A Public Dataset of Annotated Killer Whale Calls and Detections for Species Detection and Ecotype Classification Models

Authors: The author list is bookended by the organizer/writer (KJP) and the PI working (RJ). All others are alphabetical.

K.J. Palmer, Emma Cummings, Kait Frasier, Fabio Frazao, Alex Harris, April Houweling3,4, Jasper Kanes, Holger Klinck, Holly LeBlond, Amanda A. Leu, Lauren Laturnus, Craig Matkin, Olivia Murphy, Hannah Myers, Dan Olsen, Bruno Padovese, James Pilkington, Lucy Quale, Amalis Riera Vuibert, Krista Trounce, Scott Viers, Val Viers, Jenn Waldichuck3, Harald Yurk, Ruth Joy

Affiliations- Please correct leaving your name

K.J. Palmer, Simon Fraser University

Emma Cummings, SFU??

Kait Frasier, SIO

Fabio Frazao, Simon Fraser University

Alex Harris, SFU??

April Houweling3,4, JASCO, SFU

Jasper Kanes, Ocean Networks Canada

Holger Klinck, Cornell University

Holly LeBlond, DFO Whale Detection and Localization Program

Amanda A. Leu, SIO – confirm with Kait

Lauren Laturnus, SFU??

Craig Matkin, North Gulf Oceanic Society

Olivia Murphy, SFU

Hannah Myers, Marine Mammal Institute, Oregon State University and College of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences, University of Alaska Fairbanks

Dan Olsen, North Gulf Oceanic Society

Bruno Padovese, Dalhousie University

James Pilkington, DFO Cetacean Research Program

Lucy Quale, DFO Whale Detection and Localization Program

Amalis Riera Vuibert,

Krista Trounce, Vancouver Fraser Port Authority

Scott Viers, OrcaSoud

Val Viers, OrcaSound

Jenn Waldichuck3, JASCO Applied Sciences

Harald Yurk, DFO Whale Detection and Localization Program

Ruth Joy, SFU

# Abstract

Killer whales (Orcinus orca) exhibit significant ecological and genetic diversity, with three primary sympatric populations in the Northeast Pacific: Resident, Bigg’s (Transient), and Offshore. Each population is characterized by distinct foraging habits, social structures, and vocal repertoires, which complicate accurate monitoring and conservation efforts. This dataset, compiled from diverse sources, provides a comprehensive resource for the detection and classification of killer whale vocalizations. The dataset includes annotated acoustic recordings spanning nine years (2013-2023) from various geographical locations within the Northeast Pacific, collected using multiple hydrophone systems. It addresses the challenge of differentiating killer whale calls from other marine species and environmental noise and includes specific instances of confounding signals to enhance model robustness. Detailed annotations capture a broad spectrum of vocalizations and associated metadata, facilitating the development of advanced machine learning models for ecological monitoring. This curated dataset aims to improve the accuracy of killer whale detection algorithms, support conservation efforts, and advance our understanding of killer whale vocal communication across different populations.

# Background and Summary

Killer whales (Orcinus orca) are a cosmopolitan species found in every ocean. The species lineage is complex and presently delineated into multiple ecotypes that are genetically distinct (Barrett-Lennard & Ellis, n.d.; Morin et al., 2024). For consistency, we refer to these lineages as populations but readers should note that the nomenclature and taxonomy are in flux (Morin et al., 2024). In the Northeast Pacific, killer whales have diverged into genetically and culturally distinct lineages that overlap in distribution. These lineages presently include three sympatric populations that do not interbreed: Resident, Transient or henceforth Bigg’s, and Offshore killer whales (Baird & Stacey, 1988; Balcomb III & Bigg, 1986; Ford et al., 1998). Several of these populations of killer whales are in danger of extinction, and there is international interest in the protection and long term conservation of these charismatic animals and their habitat.

Each killer whale population is ecologically specialized through their seasonal distributions, social structure, and behavior which may be a consequence of differences in their preferred prey. Resident killer whales including the Southern residents and Northern residents, are obligate teleost fish consumers and are protected federally in Canada and the US. Bigg’s killer whales feed exclusively on marine mammals while Offshore killer whales specialize on sharks. Both the Transient and Offshore populations are of lower conservation status then the resident ecotypes, but still considered populations at-risk

Within the fish-eating Resident ecotype, the Southern Resident population ranges in waters off California to southeast Alaska, the Northern Resident population inhabits areas off the Northeast Pacific from Washington State to Southeast Alaska, and the Southern Alaska Residents range from waters off southeast Alaska to Kodiak Island. Among mammal-eating Transient killer whales, the West Coast Bigg's (Transient) killer whales inhabit waters off California to southeast Alaska, the Gulf of Alaska transient population ranges from waters off northern British Columbia to Kodiak Island, and the AT1 sub-population inhabits the northcentral Gulf of Alaska. Individuals from the shark-eating Offshore killer whale population have been sighted from the Aleutian Islands to California. Several of these populations, notably Southern Residents and Transients co-occur in the same regions. With different conservation statuses, being able to quickly and accurately discriminate between populations is important.

Each population faces different environmental stressors, with Southern Resident killer whales especially vulnerable to extinction due to lack of food, pollution in their environment, and acoustic masking from transiting vessels which hinder their ability to find food(Lacy et al., 2017; Williams et al., 2024). Due to these critically low numbers, there are significant and sustained efforts to improve the outcome for the SRKW population including reducing competition for salmon through fishing closures, and noise reduction efforts in both US and Canadian waters (Thornton et al. 2022). Critical Habitat designations, as determined by visual and acoustic detections of the population, inform these efforts.

