DWARF SPERM WHALE (*Kogia sima*): Northern Gulf of Mexico Stock

**STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE**

The dwarf sperm whale appears to be distributed worldwide in temperate to tropical waters (Caldwell and Caldwell 1989). Sightings of these animals in the northern Gulf of Mexico (i.e., U.S. Gulf of Mexico) occur primarily in oceanic waters (Figure 1; Mullin et al. 1991; Mullin and Fulling 2004; Maze-Foley and Mullin 2006). Dwarf sperm whales and pygmy sperm whales (*Kogia breviceps*) are difficult to differentiate at sea, and sightings of either species are usually categorized as *Kogia* spp. Sightings of this category were documented in all seasons during GulfCet aerial surveys of the northern Gulf of Mexico from 1992 to 1998 (Hansen et al. 1996; Mullin and Hoggard 2000). The difficulty in sighting dwarf and pygmy sperm whales may be exacerbated by their avoidance reaction towards ships, and change in behavior towards approaching survey aircraft (Würsig et al. 1998).

In a study using hematological and stable-isotope data, Barros et al. (1998) speculated that dwarf sperm whales may have a more pelagic distribution than pygmy sperm whales and/or dive deeper during feeding bouts. Diagnostic morphological characters have also been useful in distinguishing the 2 *Kogia* species (Barros and Duffield 2003), thus enabling researchers to use stranding data in distributional and ecological studies. Specifically, the distance from the snout to the center of the blowhole in proportion to the animal’s total length, as well as the height of the dorsal fin, in proportion to the animal’s total length, can be used to differentiate between the 2 *Kogia* species when such measurements are obtainable (Barros and Duffield 2003).

The Gulf of Mexico population is provisionally being considered a separate stock for management purposes, although there is currently no information to differentiate this stock from the Atlantic Ocean stock(s). Additional morphological, genetic and/or behavioral data are needed to provide further information on stock delineation.

**POPULATION SIZE**

The best abundance estimate available for northern Gulf of Mexico dwarf and pygmy sperm whales is 453 (CV=0.35) (Mullin 2007; Table 1). This estimate is pooled from summer 2003 and spring 2004 oceanic surveys covering waters from the 200m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ).

**Earlier abundance estimates**

Estimates of abundance were derived through the application of distance sampling analysis (Buckland et al. 2001) and the computer program DISTANCE (Thomas et al. 1998) to sighting data. From 1991 through 1994, line-transect vessel surveys were conducted in conjunction with bluefin tuna ichthyoplankton surveys during spring in the northern Gulf of Mexico from the 200 m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. EEZ (Hansen et al. 1995). Annual cetacean surveys were conducted along a fixed plankton sampling trackline. Survey effort-weighted estimated average abundance of dwarf and pygmy sperm whales for all surveys combined was 547 (cv =0.28) (Hansen et al. 1995; Table 1). Similar surveys were conducted during spring from 1996 to 2001 (excluding 1998) in oceanic waters of the northern Gulf of Mexico. Due to limited survey effort in any given year, survey effort was pooled across all years to develop an average abundance estimate.
The estimate of abundance for dwarf and pygmy sperm whales in oceanic waters, pooled from 1996 to 2001, was 742 (CV=0.29) (Mullin and Fulling 2004; Table 1). A separate estimate of abundance for dwarf sperm whales could not be estimated due to uncertainty of species identification at sea.

Recent surveys and abundance estimates
During summer 2003 and spring 2004, line-transect surveys dedicated to estimating the abundance of oceanic cetaceans were conducted in the northern Gulf of Mexico. During each year, a grid of uniformly-spaced transect lines from a random start were surveyed from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. EEZ using NOAA Ship Gordon Gunter (Mullin 2007).

As recommended in the GAMMS Workshop Report (Wade and Angliss 1997), estimates older than 8 years are deemed unreliable, and therefore should not be used for PBR determinations. Because most of the data for estimates prior to 2003 were older than this 8-year limit and due to the different sampling strategies, estimates from the 2003 and 2004 surveys were considered most reliable. The estimate of abundance for dwarf and pygmy sperm whales in oceanic waters, pooled from 2003 to 2004, was 453 (CV=0.35) (Mullin 2007; Table 1), which is the best available abundance estimate for these species in the northern Gulf of Mexico.

Table 1. Summary of combined abundance estimates for northern Gulf of Mexico dwarf and pygmy sperm whales. Month, year and area covered during each abundance survey, and resulting abundance estimate (N_{bed}) and coefficient of variation (CV).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month/Year</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>N_{bed}</th>
<th>CV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apr-Jun 1991-1994</td>
<td>Oceanic waters</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-Jun 1996-2001 (excluding 1998)</td>
<td>Oceanic waters</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-Aug 2003, Apr-Jun 2004</td>
<td>Oceanic waters</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Population Estimate
The minimum population estimate is the lower limit of the two-tailed 60% confidence interval of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate. This is equivalent to the 20th percentile of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate as specified by Wade and Angliss (1997). The best estimate of abundance for dwarf and pygmy sperm whales is 453 (CV=0.35). It is not possible to determine the minimum population estimate for only dwarf sperm whales. The minimum population estimate for the northern Gulf of Mexico is 340 dwarf and pygmy sperm whales.

