

RECOMMENDATIONS

For the diversity of species nesting here and the numbers of females arriving on each beach, the Osa Peninsula is an important nesting area of Costa Rica. The most important things that need to be done here are to 1) initiate a new project at Rio Oro, and 2) integrate the various projects so that the methods can be standardized to allow for comparison among the beaches. Many of the people currently involved have sufficient desire to help, but lack the concrete knowledge of how to correctly identify species, how to handle eggs, and how to build well-designed hatcheries. However, past attempts from people outside of the peninsula to facilitate project improvement have been met with distrust and apathy. Thus, we feel that the most effective way to organize the various projects would be to form an official council of members from each group, with a biologist advisor from outside. This group could standardize the methods, search for ways to work together and improve the knowledge levels of all, and develop together a plan for ecotourism, which to date has been lacking, though there is great potential. This group would have more power to effect change, increasing their ability to improve the situation for the Osa sea turtles.

Acknowledgements:

We would like to thank the following people and groups for their help and information: the people of Finca Alemania for housing and support, Hugh Govan from Fundacion TUVA, ADECORO, ACLORNOSA, MINAE, the Osa Rainforest Institute, ASTO,

biologist Didiher Chacon, and all of the others that helped in one way or another.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Chacon, D. 1998. Anidacion de la Tortuga *Dermochelys coriacea* en Playa Gandoca, Costa Rica. *Rev. Biol. Trop.* 47: 225-236.
- Cheung, M. Pers. Comm. 2001.
- Drake, D. 1996. Marine turtle nesting, nest predation, hatch frequency, and nesting seasonality on the Osa Peninsula, Costa Rica. *Chelonian Conservation and Biology*, 2(1): 89-92.
- Govan, H. 1998. Community turtle conservation at Rio Oro on the Pacific coast of Costa Rica. *Marine Turtle Newsletter* 80: 10-11.
- Govan, H., E. Montenegro, G. Cascante, R. Cascante, S. Mesen, D. Vasquez, O. Sandoval. 2000. Community monitoring of Leatherback turtle nesting on the Osa Peninsula, Costa Rica, 1999-2000. Final report to the U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service.
- Govan, H. Pers. Comm. 2001.
- Lutcavage, M., P. Plotkin, B. Witherington & P. Lutz. 1997. Human Impacts on Sea Turtle Survival. In: Lutz, P. & J. Musick (eds). *The Biology of Sea Turtles*. CRC, Boca Raton, Florida. p. 387-404.

THE USE OF SUBJECTIVE PATTERNS IN GREEN TURTLE PROFILES TO FIND MATCHES IN AN IMAGE DATABASE

Peter Bennett and Ursula Keuper-Bennett

Turtle Trax, 24 Reid Drive Unit 3, Mississauga, Ontario CANADA

Each summer since 1989, we have photographed and videotaped an ohana* of turtles at Honokowai, West Maui, Hawaii. To identify individual turtles, we capture facial profiles and catalog them in a database, as we described in our presentation at the 19th Sea Turtle Symposium in South Padre[1].

Green turtle profiles feature a relatively small number of facial plates in a limited number of arrangements, yet the variety is rich enough that every animal is unique, at least within our ohana. While some profiles are similar enough to cause confusion when seen or captured at a distance or with low resolution equipment, close examination has thus far always revealed differences. Further, when turtles exhibit similar profiles on one side, the other profile has always revealed differences sufficient to identify the animal conclusively.

THE PROBLEM

Until recently, it was feasible (but tedious) to compare each potentially new profile with those already cataloged, one by one. During summer 2000, however, our database quickly grew to exceed 400 left profiles and 400 right profiles. (Because left and rights are not always matched, we have arbitrarily chosen to avoid counting a turtle twice by counting only left profiles, so these numbers represent 407 "counted" turtles and 78 "right profile orphans.")

Upon encountering a profile (called the Unknown Turtle), the task of comparing it with each one of the 400+ profiles became overwhelming. Clearly we needed a methodology to find quickly

whether a matching profile existed in the database.

Pattern recognition and matching is a well-explored field with considerable technology in place[2,3,4]. For our purposes, however, existing methods had a significant flaw: implementation would require considerable resources and time. Any adopted technology would have to be integrated into the database structure we already have, or would require re-engineering the database software.

THE SOLUTION

We realized that most existing technologies were designed to find a single solution: the best possible match. We reasoned that we did not need such a precise result. We therefore looked for a solution that would simply reduce the list of possible matches for the Unknown Turtle to a manageable size--a short list. We could then quickly examine the short list and determine whether the Unknown Turtle was already cataloged.

We based our solution on simple keyword-search techniques. We decided that if profiles in our catalog were described by keywords--plate pattern and shape descriptors--we could produce manageable short lists by searching for combinations. In practice, we found that as few as two keywords could produce useable short lists, and that three or four keywords often returned a single candidate--usually the correct match.

Of course, if the Unknown Turtle was not in our database, it would not appear on any list no matter how short. Although experience has

shown repeatedly that an Unknown Turtle that does not turn up on a short list really is not in the database, we nevertheless perform a one-by-one comparison with every cataloged profile. This eliminates the possibility that the Unknown Turtle is in the database but the profile did not include the proper keywords.