Determining killer whale occupancy involves both visual and ioacoustics monitoring (Olson et al., 2018). While visual sightings are mostly collected by citizen scientists and are restricted to daylight hours with good visibility. Passive acoustic monitoring is done through an underwater hydrophone cabled to shore and collects sound data continuously, sometimes in areas inaccessible to visual observers. Passive acoustic monitoring generates large volumes of data which are typically too large to examine manually, instead requiring automated processing to produce results within reasonable timeframes. A variety of generalized detection algorithms are available that work reasonably well as binary detectors of killer whale calls (Gillespie et al., 2013; Helble et al., 2012) and neural network based killer whale detectors have been published (Bergler et al., 2019; Kirsebom et al., 2022). While progress has been made on automating detection of killer whales using acoustic data, there is a need to develop classifiers that are capable of distinguishing between different ecotypes and populations of killer whales.

Killer whale vocalizations can be broadly grouped into three broad categories, echolocation clicks, whistles, and pulsed calls (Ford, 1987; Janik, 2009). Echolocation clicks are impulsive sounds with the majority of the energy between 20 and 100 kHz, and used in feeding and navigation (Au et al., 2004; Barrett-lennard et al., 1996). Whistles are tonal calls typically used for social communication among individuals within a pod. These whistles are narrow band signals that function in close-range communication, generally spanning from 0.5 to 25 kHz, and may be involved in coordinating movements and maintaining group cohesion (Riesch et al., 2008; Souhaut & Shields, 2021; Thomsen et al., 2001). Pulsed calls are the most common signal type used for communication by killer whales, and are composed of a series of pulses produced in such rapid succession as to sound tonal (Watkins, 1968). Pulsed calls form distinct, complex vocalizations from 0.5 to 25 kHz characterized by a series of tonal sounds that vary in frequency and amplitude (Ford 1987). Pulsed calls are primarily used for social communication within and between pods, serving functions in group coordination, individual identification, and conveying social and behavioral cues. Each killer whale population has a distinct vocal dialect or repertoire of stereotyped pulsed calls that are unique to their population. Resident killer whales produce calls in higher frequency ranges with significantly higher minimum, peak, and median call frequencies (Filatova et al., 2015; Foote & Nystuen, 2008). Fundamental frequencies of transient calls are typically lower in peak frequency and fall within a smaller range than resident calls(Filatova et al., 2015; Foote & Nystuen, 2008). The offshore ecotype produces calls with a higher minimum frequency than other ecotypes(Madrigal et al., 2021). Differences between these broad sound classes contribute to the distinct vocal repertoires associated with different whale social groups and form the motivation for harnessing the power of modern classification methodologies to make the most of acoustic surveys both in archived or near real-time settings.

Accurate machine learning models rely on extensive and well curated labeled datasets in order to reliably detect killer whales in underwater ambient sound data (Gudivada et al., 2017; Priestley et al., 2023). In acoustic ecology, the data used to train machine learning algorithms should represent the full range of the animals' vocalizations, and those vocalisations should remain relatively static over time (Shiu et al., 2020). Many machine learning applications in conservation are targeted at longitudinal, or backwards looking datasets to assess changes in occupancy of species on the scale of years or decades (Brookes et al., 2013; Kotila et al., 2023; Myers et al., 2021; Parijs et al., 2009; Pilkington et al., 2023). In species capable of cultural adaptation of their repertoires including humpback and killer whales, data for machine learning algorithms must represent signals that were previously heard in the environment (e.g. antiquated song, and killer whale calls from now diseased animals). Furthermore, environmental factors including but not limited to background noise, instrument parameters, sound propagation conditions can all influence how robust a detection and classification algorithm is.

The goal of this curated dataset is to facilitate the construction and evaluation of detectors that are capable of 1) discriminating killer whale calls from other acoustically similar species and 2) discriminate within species , for example, between killer whale ecotypes, and populations. There are a few challenges in doing so. First, data contributed to this effort were amassed from several independent projects each with different goals, using different data collection methods, and annotated to different levels. For example, audio files were all processed with energy detectors and analysts validated each detection. Other efforts focused on annotating all signals of interest in a small subset of data. Second it is not always possible to discriminate between killer whale and other species in the frequency range, notably Pacific white-sided dolphins and humpback whales, even for expert analysts. Within killer whale vocalisations, it is possible to discriminate between ecotypes, populations, and sometimes, pods or maternally related family groups. However, the annotation resolution in the curated dataset varies. Often, it is possible to discriminate ecotypes if numerous calls are detected within an encounter. However, in some cases no ecotype specific information is present within the acoustic encounter. Thus, the annotation scheme should retain classification uncertainty where present. Nevertheless, the dataset's diverse sources and comprehensive annotations provide a robust starting point for improving detection systems and advancing our understanding of killer whale vocalizations.

# Methods

In this study, we targeted an "ecologically representative" dataset signifying its comprehensive coverage of annotated audio signals spanning the entire vocal repertoire of the three populations of killer whales in the region: Resident, Bigg’s, and Offshore killer whales. The dataset encompasses recordings sourced from a variety of geographical locations and varying recording conditions. A critical requirement for the dataset is its capability to facilitate the discrimination of target species vocalizations from those produced by other organisms within the survey area, particularly humpback whales, and other odontocetes such as Pacific white-sided dolphins easily confused with the acoustic signals of killer whales. Effort was also made to include anthropogenic noises such as ship propeller cavitation and other abiotic sounds that can sometimes confuse both humans and machine models. Therefore, the dataset includes specific instances of a variety of confounding signals to potentially enhance the robustness of any detection and classification algorithm developed with these data.

