour porpoise (Phocoena phocoena). Journal of Cetacean Research and Management 6, 139–146.
- Geremia, C., White, P.J., Hoeting, J.A., Wallen, R.L., Watson, F.G.R., Blanton, D. & Hobbs, N.T. (2014). Integrating population- and individual-level information in a movement model of Yellowstone bison. *Ecological Applications* **24**, 346–362.
- Gerrodette, T. (1987). A Power Analysis for Detecting Trends. Ecology 68, 1364.
- Gerrodette, T. (1991). Models for Power of Detecting Trends: A Reply to Link and Hatfield. Ecology 72, 1889.
- Gnone, G., Bellingeri, M., Dhermain, F., Dupraz, F., Nuti, S., Bedocchi, D., Moulins, A., Rosso, M., Alessi, J., McCrea, R.S., Azzellino, A., Airoldi, S., Portunato, N., Laran, S., David, L., Di Meglio, N., Bonelli, P., Montesi, G., Trucchi, R., Fossa, F. & Wurtz, M. (2011). Distribution, abundance, and movements of the bottlenose dolphin (Tursiops truncatus) in the Pelagos Sanctuary MPA (north-west Mediterranean Sea). Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems 21, 372–388.
- Godley, B. & Wilson, R. (2008). Tracking vertebrates for conservation: Introduction. *Endangered Species Research* **4**, 1–2.
- Godley, B., Blumenthal, J., Broderick, A., Coyne, M., Godfrey, M., Hawkes, L. & Witt, M. (2008). Satellite tracking of sea turtles: Where have we been and where do we go next? *Endangered Species Research* **4**, 3–22.
- Gordon, J.C.D. (1991). Evaluation of a method for determining the length of sperm whales (Physeter catodon) from their vocalizations. Journal of Zoology 224, 301–314.
- Graham, A. & Bell, R. (1989). Investigating Observer Bias in Aerial Survey by Simultaneous Double-Counts. The Journal of Wildlife Management 53, 1009.
- Graham, R.T., Witt, M.J., Castellanos, D.W., Remolina, F., Maxwell, S., Godley, B.J. & Hawkes, L.A. (2012). Satellite Tracking of Manta Rays Highlights Challenges to Their Conservation. PLoS ONE 7, e36834.

- Gredzens, C., Marsh, H., Fuentes, M.M.P.B., Limpus, C.J., Shimada, T. & Hamann, M. (2014). Satellite Tracking of Sympatric Marine Megafauna Can Inform the Biological Basis for Species Co-Management. PLoS ONE 9, e98944.
- Hammond, P. s., Berggren, P., Benke, H., Borchers, D. l., Collet, A., Heide-Jørgensen, M. p., Heimlich, S., Hiby, A. r., Leopold, M. f. & Øien, N. (2002). Abundance of harbour porpoise and other cetaceans in the North Sea and adjacent waters. Journal of Applied Ecology 39, 361–376.
- Hammond, P.S. (2002). Assessment of Marine Mammal Population Size and Status. In Marine Mammals: 269–291. Evans, P.G.H. & Raga, J.A. (Eds). . Springer US.
- Hammond, P.S., Macleod, K., Berggren, P., Borchers, D.L., Burt, L., Cañadas, A., Desportes, G., Donovan, G.P., Gilles, A., Gillespie, D., Gordon, J., Hiby, L., Kuklik, I., Leaper, R., Lehnert, K., Leopold, M., Lovell, P., Øien, N., Paxton, C.G.M., Ridoux, V., Rogan, E., Samarra, F., Scheidat, M., Sequeira, M., Siebert, U., Skov, H., Swift, R., Tasker, M.L., Teilmann, J., Van Canneyt, O. & Vázquez, J.A. (2013). Cetacean abundance and distribution in European Atlantic shelf waters to inform conservation and management. Biological Conservation 164, 107–122.
- Harris, D., Marques, T., Matias, L., Mellinger, D.K., Küsel, E.T. & Thomas, L. (2013). Highlighting pros and cons of abundance estimation using passive acoustic data: monitoring fin whales (Balaenoptera physalus) off the southern Portuguese coast using seismometers. Acoustical Society of America Journal 134, 3971.