THE IMPLEMENTATION

To implement our solution we needed a list of keywords--the descriptive terms for patterns and shapes that appear in green turtle profiles. We realized that while there is value in a standardized list (everyone can grasp what is meant by 'inverted Y' or 'big triangle') the list did not have to be limited to universally understood descriptions. The reason for this is that there is no harm (minor performance issues notwithstanding) in including a subjective keyword, i.e. one understood only by one person. Anyone who does not understand the keyword can simply ignore it. This accommodates the tendency of each individual to see different patterns and shapes in a particular profile.

Alternatively, anyone can produce a short list of turtles for a keyword that is not understood. By studying the results, you can often grasp the commonality in the profiles and thereby expand your 'descriptive vocabulary'!

We developed a list of 64 keywords for our use, many of them subjective. For example, terms such as 'big triangle' vs. 'small triangle' leave room for individual interpretation. Indeed, what appears to be 'big' in one image could be interpreted differently in another image, even by the same person. Is this a fatal flaw? The answer is no. The purpose of a keyword is to make sure a profile is included in a short list. While people intuitively think of 'big' and 'small' as mutually exclusive, in this context they need not be. If there is the slightest doubt which of the two descriptions should apply, our implementation works better if both descriptions are included. Having big triangles show up in a short list that requested small triangles is only a detriment if it expands the list beyond a manageable size. In a database the size of ours, there are simply not enough triangles to turn this into a problem.

THE CONCLUSIONS

We believe that we have established that facial profiles are a reliable method of identifying green turtles. We have used this identification procedure to monitor turtles over several years, tracking the effects of fibropapillomatosis on individuals. Fortunately, the Hawaiian green turtle, at least at Honokowai, tolerates human presence enough to let us apply these methods and build our database.

As our database grew, however, a pattern matching system became essential. Taking pictures or video is just one small part of the process. The images must be of sufficient quality to resolve potential

confusion in identification. They must be cataloged with the history of the turtle, including a description of the effects of the disease. There is little value if they cannot be quickly retrieved, or if it is not possible to determine whether a 'new' profile already exists in the database.

Our keyword-based technique solves these problems. Further, it is:

- simple, requiring easily understood and available keyword search technology.
- robust, accommodating excessive description and even description that would normally be considered conflicting.
- subjective, meaning that it is not limited to someone else's idea of what keywords can be used to describe a profile.
- expandable, allowing users to add keywords meaningful to them, since such keywords do not interfere with searches by other users.
- self-documenting, since you can search for a keyword that you do not understand and learn what the keyword means from the results.

Acknowledgements:

We gratefully acknowledge George H. Balazs, Honolulu Laboratory of the US National Marine Fisheries Service, for his guidance, assistance, and encouragement.

LITERATURE CITED

- [1] Bennett, P. A., U. Keuper-Bennett, and G. H. Balazs. 2000. Photographic evidence for the regression of fibropapillomas afflicting green turtles at Honokowai, Maui, in the Hawaiian Islands. In Proceedings of the Nineteenth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation, March 2-6, 1999, South Padre Island, Texas, p. 37-39. U.S. Dep. Commer. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-443.
 - [2] Pattern Recognition, The Journal of the Pattern Recognition Society. Elsevier Science, Amsterdam.
 - [3] International Journal of Pattern Recognition and Artificial Intelligence. World Scientific Publishing Company, Singapore.
 - [4] Pattern Analysis and Applications. Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg.
- * ohana, n. Hawaiian for a group with shared experience. Suggested by George H. Balazs as the best description for the group of turtles we have been observing, as opposed to 'community' or 'population.'

THE EVOLUTION OF COMMUNITY-BASED CONSERVATION ACTION: FORMATION OF THE COMITE PARA LA PROTECCION DE LAS TORTUGAS MARINAS, BAHIA MAGDALENA, BAJA CALIFORNIA SUR, MEXICO


Kristin E. Bird¹ and Wallace J. Nichols²

¹ Oregon State University, Dept. of Anthropology, 238 Waldo Hall, Corvallis, OR 97331 USA

² Wildcoast and Dept. of Herpetology, California Academy of Sciences, c/o Wildcoast General Delivery, Davenport, CA 95017 USA

A major goal of community-based efforts in sea turtle conservation is to develop practices, which will protect sea turtle populations and

habitats that are also compatible with the socioeconomic system and cultural ecology of local resource-dependent communities. This goal



NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-528

**PROCEEDINGS
OF THE TWENTY-FIRST ANNUAL
SYMPOSIUM ON SEA TURTLE
BIOLOGY AND CONSERVATION**

24 to 28 February 2001
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA

Compiled by:

Michael S. Coyne & Randall D. Clark

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Carlos M. Gutierrez, Secretary

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION
Conrad C. Lautenbacker, Jr., Administrator

NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE
William T. Hogarth, Assistant Administrator for Fisheries

Technical Memoranda are used for documentation and timely communication of preliminary results, interim reports, or special-purpose information, and have not received complete review, editorial control or detailed editing.