Building such a dataset is challenging and often cost prohibitive for a single organization. Thus, in this effort we have combined smaller annotated datasets from multiple commercial, non-profit, academic, and governmental organizations to build an ecologically representative annotation dataset. Much of the annotation effort was provided through the Humans and Algorithms Listening for Orcas (HALLO) project which used a standardized annotation procedure included in supplemental information A. The following sections provide detailed information on the 1) Deployment 2) Processing and 3) Annotation procedure for each of the projects. Metadata, where available, is outlined in Table 2. While every effort has been made to regularize metadata across the entirety of the dataset, this was not always possible. Rather than exclude data not meeting an arbitrary threshold, we provide as much detail as possible and leave final decisions on datasets to include or exclude in model building to the readers discretion.

## Data Records

The challenge dataset contains audio and annotations provided by a collaboration of industry partners, not-for-profits, universities, and governmental organizations (Table 2). These include Orcasound, Ocean Networks Canada (ONC), the Canadian Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO), and JASCO Applied Sciences (JASCO, Saturna Island Marine Research & Education Society (SIMRES), and the University of Alaska Fairbanks and North Gulf Oceanic Society (Figure 1). Data were collected using a variety of instruments deployed in the Northeast Pacific from Washington State to Southeast Alaska including AAMRs ([https://www.jasco.com](https://www.jasco.com/amar-g4)), Ocean Sonics icListen hydrophones (https://oceansonics.com/products/iclisten-sj9/), and Ocean Instruments SoundTrap recording hydrophones (<https://www.oceaninstruments.co.nz/>), and in depths ranging from 8 to 253 m. Data coverage varied, as time and funding allowed but covered a 9-year period between May 2013 and April 2023. Deployment, processing, and annotation details for each dataset are provided in the following sections.

To address consistency issues across multiple annotation schemes and annotators we take a two-step approach. First, we provide the raw annotations with explanations from each organization regarding how the data were processed. The original annotations often contain considerable information that is beyond the scope of the challenge including a variety of different labels for biologic and anthropogenic sounds and finer resolution on killer whale calls (e.g. matriline or call type). These annotation details may be of interest to those knowledgeable in the field of killer whale acoustics. We also provide a collated dataset across all providers and deployment locations to get detection and classification algorithms running quickly. The collated annotation table (Annotations.csv) includes standardized annotations from across all datasets with labels described in Technical Validation section (Table 1). Finally, we include the code used to homogenize the datasets that produces the Annoations.csv file.

### Orcasound

Orcasound is a cooperative hydrophone network and an open-source software & hardware project. Orcasound audio and annotations were compiled from multiple recording efforts spanning from 2017 to 2020. This public dataset includes nine labeling efforts with the 'Pod.Cast' annotation tool, an open-source web app developed by Microsoft Hackathon volunteers to efficiently analyze audio data to detect the presence of killer whale calls (https://ai4orcas.net/portfolio/pod-cast-annotation-system/). Origional audio recordings and annotations are accessible via Orcasound's open labeled data bucket. The dataset is organized into annotation rounds that used audio data from various Orcasound locations with a range of SRKW call signal to noise ratios and background noise characteristics. Full details of Orcasound data are available on the gitub account for these projects (*Orcasound*, n.d.)

**Deployment**

The Orcasound data were gathered from three sites in Washington State, USA: the Orcasound Lab on San Juan Island (Haro Strait), Bush Point on Whidbey Island, and Port Townsend (the latter two within Admiralty Inlet). At each location, low-cost hydrophones were deployed: LabCore-40 or CRT26-08 elements were utilized in Admiralty Inlet, whereas Orcasound Lab tested a wide variety of elements, including HTI 99-MIN, Aquarian AS-1, and ITC1032 models. These hydrophones were deployed in shallow waters (less than 10 meters at low tide) using bespoke, affordable live-streaming equipment (Raspberry Pi with the Pisound ADC HAT [24 bit, stereo, max 192 kHz]) and the orcanode open source code that generates compressed, lossy audio segments in HLS format and uploads it to an open S3 bucket sponsored by Amazon. Hydrophones and recording systems for these projects have not been calibrated.

**Processing**

Audio data were collected in a variety of formats and at multiple sample rates. The majority of the audio data were sampled at 48khz but a strong lowpass filter with a steep rolloff at 16.5khz was applied rendering frequencies above this filter unusable. All audio files were pre-processed with an anti-aliasing filtration diminishing sound intensities at frequencies above 12kHz. Potential southern resident killer whale calls were initially detected by citizen scientists who have access to live-streamed audio recordings. Citizen scientists indicate periods of likely killer whale activity, and those audio files are reviewed by expert analysists and annotated. These files were archived and noted as ‘candidates’ for further analysis (*OrcaHello*, n.d.).

**Annotation**

A subset of Orcasound's open labeled data includes archives that were prepared via the Pod.Cast system. Audio and annotations consist of 9 of the 10 ‘rounds’ of pod.cast datasets, each being part of a Google Summer of Code competition. For each 'Round' of data, candidate audio data for SRKW pre-labeled by running an existing classifier with a threshold tuned for high-recall, and validated by crowd-sourcing the predictions.

This project's annotations specifically aimed at identifying Southern Resident Killer Whales (SRKW), categorizing detections into two classes: SRKW and False Positive. The annotation granularity varied between these classes; for confirmed SRKW calls, the start and end times were documented. For non-detections (i.e., 'false positives'), the files were marked as 'FP,' without specifying time or frequency boundaries. Citizen scientist-flagged files underwent expert review to confirm the presence of SRKW calls, noting the call's start and end times. Frequency bounds were not recorded, hence listed as 'NAN' in the frequency columns of the annotation files. Files lacking identifiable SRKW calls were tagged as 'noise,' and all noise labels were reclassified as 'Abiotic' in the Species Class column.