- Harrison, P.J., Buckland, S.T., Thomas, L., Harris, R., Pomeroy, P.P. & Harwood, J. (2006). Incorporating movement into models of grey seal population dynamics. J Anim Ecol 75, 634–645.
- Harwood, J., Anderson, S.S., Fedak, M.A., Hammond, P.S., Hiby, A.R., McCONNELL, B.J., Martin, A.R. & Thompson, D. (1989). New approaches for field studies of mammals: experiences with marine mammals. Biological Journal of the Linnean Society 38, 103–111.
- Haviland-Howell, G., Frankel, A.S., Powell, C.M., Bocconcelli, A., Herman, R.L. & Sayigh, L.S. (2007). Recreational boating traffic: a chronic source of anthropogenic noise in the Wilmington, North Carolina Intracoastal Waterway. J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 122, 151–160.
- Heerah, K., Andrews-Goff, V., Williams, G., Sultan, E., Hindell, M., Patterson, T. & Charrassin, J.-B. (2013). Ecology of Weddell seals during winter: Influence of environmental parameters on their foraging behaviour. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography*, Fourth International Symposium on Bio-logging Science **88–89**, 23–33.
- Hersh, M.H., LaDeau, S.L., Previtali, M.A. & Ostfeld, R.S. (2013). When is a parasite not a parasite? Effects of larval tick burdens on white-footed mouse survival. *Ecology* **95**, 1360–1369.
- Hiby, L. & Krishna, M.B. (2001). Line Transect Sampling from a Curving Path. Biometrics 57, 727–731.
- Hoelzel, A.R. (2009). Marine Mammal Biology: An Evolutionary Approach. John Wiley & Sons.
- Horrocks, J. & Rueffer, M. (2014). A Bayesian approach to estimating animal density from binary acoustic transects. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* **80**, 17–25.
- Horrocks, J., Hamilton, D.C. & Whitehead, H. (2011). A likelihood approach to estimating animal density from binary acoustic transects. Biometrics 67, 681–690.
- using locally linear state-space models. *Ecosphere* **3**, art58.
- Ives, A.R. & Dakos, V. (2012). Detecting dynamical changes in nonlinear time series using locally linear state-space models. *Ecosphere* **3**, art58.
- Jepson, P.D., Arbelo, M., Deaville, R., Patterson, I.A.P., Castro, P., Baker, J.R., Degollada, E., Ross, H.M., Herráez, P., Pocknell, A.M., Rodríguez, F., Howie, F.E., Espinosa, A., Reid, R.J., Jaber, J.R., Martin, V., Cunningham, A.A. & Fernández, A. (2003). Gas-bubble lesions in stranded cetaceans. Nature 425, 575–576.
- Jewell, O.J.D., Wcisel, M.A., Gennari, E., Towner, A.V., Bester, M.N., Johnson, R.L. & Singh, S. (2011). Effects of Smart Position Only (SPOT) Tag Deployment on White Sharks Carcharodon carcharias in South Africa. PLoS ONE 6, e27242.
- Jewell, R., Thomas, L., Harris, C.M., Kaschner, K., Wiff, R., Hammond, P.S. & Quick, N.J. (2012). Global analysis of cetacean line-transect surveys: detecting trends in cetacean density. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 453, 227–240.

- Johnson, D.S., London, J.M., Lea, M.-A. & Durban, J.W. (2008). Continuous-time correlated random walk model for animal telemetry data. *Ecology* **89**, 1208–1215.
- Kaschner, K., Quick, N.J., Jewell, R., Williams, R. & Harris, C.M. (2012). Global Coverage of Cetacean Line-Transect Surveys: Status Quo, Data Gaps and Future Challenges. PLoS ONE 7, e44075.
- Kaschner, K., Tittensor, D.P., Ready, J., Gerrodette, T. & Worm, B. (2011). Current and future patterns of global marine mammal biodiversity. PLoS ONE 6, e19653.