Current Population Trend
There are insufficient data to determine the population trends for this species due to uncertainty in species identification at sea. The pooled abundance estimate for Kogia spp. for 2003-2004 of 453 (CV=0.35) and that for 1996-2001 of 742 (CV=0.29) are not significantly different (P>0.05), but due to the precision of the estimates, the power to detect a difference is low. The abundance estimate for Kogia spp. for 1991-1994 was 547 (CV=0.28). These temporal abundance estimates are difficult to interpret without a Gulf of Mexico-wide understanding of Kogia abundance. The Gulf of Mexico is composed of waters belonging to the U.S., Mexico and Cuba. U.S. waters only comprise about 40% of the entire Gulf of Mexico, and 65% of oceanic waters are south of the U.S. EEZ. The oceanography of the Gulf of Mexico is quite dynamic, and the spatial scale of the Gulf is small relative to the ability of most cetacean species to travel. Studies based on abundance and distribution surveys restricted to U.S. waters are unable to detect temporal shifts in distribution beyond U.S. waters that might account for any changes in abundance.

CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES
Current and maximum net productivity rates are unknown for this stock. For purposes of this assessment, the maximum net productivity rate was assumed to be 0.04. This value is based on theoretical modeling showing that cetacean populations may not grow at rates much greater than 4% given the constraints of their reproductive history (Barlow et al. 1995).

POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL REMOVAL
Potential biological removal level (PBR) is the product of the minimum population size, one half the maximum net productivity rate and a recovery factor (MMPA Sec. 3.16 U.S.C. 1362; Wade and Angliss 1997). The minimum population size for dwarf and pygmy sperm whales is 340. The maximum productivity rate is 0.04, the default value for cetaceans. The “recovery” factor, which accounts for endangered, depleted, threatened stocks, or stocks of unknown status relative to optimum sustainable population (OSP), is assumed to be 0.5 because the stock is of
unknown status. PBR for the northern Gulf of Mexico dwarf and pygmy sperm whales is 3.4. It is not possible to determine the PBR for only dwarf sperm whales.

**ANNUAL HUMAN-CAUSED MORTALITY AND SERIOUS INJURY**

There has been no reported fishing-related mortality of dwarf or pygmy sperm whales during 1998-2007 (Yeung 1999; 2001; Garrison 2003; Garrison and Richards 2004; Garrison 2005; Fairfield Walsh and Garrison 2006; Fairfield-Walsh and Garrison 2007; Fairfield and Garrison 2008).

**Fisheries Information**

The level of past or current, direct, human-caused mortality of dwarf sperm whales in the northern Gulf of Mexico is unknown. Pelagic swordfish, tunas and billfish are the targets of the longline fishery operating in the northern Gulf of Mexico. There were no reports of mortality or serious injury to dwarf sperm whales by this fishery.

**Other Mortality**

At least 17 dwarf sperm whale strandings were documented in the northern Gulf of Mexico from 1999 through 2007 (NOAA National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Database unpublished data, accessed 16 September 2008; Table 2 displays 2003-2007 data). No evidence of human interactions was detected for these stranded animals. An additional 9 *Kogia* spp. stranded during 1999-2007 (2 in Texas in 2000, 1 in Texas in 2001, 2 in Texas in 2002, 1 in Mississippi in 2003, 1 in Florida in 2003, 1 in Florida in 2004, and 1 in Florida in 2006). Evidence of human interactions was detected for 1 of these stranded animals. Stranding data probably underestimate the extent of fishery-related mortality and serious injury because not all of the marine mammals which die or are seriously injured in fishery interactions wash ashore, not all that wash ashore are discovered, reported or investigated, nor will all of those that do wash ashore necessarily show signs of entanglement or other fishery-interaction. Finally, the level of technical expertise among stranding network personnel varies widely as does the ability to recognize signs of fishery interactions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;d,e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>0&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> 1 additional *Kogia* sp. stranded  
<sup>b</sup> 1 additional *Kogia* sp. stranded  
<sup>c</sup> 1 additional *Kogia* sp. stranded  
<sup>d</sup> 1 additional *Kogia* sp. stranded  
<sup>e</sup> Previously reported incorrectly as 1 stranded animal  
<sup>f</sup> Mass stranding of 2 animals in August 2007

**STATUS OF STOCK**

The status of dwarf sperm whales in the northern Gulf of Mexico, relative to OSP, is unknown. The species is not listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act. There are insufficient data to determine the population trends for this species. Total human-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is not known. There is insufficient information available to determine whether the total fishery-related mortality and serious injury for this stock is insignificant and approaching zero mortality and serious injury rate. Despite an unknown PBR for this species, this is not a strategic stock because it is assumed that average annual human-related mortality and serious injury does not exceed combined PBR for dwarf and pygmy sperm whales. However, the continuing inability to distinguish between species of *Kogia* raises concerns about the possibility of mortalities of 1 stock or the
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