### Ocean Networks Canada

Ocean Networks Canada (ONC) operates cabled underwater observatories in Canadian waters collecting continuous oceanographic data for the benefit of science, society, and industry. Many of their nodes are equipped with calibrated hydrophones (Biffard et al., 2022) to record long term data on changing ocean soundscapes and support research on noise and soniferous animals. Calibration information and other metadata are available on the Ocean Data Portal (*Ocean Networks Canada - Oceans 3.0*, n.d.).

**Deployment**

Acoustic data were collected using an Ocean Sonics SC2 (<https://oceansonics.com/>) recording system deployed on the Barkley Canyon Upper Slope platform of ONC’s Northeast Pacific Time-series Underwater Networked Experiments observatory. The hydrophone was mounted 1 m above the sea floor and sampled continuously at 64 kHz. data that did not contain classified signals were archived after review by regional navies.

**Processing**

The hydrophone sampled at 64kHz but uses a 25.6kHz anti-aliasing filter during data collection and digitization, yielding a 32kHz bandwidth with reduced apparent sound intensities above 25.6kHz. Data were evaluated for the presence of killer whales and other species in three separate efforts with varying protocols for each. All manual annotation was completed initially using JASCO’s PAMLab software. Annotations were produced using a logarithmic spectrogram display with different spectral settings in 4 different bands, enabling multi-species identification across the full bandwidth in a single pass. All visible signals were considered for annotation, and no signal-to-noise ratio threshold was used. Annotations initially made in PAMLab were reviewed for accuracy, signal diversity, and completeness using Raven Pro v 1.6. No automatic detection algorithms were applied during any part of the analysis.

**Annotation**

Two groups independently annotated these data for different purposes using different approaches. The original annotation effort focused on categorizing marine mammal presence as well as producing diverse call-level annotations for classifier development. Here, every second file for each of the first four days of the month in 2014 was reviewed for the presence of marine mammal signals. If a marine mammal call or signal was found, the signal was annotated on one of three levels. If the file contained a killer whale signal, all pulsed signals within the file were annotated if present. Some whistles were annotated but echolocation clicks were not annotated. Due to their infrequent use of the area, files previously identified as containing killer whales in 2013 during opportunistic data checks were also annotated and included in the data set. For all other species, only one signal (e.g. fin whale classic call) was annotated per file with exceptions made to include an extra call to capture diverse signals. Thus, some of the audio files containing biological sounds contain more biological signals than were annotated.

A latter effort sought to incorporate inter-observer variability into the analysis and thus hired two outside experts to re-annotate a section of data between May 20 and June 23, 2023. Thus, two outside experts from JASCO analyzed a subset of the annotations from A Raven Pro. In the secondary analysis all SRKW and Bigg’s communication signals such as pulsed calls, whistles, buzzes, and rasps were annotated with bounding boxes demarcating the start and end time of the signal as well as the low and high frequencies. When possible, pulsed calls were further classified into specific call types, following the call types demarcated by Ford (1987). Although not all echolocation clicks were recorded, a singular instance or burst of clicks was marked in each audio file to indicate the presence of echolocation in the file. Each signal was assigned a confidence rating of either ‘low’, ‘medium’, or ‘high’ to specify the level of certainty provided by the annotator. If the call could not be identified, it was left as ‘unknown’. The two annotation streams have been combined for the final dataset. The two annotation sets have not been thoroughly cross referenced in order to allow for inter-observer analysis.

For the purposes of the detection and classification dataset, all annotations indicating the possible presence of killer whales were categorized as ‘KW’ regardless of certainty. Annotations that indicated uncertainty to the species by indicating either possible alternative species or were demarcated with medium or low certainty were defined in the KW\_certain category. Because click annotation varied between groups, click annotations in the ONC data were classified as ‘undetermined biological’ sounds. Killer whale annotations that were paired with other potential species, e.g. “killer whale/white sided dolphin” were similarly classed as undetermined biological sounds. All killer whale annotations containing a “?” were tagged as uncertain as

There were over a hundred different tags for specie data in these annotations including all variation of possible confounding species (e.g. killer whale, humpback, or Pacific-white sided dolphin, or unidentified biological sounds). For this dataset any label that contained killer whale possibility was tagged as KW and if other species were listed as alternative possibilities the KW certainty column was set to 0. Calls that were identified as possible humpback whale calls were added to the humpback category The ClassSpecies label for killer whale clicks and buzzes was set to ‘UndBio’ as this was the only dataset that labeled impulsive calls. Should users wish to include clicks in classifiers, they should refer to the original annotations

### Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada

Two groups within DFO provided datasets to the challenge, the Cetacean Research Program and Whale Detection and Localization Program. Data processing methods were consistent across projects within each lab but varied slightly between labs. Exact hydrophone locations are not publicly available for any DFO hydrophone dataset. Instead, general location descriptors are provided.

*Cetacean Research Program*

Data from the Cetacean Research Program (CRP) lab consisted of two deployments, one on the continental shelf edge off the west coast of Vancouver Island and another from an instrument deployed on the northern mainland coast of British Columbia. Data were based on approximately 375 days of recording off Vancouver Island and 116 days of recording in northern BC. With the former targeting the winter months. The focus of the original analysis effort that resulted in these datasets was simply to identify which of the recording files contained killer whales calls for use in various habitat studies. The analysis was conducted by using an automated detector and manually identifying all of the resulting detections. Such a manually annotated dataset may be useful to detector/classifier development efforts.