- Kéry, M., Royle, J.A., Plattner, M. & Dorazio, R.M. (2009). Species richness and occupancy estimation in communities subject to temporary emigration. *Ecology* **90**, 1279–1290.
- Klinck, H., Mellinger, D.K., Klinck, K., Bogue, N.M., Luby, J.C., Jump, W.A., Shilling, G.B., Litchendorf, T., Wood, A.S., Schorr, G.S. & Baird, R.W. (2012). Near-real-time acoustic monitoring of beaked whales and other cetaceans using a SeagliderTM. PLoS ONE 7, e36128.
- Knape, J., Besbeas, P. & de Valpine, P. (2013). Using uncertainty estimates in analyses of population time series. *Ecology* **94**, 2097–2107.
- Koblitz, J.C., Amundin, M., Carlström, J., Thomas, L., Carlén, I., Teilmann, J., Tregenza, N., Wennerberg, D., Kyhn, L., Svegaard, S., Koza, R., Kosecka, M., Pawliczka, I., Ljungqvist, C.T., Brundiers, K., Wright, A., Mikkelsen, L., Tougaard, J., Loisa, O., Galatius, A., Jüssi, I. & Benke, H. (2014). Large-scale static acoustic survey of a low-density population—Estimating the abundance of the Baltic Sea harbor porpoise. The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 136, 2248–2248.
- Kuningas, S., Similä, T. & Hammond, P.S. (2014). Population size, survival and reproductive rates of northern Norwegian killer whales (Orcinus orca) in 1986–2003. Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom 94, 1277–1291.
- Laake, J. & Borchers, D. (2004). Methods for incomplete detection at distance zero. In Advanced distance sampling: estimating abundance of biological populations: 108–189. Buckland, S.T., Anderson, D.R., Burnham, K.P., Laake, J., Borchers, D. & Thomas, L. (Eds). . Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, Incorporated.
- Lammers, M.O., Brainard, R.E., Au, W.W.L., Mooney, T.A. & Wong, K.B. (2008). An ecological acoustic recorder (EAR) for long-term monitoring of biological and anthropogenic sounds on coral reefs and other marine habitats. J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 123, 1720–1728.
- Langrock, R., King, R., Matthiopoulos, J., Thomas, L., Fortin, D. & Morales, J.M. (2012). Flexible and practical modeling of animal telemetry data: hidden Markov models and extensions. *Ecology* **93**, 2336–2342.
- Lauriano, G., Panigada, S., Casale, P., Pierantonio, N. & Donovan, G.P. (2011). Aerial survey abundance estimates of the loggerhead sea turtle Caretta caretta in the Pelagos Sanctuary, northwestern Mediterranean Sea. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 437, 291–302.
- Lauriano, G., Pierantonio, N., Donovan, G. & Panigada, S. (2014). Abundance and distribution of Tursiops truncatus in the Western Mediterranean Sea: An assessment towards the Marine Strategy Framework Directive requirements. Marine Environmental Research 100, 86-93.
- Lindley, S.T. (2003). Estimation of population growth and extinction parameters from noisy data. *Ecological Applications* **13**, 806–813.
- Linnenschmidt, M., Teilmann, J., Akamatsu, T., Dietz, R. & Miller, L.A. (2013). Biosonar, dive, and foraging activity of satellite tracked harbor porpoises (Phocoena phocoena). Mar Mam Sci 29, E77–E97.
- Lowther, A.D., Harcourt, R.G., Page, B. & Goldsworthy, S.D. (2013). Steady as He Goes: At-Sea Movement of Adult Male Australian Sea Lions in a Dynamic Marine Environment. PLoS ONE 8, e74348.
- Lowther, A.D., Lydersen, C., Biuw, M., de Bruyn, P.J.N., Hofmeyr, G.J.G. & Kovacs, K.M. (2014). Post-breeding at-sea movements of three central-place foragers in relation to submesoscale fronts in the Southern Ocean around Bouvetøya. *Antarctic Science* **26**, 533–544.