**Deployment**

Data were collected using AURAL-M2 and SM2M off of Vancouver Island and Northern BC, respectively. As with all DFO data exact locations are not publicly available. Deployment depth off of Vancouver Island was approximately 114m and 35m at the Northern BC deployment site. The AURAL-M2 sampled audio at 16.384 kHz and the SM2M sampled at 16khz.

**Processing**

The raw audio recordings (WAV) were post-processed using the Whistle and Moan Detector in PAMGuard version 1.12.08 (Gillespie et al., 2013) with an FFT length of 512 and hop size of 50% (256). The detector was user- configured with a high-pass filter of 800Hz to limit the number of humpback whale detections and lessen the manual validation burden. The SNR detection threshold was set to 6dB. All detections in the first two seconds of each file were excluded because the detection algorithm produces several false detections within this period.

PAMGuard detections were subsequently processed into calls using a simple grouping algorithm. The algorithm first searched for temporally overlapping detections. Detection start, end, low and high frequencies were combined if the labels were consistent across overlapping detections. This was done with finer resolution labels (e.g. call type, clan, subclan, or pod) than are presented in the final dataset.

**Annotation**

All detections including whistles and pulsed calls were aurally and visually reviewed using PAMGuard and identified to species (for biotic) and sound type (for abiotic). Where applicable and as time allowed, detections were also acoustically identified to ecotype. Note that files may contain more identifiable calls than the annotations indicate due to false negatives that are inherent when using automated detectors. These manual reviews were conducted by trained and experienced analysts using the HALLO protocol (HALLO Annotation Guidelines).

Note that individual detections may be separate components of the same discrete call (i.e. harmonics or sidebands), thus, not every detection represents a unique vocalization. The PAMGuard Whistle and Moan detector detects individual contours, so all individual harmonics within a call would constitute separate detections if they meet the detector’s criteria (this happens quite frequently). Also, the settings of the detector mean that independent tones (like from multiple individuals) that cross or overlap in frequency and time may be detected as a single detection. Of the 158k annotations provided, the start time of 348 annotations coincided (e.g. overlapped) with the time start time and duration of other annotations.

*Whale Detection and Localization Program*

Whale Detection and Localization Program (WDL) provided data from four deployment locations in Canadian waters including, Carmanah Point, Swanson Channel, and two locations in the Northern and Southern ends of the Strait of Georgia. The annotated dataset spanned 298 days from September 2021 through June 2022.

**Deployment**

Four locations were chosen for the study area. Carmanah Point, Swanson Channel and the Northern and Southern Ends of the Strait of Georgia. Exact locations are not disclosed. A SoundTrap (www.oceaninstruments.co.nz) was used for the Carmanah point location and AMARS (https://www.jasco.com) were used for all other deployments. All deployments were between about 3- 5 months long. Audio data were continuously sampled at either 192 kHz for the SoundTrap or 256 kHz for the AMARs.

**Processing**

Audio recordings were processed with the PAMGuard (Gillespie et al. 2013) Whistle and Moan Detector (v. 2.02.03) for the presence of potential killer whale calls. Audio files were downsampled within PAMGuard to 48 kHz, and a weak IIR Butterworth high-pass filter with a threshold of 2 kHz and an order of 1 was applied to reduce background noise in the lower frequency bands. Nominal sensitivities of -164.1 dB and -176.2 were used for AMARs and the SoundTraps, respectively. The Whistle and Moan Detector used a minimum frequency threshold of 200 Hz, a maximum frequency threshold of 24000 Hz (the Nyquist rate), and a minimum contour length of 15 time slices (about 341 milliseconds); otherwise, all other detection settings were kept at their defaults. In the detector's noise and thresholding tab, all boxes except "Run Gaussian Kernel Smoothing" were checked and any input values were kept at their defaults as well. The FFT engine used with the detector used an FFT length of 2048, a hop size of 1024, and a Hann window function, with the same noise parameters as those in the detector.

**Annotation**

All PAMGuard detections were evaluated for the presence of killer whales by expert analysts and annotated as such. Annotations included whistles and pulsed calls but echolocation clicks were not included as they were rarely discovered by the whistle and moan detector. As with the Pilkington dataset that was similarly processed by PAMGuard, multiple annotations could represent a single call. In this case, 27% of the detections overlapped in time and could represent call partitions.

### JASCO and Vancouver Frasier Port Authority

The Vancouver Frasier Port Authority (VFPA) in collaboration with JASCO Applied Sciences, collected data from two locations in Haro Strait and Boundary Pass. These data were part of the Enhancing Cetacean Habitat Observation program which aims to improve killer whale acoustic habitat through voluntary vessel speed reductions (Joy et al., 2019).

**Deployment**

AMAR recorders were deployed directly adjacent to the southbound and northbound shipping lanes in Haro Strait (Table 2, Figure 1). Instruments at both locations were deployed and recovered twice. The first deployment extended between July 6th and September 8th 2017. Instruments were deployed and refurbished AMAR’s were re-deployed at the same locations on September 8th and recovered October 26th of the same year. Data from the boundary pass location were collected over the period between September 2018 and April 2019. Deployment depths ranged between 193m to 251m across the three regions.

**Processing**

For all deployments, data were sampled at 256 kHz and killer whale encounters were identified with a proprietary detection algorithm developed by JASCO Applied Science.

**Annotation**

Encounters were manually annotated by expert analysts for the presence of killer whale calls following the HALLO protocol. Expert annotators used Raven Pro to identify killer whale calls and, where possible, classify calls to call type. Annotators also noted the presence of a variety of non-target calls and abiotic sounds including unknown signals, background noise, fish, and potential Pacific-white-sided dolphins.

### JASCO, Vancouver Frasier Port Authority, Ocean Networks Canada

**Strait of Georgia**

The Strait of Georgia underwater listening station (ULS) is a collaborative project between the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority, Transport Canada, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Ocean Networks Canada and JASCO Applied Sciences. Data from this hydrophone have been used in evaluating changes in noise levels associated with voluntary vessel slowdowns (Joy et al., 2019).This listening station has been in place since September 2015 and is now in its third year of operation. A small section of the data were manually validated for the presence of killer whales, humpback whales and other signals of interest.

**Deployment**

The ULS is situated on the seabed at approximately 170 m depth approximately 30km west of Vancouver, Canada. The location aims to monitor noise in association with the northbound shipping lane. Synchronized data from four hydrophones are streamed to shore in near real-time via the Victoria Experimental Network Under the Sea (VENUS) Observatory operated by Ocean Networks Canada.

**Processing**

For all deployments, data were sampled at 256 kHz and killer whale encounters were identified with a proprietary detection algorithm developed by JASCO Applied Science.

**Annotation**

Encounters were manually annotated by expert analysts for the presence of killer whale calls following the HALLO protocol. Annotators used Raven Pro to identify killer whale calls and, where possible, classify calls to call type. Annotators also noted the presence of a variety of non-target calls and abiotic sounds including unknown signals, background noise, fish, sonar, and potential Pacific-white-sided dolphins.

### SIMRES

The Saturna Island Marine Research and Education Society (SIMRES) maintains several hydrophones along the BC coast as part of the Whale Sound Network. This network collaborates to enable scientific quantification of how the ocean soundscape is changing. Since 2015, hydrophones have been placed in Boundary Pass at two different locations, East Point and Monarch Head (SIMRES, 2020). The annotated data provided were from the East Point Hydrophone located off the southeasternmost point of Saturna Island. From June through October 2022, Southern Resident killer whales (SRKW) were both acoustically detected and visually sighted 13 times by nearby citizen scientists from the Southern Gulf Islands Whale Sighting Network (SGIWSN) and student researchers from Simon Fraser University.

The goal of this annotation effort was to determine how vessel noise impacts SRKW acoustic behavior in Boundary Pass. The annotated dataset includes 13 hours and 40 minutes of SRKW acoustic activity and call types were identified from all three SRKW pods, J, K, and L. The duration of acoustic events varied and ranged from 5 minutes to 190 minutes.

**Deployment**

An Ocean Sonic’s icListen high-frequency (HF) smart hydrophone (RB9-ETH) with ethernet (<https://oceansonics.com/products/iclisten-sj9/>) was used to collect audio recordings. The shore-cabled hydrophone is located at a depth of 18 m, approximately 120 m from shore, near the commercial shipping channel in Boundary Pass (48.780° N, 123.052° W). Data are continuously sampled at 128 kHz but down sampled to 64 kHz files are provided.

**Processing**

Audio data were not pre-processed with any detection algorithms for this for this study.

**Annotation**

Audio files were manually annotated in Raven Pro v 1.6. All SRKW communication signals including pulsed calls, whistles, buzzes, and rasps were annotated with bounding boxes demarcating the start and end time of the signal as well as the low and high frequencies. When possible, pulsed calls were further classified into the specific call types outlined by Ford (1987). A singular instance or burst of clicks was marked in each audio file to indicate the presence of echolocation but echolocation clicks were not otherwise annotated. The original selection tables also contain annotators comments which may be useful in selecting data to build finer level detection and classification algorithms than outlined here.

Annotated signals were assigned a confidence rating of either ‘low’, ‘medium’, or ‘high’ to specify the level of certainty provided by the annotator. If the call could not be identified, it was left as ‘unknown’. A small number of potential humpback whale calls were also annotated with uncertainty, these have been included in the ‘humpback’ SpeciesClass.

All killer whale annotations were included in the combined annotation dataset regardless of quality. Annotiation indicating a low or medium quality were noted as ‘Uncertain” or 0 in the KW\_certain colum.

### Scripps Institute of Oceanography

Data from two locations spanning 2008-2013 years were provided by the Scripts Institute of Oceanography. Data were part of a long-term monitoring project off the Washington Coast and consist of encounters included in previously published work (Leu et al., 2022; Rice et al., 2017).

**Deployment**

High-frequency acoustic recording packages (HARP; Wiggens et al.(2007)) packages were deployed in a nearshore (Cape Elizabth) and offshore (Quinault Canyon) location. HARPs sampled continuously at 200 kHz. Data from this project represents the most southern locations studied as well as the deepest deployment (1400 m).

**Processing**

Audio data were not pre-processed with any detection algorithms for this for this study.

**Annotation**

Original pulsed annotations ad described in Rice et al. (2017) were not available. As such, data were re-analyzed for the presence of killer whale calls using Raven Pro v1.6. Only calls that could be confidently identified as killer whales were included in the final annotations. Humpback whale calls were added opportunistically and examples of self-noise, tagged as abiotic signals, were included as these signals show structural similarities to biological signals and should be trained against. Killer whale ecotype classes were defined off of the original encounter labels (Leu et al., 2022, 2022). Though present in the encounters, echolocation clicks were not labeled during the annotation effort.

### SMRU Consulting

SMRU Consulting in collaboration with the Whale Museum have maintained a cabled hydrophone within SRKW core habitat for nearly two decades. These data have also been involved in evaluating then potential benefits of voluntary ship slowdowns (Joy et al., 2019). Data are routinely evaluated for the presence of killer whales and humpback whales. The hydrophone location is also within visual range of the Lime Kiln lighthouse which houses volunteers trained for whale and dolphin identification. Audio files associated with visually confirmed acoustic encounters over several periods from 2016-2021 were provided for the challenge dataset.