- Lusseau, D., Wilson, B., Hammond, P.S., Grellier, K., Durban, J.W., Parsons, K.M., Barton, T.R. & Thompson, P.M. (2006). Quantifying the influence of sociality on population structure in bottlenose dolphins. J Anim Ecol 75, 14–24.

- Madsen, P.T., Johnson, M., de Soto, N.A., Zimmer, W.M.X. & Tyack, P. (2005). Biosonar performance of foraging beaked whales (Mesoplodon densirostris). J. Exp. Biol. 208, 181–194.
- Mann, J. (1999). Behavioral Sampling Methods for Cetaceans: A Review and Critique. Marine Mammal Science 15, 102–122.
- Marques, T.A., Buckland, S.T., Borchers, D.L., Tosh, D. & McDonald, R.A. (2010). Point transect sampling along linear features. Biometrics 66, 1247–1255.
- Marques, T.A., Thomas, L., Fancy, S.G. & Buckland, S.T. (2007). IMPROVING ESTIMATES OF BIRD DENSITY USING MULTIPLE- COVARIATE DISTANCE SAMPLING. The Auk 124, 1229.
- McClintock, B.T., King, R., Thomas, L., Matthiopoulos, J., McConnell, B.J. & Morales, J.M. (2012b). A general discrete-time modeling framework for animal movement using multistate random walks. *Ecological Monographs* **82**, 335–349.
- McClintock, B.T., London, J.M., Cameron, M.F. & Boveng, P.L. (2015). Modelling animal movement using the Argos satellite telemetry location error ellipse. Methods Ecol Evol 6, 266–277.
- McClintock, B.T., Russell, D.J.F., Matthiopoulos, J. & King, R. (2012c). Combining individual animal movement and ancillary biotelemetry data to investigate population-level activity budgets. *Ecology* **94**, 838–849.
- New, L.F., Matthiopoulos, J., Redpath, S. & Buckland, S.T. (2009). Fitting models of multiple hypotheses to partial population data: investigating the causes of cycles in red grouse. Am. Nat. 174, 399–412.
- Newman, K.B., Buckland, S.T., Lindley, S.T., Thomas, L. & Fernández, C. (2006). Hidden process models for animal population dynamics. Ecol Appl 16, 74–86.
- Newman, K.B., Fernández, C., Thomas, L. & Buckland, S.T. (2009). Monte carlo inference for state-space models of wild animal populations. Biometrics 65, 572–583.
- Notarbartolo Di Sciara, G. (2014). Sperm whales, Physeter macrocephalus, in the Mediterranean Sea: a summary of status, threats, and conservation recommendations. Aquatic Conserv: Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst. 24, 4–10.
- Notarbartolo Di Sciara, G., Frantzis, A., Bearzi, G. & Reeves, R.R. (2013). Physeter macrocephalus (Mediterranean subpopulation) [WWW Document]. IUCN 2013. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2013.2. URL <www.iucnredlist.org>
- Olsen, E., Budgell, W.P., Head, E., Kleivane, L., Nøttestad, L., Prieto, R., Silva, M.A., Skov, H., Víkingsson, G.A., Waring, G. & Øien, N. (2009). First Satellite-Tracked Long-Distance Movement of a Sei Whale (Balaenoptera borealis) in the North Atlantic. Aquatic Mammals 35, 313–318.
- Panigada, S. & Notarbartolo di Sciara, G. (2012). Balaenoptera physalus (Mediterranean subpopulation) [WWW Document]. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2014.3. URL <www.iucnredlist.org>
- Panigada, S., Lauriano, G., Burt, L., Pierantonio, N. & Donovan, G. (2011). Monitoring Winter and Summer Abundance of Cetaceans in the Pelagos Sanctuary (Northwestern Mediterranean Sea) Through Aerial Surveys. PLoS ONE 6, e22878.
- Panigada, S., Zanardelli, M., MacKenzie, M., Donovan, C., Mélin, F. & Hammond, P.S. (2008). Modelling habitat preferences for fin whales and striped dolphins in the Pelagos Sanctuary (Western Mediterranean Sea) with physiographic and remote sensing variables. Remote Sensing of Environment 112, 3400–3412.
- Pardo, M.A., Gerrodette, T., Beier, E., Gendron, D., Forney, K.A., Chivers, S.J., Barlow, J. & Palacios, D.M. (2015). Inferring Cetacean Population Densities from the Absolute Dynamic Topography of the Ocean in a Hierarchical Bayesian Framework. PLoS ONE 10, e0120727.
- Patterson, T.A., McConnell, B.J., Fedak, M.A., Bravington, M.V. & Hindell, M.A. (2010). Using GPS data to evaluate the accuracy of state–space methods for correction of Argos satellite telemetry error. *Ecology* **91**, 273–285.

- Pavan, G., Hayward, T.J., Borsani, J.F., Priano, M., Manghi, M., Fossati, C. & Gordon, J. (2000). Time patterns of sperm whale codas recorded in the Mediterranean Sea 1985-1996. J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 107, 3487–3495.
- Péron, G., Crochet, P.-A., Doherty, P.F. & Lebreton, J.-D. (2010). Studying dispersal at the landscape scale: efficient combination of population surveys and capture–recapture data. *Ecology* **91**, 3365–3375.
- Photopoulou, T., Best, P.B., Hammond, P.S. & Findlay, K.P. (2011). Movement patterns of coastal bottlenose dolphins in the presence of a fast-flowing, prevailing current: shore-based observations at Cape Vidal, South Africa. African Journal of Marine Science 33, 393–401.
- Pierantonio, N. & Bearzi, G. (2012). Review of fin whale mortality events in the Adriatic Sea (1728–2012), with a description of a previously unreported killing. Marine Biodiversity Records 5, null–null.
- Pirotta, E., Laesser, B.E., Hardaker, A., Riddoch, N., Marcoux, M. & Lusseau, D. (2013). Dredging displaces bottlenose dolphins from an urbanised foraging patch. Mar. Pollut. Bull. 74, 396–402.
- Pirotta, E., Matthiopoulos, J., MacKenzie, M., Scott-Hayward, L. & Rendell, L. (2011). Modelling sperm whale habitat preference: a novel approach combining transect and follow data. Marine Ecology Progress Series 436, 257–272.
- Pirotta, E., Milor, R., Quick, N., Moretti, D., Di Marzio, N., Tyack, P., Boyd, I. & Hastie, G. (2012). Vessel Noise Affects Beaked Whale Behavior: Results of a Dedicated Acoustic Response Study. PLoS ONE 7, e42535.
- Podestà, M., D'Amico, A., Pavan, G., Drougas, A., Komnenou, A. & Portunato, N. (2006). A review of Cuvier's beaked whale strandings in the Mediterranean Sea. J. Cetacean Res. Manage 7, 251–261.
- Pollard, J.H., Palka, D. & Buckland, S.T. (2002). Adaptive Line Transect Sampling. Biometrics 58, 862–870.
- Pomerleau, C., Patterson, T.A., Luque, S., Lesage, V., HeideJrgensen, M.P., Dueck, L.L. & Ferguson, S.H. (2011). Bowhead whale Balaena mysticetus diving and movement patterns in the eastern Canadian Arctic: implications for foraging ecology. *Endang Species Res* **15**, 167–177.
- Rastetter, E.B., Williams, M., Griffin, K.L., Kwiatkowski, B.L., Tomasky, G., Potosnak, M.J., Stoy, P.C., Shaver, G.R., Stieglitz, M., Hobbie, J.E. & Kling, G.W. (2010). Processing arctic eddy-flux data using a simple carbon-exchange model embedded in the ensemble Kalman filter. *Ecological Applications* **20**, 1285–1301.
- Raymond, B., Lea, M.-A., Patterson, T., Andrews-Goff, V., Sharples, R., Charrassin, J.-B., Cottin, M., Emmerson, L., Gales, N., Gales, R., Goldsworthy, S.D., Harcourt, R., Kato, A., Kirkwood, R., Lawton, K., Ropert-Coudert, Y., Southwell, C., van den Hoff, J., Wienecke, B., Woehler, E.J., Wotherspoon, S. & Hindell, M.A. (2015). Important marine habitat off east Antarctica revealed by two decades of multi-species predator tracking. Ecography 38, 121–129.