**Deployment**

The recording setup consists of a cabled Reson TC4032 hydrophone ~70m from shore mounted to the seafloor at 23m depth. Data were digitized at 250 kHz sample rate, 16 bit depth using a SMRU Consulting data acquisition board and PAMGuard software, stored as wav files and uploaded to a cloud-based systems.

**Processing**

Audio data from the Lime Kiln hydrophone were processed for the presence of biological sounds with the PAMGuard whistle and moan detector (Gillespie et al., 2009) which generated binary detection files.

**Annotation**

PAMGuard binary detection files were inspected in the PAMGuard ViewerMode to view the detections and spectrogram as well as listen to the sound. A detection event was annotated as the time period from the first to last call with no more than 30 minutes between calls.

Annotation procedures followed the HALLO protocol.

### University of Alaska Fairbanks

Data contributed by the University of Alaska Fairbanks and North Gulf Oceanic Society are part of a long-term killer whale monitoring project in the Gulf of Alaska. This includes recordings of the southern Alaska resident, Gulf of Alaska transient, AT1 transient, and offshore killer whale populations.

**Deployment**

Recordings of southern Alaska residents were taken with a dipping hydrophone during vessel survey encounters in Prince William Sound and Kenai Fjords (Figure 1) between May and October in 2019, 2020, and 2021. When killer whales were encountered, we photographically identified as many individuals present as possible. We then maneuvered the vessel approximately 500 m in front of the animals, shut off the engine, and collected a field recording. Recordings before June 16th, 2021 were made with a High-Tech, Inc. HTI-96-Min hydrophone deployed at approximately 8 – 10 m depth with a TASCAM DR100 portable digital recorder (sampling rate 24 kHz). Recordings after June 16th, 2021 were made with a Ocean Instruments SoundTrap ST300 hydrophone (sampling rate 24 kHz) deployed at 20 -30 m depth (Table 2).

We rarely encountered transient or offshore killer whales during vessel surveys, and transient killer whales also vocalize less often than residents (Deecke et al., 2005; Saulitis et al., 2005a) making field recordings difficult to obtain. We therefore contributed recordings from moored hydrophones in which we detected Gulf of Alaska transient, AT1 transient, or offshore killer whales. Moored hydrophones were deployed in Hinchinbrook Entrance, Montague Strait, Resurrection Bay, and Kachemak Bay (Sup. Fig XXX,Table 2) beginning in 2016, though for this analysis we included transient recordings from June 2019 to May 2021 and offshore recordings from May 2022 and April 2023. Hydrophones were deployed at depths of 25 – 42 m on primarily gravel and sand substrate and were moored approximately 2 m above the seafloor. Moored hydrophones recorded at a 24 kHz sampling rate and were duty cycled (primarily 5 min on, 10 min off) based on battery requirements. All moored hydrophones were Ocean Instruments SoundTrap ST300s, except for the hydrophone in Montague Strait in 2023 which was a model ST600.

**Processing**

All acoustic data from moored hydrophones were processed using the Whistle and Moan Detector in the open-source software package PAMGuard v.1.15.17 (Gillespie et al., 2009). Spectrograms were created with a 1024 Hz Fast Fourier transform length and 50% overlap. The Whistle and Moan detector identified tonal signals in the 700 – 12,000 Hz frequency range with a minimum length of 15 time slices, minimum size of 30 pixels, and that met an 8 dB signal-to-noise ratio threshold. Recordings with at least three detections were manually checked visually and aurally by H. Myers and classified to the population level. Gulf of Alaska transients and AT1 transients were identified using published call catalogues (Myers et al., 2021; Saulitis et al., 2005b). Offshore killer whale detections were confirmed by J. Pilkington. A small minority of recordings included multiple killer whale populations or killer whale and humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) vocalizations; these recordings were not included in the dataset.

**Annotation**

In recordings with killer whales, discrete pulsed calls were manually annotated by H. Myers in Raven Pro v.1.6.5. A bounding box was drawn around each call, and the call start time, end time, low frequency, high frequency, and length were saved in selection tables.

## Technical Validation

All potential killer whale annotations were created by expert analysts at their respective institutes based on a canonical catalogue of killer whale calls (Ford 1987). As with all biological signals, the sound quality of the killer whale vocalisations varied considerably based on the background noise, distance between the animal and the hydrophone, and propagation considerations.

Low SNR detections, as indicated by the reviewing analyst, were not included in the dataset or tagged as uncertain. Calls associated with SIMRES were linked with concurrent sightings of SRKW animals.

Collated annotations covered an approximately 11-year span from May 2011 through April 2023 and were recorded on a variety of instruments including JASCO AMARs, Soundtraps, IC listening devices, and custom-built hydrophones (Table 2).

An annotation file is provided as a CSV that includes links to audio files (Table 1

## Usage Notes

The intended purpose of this currated dataset is to build classifiers for detecting killer whales and classifying signals to population or ecotype in the Northeastern Pacific. In building detection and classification algorithms users should consider both their intended applications and potential limitations. For instance, users will immediately note that sample rates differ between each of the contributed datasets and analysis of the annotations will show that down sampling the higher frequency data will limit exclude some of the higher frequency annotations. Conversely, excluding the lower frequency annotations will result in a much-reduced dataset. The biological implications of the sample rate are also worth noting. Much of the effort in classifying killer whale ecotypes and populations has utilized lower frequency sound <12 kHz (Ford et al. 2022). However, as seen in this dataset, killer whale vocalizations may have fundamental frequencies at or above 20khz. Whether or not the features present at higher frequencies represent useful information for population or ecotype discrimination is yet to be determined.