- Redfern, J.V., Ferguson, M.C., Becker, E.A., Hyrenbach, K.D., Good, C., Barlow, J., Kaschner, K., Baumgartner, M.F., Forney, K.A., Ballance, L.T., Fauchald, P., Halpin, P., Hamazaki, T., Pershing, A.J., Qian, S.S., Read, A., Reilly, S.B., Torres, L. & Werner, F. (2006). Techniques for cetacean–habitat modeling. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 310, 271–295.
- Russell, D.J.F., Brasseur, S.M.J.M., Thompson, D., Hastie, G.D., Janik, V.M., Aarts, G., McClintock, B.T., Matthiopoulos, J., Moss, S.E.W. & McConnell, B. (2014). Marine mammals trace anthropogenic structures at sea. *Current Biology* **24**, R638–R639.
- Sharples, R.J., Mackenzie, M.L. & Hammond, P.S. (2009). Estimating seasonal abundance of a central place forager using counts and telemetry data. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 378, 289–298.
- Sharples, R.J., Moss, S.E., Patterson, T.A. & Hammond, P.S. (2012). Spatial Variation in Foraging Behaviour of a Marine Top Predator (Phoca vitulina) Determined by a Large-Scale Satellite Tagging Program. PLoS ONE 7, e37216.
- Shimada, T., Jones, R., Limpus, C. & Hamann, M. (2012). Improving data retention and home range estimates by data-driven screening. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* **457**, 171–180.

- Silva, M.A., Jonsen, I., Russell, D.J.F., Prieto, R., Thompson, D. & Baumgartner, M.F. (2014). Assessing Performance of Bayesian State-Space Models Fit to Argos Satellite Telemetry Locations Processed with Kalman Filtering. *PLoS ONE* **9**, e92277.
- Sippel, T., Paige Eveson, J., Galuardi, B., Lam, C., Hoyle, S., Maunder, M., Kleiber, P., Carvalho, F., Tsontos, V., Teo, S.L.H., Aires-da-Silva, A. & Nicol, S. (2015). Using movement data from electronic tags in fisheries stock assessment: A review of models, technology and experimental design. *Fisheries Research*, IO Tuna tagging **163**, 152–160.
- Solsona Berga, A., Wright, A.J., Galatius, A., Sveegaard, S. & Teilmann, J. (2015). Do larger tag packages alter diving behavior in harbor porpoises? Mar Mam Sci 31, 756–763.
- Sveegaard, S. & Teilmann, J. (2007). Identifying areas of high porpoise density using satellite telemetry. In ICES CM 2007/MHC, ICES CM 2007/MHC: 33–34. ICES.
- Sveegaard, S., Galatius, A., Dietz, R., Kyhn, L., Koblitz, J.C., Amundin, M., Nabe-Nielsen, J., Sinding, M.-H.S., Andersen, L.W. & Teilmann, J. (n.d.). Defining management units for cetaceans by combining genetics, morphology, acoustics and satellite tracking. Global Ecology and Conservation.
- Teloni, V., Zimmer, W.M.X., Madsen, P.T. & Wahlberg, M. (2007). Consistent acoustic size estimation of sperm whales using clicks recorded from unknown aspects. Journal of Cetacean Research and Management 9, 127–136.
- Tezanos-Pinto, G., Baker, C.S., Russell, K., Martien, K., Baird, R.W., Hutt, A., Stone, G., Mignucci-Giannoni, A.A., Caballero, S., Endo, T., Lavery, S., Oremus, M., Olavarría, C. & Garrigue, C. (2009). A worldwide perspective on the population structure and genetic diversity of bottlenose dolphins (Tursiops truncatus) in New Zealand. J. Hered. 100, 11–24.
- Thomas, L., Buckland, S.T., Rexstad, E.A., Laake, J.L., Strindberg, S., Hedley, S.L., Bishop, J.R.B., Marques, T.A. & Burnham, K.P. (2010). Distance software: design and analysis of distance sampling surveys for estimating population size. Journal of Applied Ecology 47, 5–14.
- Thomas, L., Laake, J.L., Strindberg, S., Marques, F.F.C., Buckland, S.T., Borchers, D.L., Anderson, D.R., Burnham, K.P., Hedley, S.L. & Pollard, J.H. (2006). Distance 5.0. Research Unit for Wildlife Population Assessment, University of St. Andrews, UK.
- Thompson, P.M., Wilson, B., Grellier, K. & Hammond, P.S. (2000). Combining Power Analysis and Population Viability Analysis to Compare Traditional and Precautionary Approaches to Conservation of Coastal Cetaceans. Conservation Biology 14, 1253–1263.
- Urian, K., Gorgone, A., Read, A., Balmer, B., Wells, R.S., Berggren, P., Durban, J., Eguchi, T., Rayment, W. & Hammond, P.S. (2015). Recommendations for photo-identification methods used in capture-recapture models with cetaceans. Mar Mam Sci 31, 298–321.
- Valpine, P. de & Rosenheim, J.A. (2008). Field-scale roles of density, temperature, nitrogen, and predation on aphid population dynamics. *Ecology* **89**, 532–541.
- Weir, C.R., MacLeod, C.D. & Pierce, G.J. (2012). Habitat preferences and evidence for niche partitioning amongst cetaceans in the waters between Gabon and Angola, eastern tropical Atlantic. Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom 92, 1735–1749.
- Williams, C.K., Ives, A.R. & Applegate, R.D. (2003). Population dynamics across geographical ranges: time-series analyses of three small game species. *Ecology* **84**, 2654–2667.
- Williams, R., Hedley, S.L. & Hammond, P.S. (2006). Modeling distribution and abundance of Antarctic baleen whales using ships of opportunity. Ecology and Society 11(1): 1.
- Wilson, R.M., Kucklick, J.R., Balmer, B.C., Wells, R.S., Chanton, J.P. & Nowacek, D.P. (2012). Spatial distribution of bottlenose dolphins (Tursiops truncatus) inferred from stable isotopes and priority organic pollutants. Sci. Total Environ. 425, 223–230.
- Witt, M.J., Baert, B., Broderick, A.C., Formia, A., Fretey, J., Gibudi, A., Mounguengui, G.A.M., Moussounda, C., Ngouessono, S., Parnell, R.J., Roumet, D., Sounguet, G.-P., Verhage, B., Zogo, A. & Godley, B.J. (2009). Aerial surveying of the world's largest leatherback turtle rookery: A more effective methodology for large-scale monitoring. Biological Conservation 142, 1719–1727.
- Woody, S.T., Ives, A.R., Nordheim, E.V. & Andrews, J.H. (2007). Dispersal, density dependence, and population dynamics of a fungal microbe on leaf surfaces. *Ecology* **88**, 1513–1524.

- Wormald, C.L., Steele, M.A. & Forrester, G.E. (2013). High population density enhances recruitment and survival of a harvested coral reef fish. Ecol Appl 23, 365–373.
- Zeng, Z., Nowierski, R.M., Taper, M.L., Dennis, B. & Kemp, W.P. (1998a). Complex population dynamics in the real world: modeling the influence of time-varying parameters and time lags. *Ecology* **79**, 2193–2209.
- Zimmer, W.M.X. (2011). Passive Acoustic Monitoring of Cetaceans. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Zimmer, W.M.X., Harwood, J., Tyack, P.L., Johnson, M.P. & Madsen, P.T. (2008). Passive acoustic detection of deep-diving beaked whales. J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 124, 2823–2832.
- Zitterbart, D.P., Kindermann, L., Burkhardt, E. & Boebel, O. (2013). Automatic Round-the-Clock Detection of Whales for Mitigation from Underwater Noise Impacts. PLoS ONE 8, e71217.