The audio files presented here are done so in their raw state. They have not been normalized to account for different gain and calibration settings between the various instruments and individual project goals. Researchers wishing to measure received levels should reach out individual data providers directly to determine appropriate calibration offsets. It is also important to note that the sample rate is not always indicative of the useful frequencies. Some groups have applied low-pass filters with cutoff frequencies considerably below Nyquist.

Echolocation clicks in the sound files have not been annotated consistently and are thus not included in the final dataset. However, the presence of echolocation clicks has been noted in some files from JASCO and ONC. See original files for those annotations. As echolocation clicks can be diagnostic of species and potentially ecotype (Leu et al., 2022), further annotation of this dataset could feed into training or validation based on echolocation parameters.

Data for this project represent a large collaboration of groups and institutions and each dataset was processed in accordance with each groups project goals. Post processing of the annotations was done to provide a uniform system for machine learning algorithms. However, users should consider details from each deployment carefully to determine whether they wish to do any additional post-processing. For example, multiple annotations from the DFO datasets may represent different harmonics of the same call. Alternatively, data derived from ONC projects considered only pulsed calls. Thus, unannotated whistles and echolocation clicks may be present in some files. See individual datasets above for details.

## Code Availability

Data and annotations were collated using R and available here. https://github.com/JPalmerK/DCLDE2026

# Acknowledgements

# Author Contributions

~~Kaitlin J Palmer~~, Emma Cummings, Kait Frasier, Fabio Frazao, ~~Alex Harris, April Houweling3~~,4, Jasper Kanes, Holger Klinck, Holly LeBlond, Amanda A. Leu, Lauren Laturnus, Craig Matkin, Olivia Murphy, Hannah Myers, Dan Olsen, Bruno Padovese, ~~James Pilkington~~, Lucy Quale, Amalis Riera Vuibert, Krista Trounce, Scott Viers, Val Viers, Jenn Waldichuck3, Harald Yurk, Ruth Joy

KJ Palmer collated the final dataset, managed data sharing agreements, produced the collated annotation files, and annotated the SCRIPPS dataset. She also drafted, edited and reviewed the manuscript a

F. Frazao devised the HALLO annotation procedure and participated in data curation throughout the process. He also participated in editing the manuscript.

J Wladichuckwas the lead expert analyst on the HALLO datasets, managed JASCO datasets, participated in managing data sharing agreements, facilitated data transfers, and participated in writing and editing the manuscript.

A. Houweling was a member of the expert annotation team, participated in writing and editing the manuscript, and facilitated data transfers, and participated in editing the manuscript.

J. Pilkington provided data and annotations from the Department of Fisheries and Oceans Cetacean Research Program, participated in writing and editing the manuscript.

H. Yurk provided data and annotations from the Department of Fisheries and Oceans Whale and Dolphin Listening Program, participated in writing and editing the manuscript.

H. Klinck provided manuscript and data storage funding, was involved in the project conception and participated in writing and editing of the manuscript.

A. Harris served as expert annotator

R. Joy


Etc

Etc.

# Competing Interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

# Figures



# Figure Legends

Figure 1 Map of study area and hydrophone locations. Points represent data collection sites and transparent bubbles indicate approximate regions for DFO data collection sites (exact coordinates are not provided).

# Tables

Table 1 Annotation file descriptors

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| CSV Headings | Contents | Structure |
| **SoundFile** | Name of the audio file from which the annotation was derived | Character string |
| **FilePath** | Full file path to the to the audio file above | Character string |
| **FileBeginSec** | Seconds into the audio file representing the start of the bounding box or detection | Double |
| **FileEndSec** | Seconds into the audio file representing the end of the call annotation | Double |
| **LowFreqHz** | Lower limit of the bounding box or detection, in Hz | Double |
| **HighFreqHz** | Upper limit of the bounding box or detection, in Hz | Double |
| **UTC** | UTC time at the beginning of each annotation (**FileBeginSec**) | Character string ISO formatted date/time |
| **ClassSpecies** | Species or class description with the following options: Killer Whale (**KW**), Humpback Whale (**HW**), Abiotic (**AB**), and Undetermined Biological sound (**UndBio**). | Character string |
| **AnnotationLevel** | Caracter string representing whether the annotation represented a validated **detection, call,** or **file** | Character string |
| **KW** | Indicator of whether or not the annotation denotated that the annotation represented a killer whale call | Bool (0,1) |
| **KW\_certain** | Indicator of whether or not the annotator was certain that the annotation was a KW. This is often represented by a question mark in the annotations. For ONC data, annotators listed all potential species that the thought the call could come from. | Bool (NA,0,1) |
| **Ecotype** | Killer whale ecotype or population represented by the KW annotation, if known. **SRKW**- Southern Resident Killer Whale, **BKW**- Bigg’s killer whale, **NRKW**- Northern Resident Killer Whale, or **OKW**- Offshore Killer Whale or blank when no ecotype could be determined | Character string or NA |
| **Data Provider** | Group providing the data | Character string |
| **Dep** | Shorthand for the deployment location | Character string |

Table 2 Deployment summary for the data included in the detection and classification dataset. Annotation start and finish dates represent first and last annotation included in the dataset. Deployment is the name of the deployment location used in the annotations table.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Dataset Provider** | **Location Description** | **Deployment** | **Latitude** | **Longitude** | **Depth (m)** | **Sample Rate (kHz)** | **Hydrophone/Recorder** | **Annotations Start** | **Annotations Finish** |
| Orca Sound | Orcasound Lab | podcast\_round2 | 48.525 | -123.159 | 8 | 32 |  | 2020-09-27 | 2019-07-05 |
|  | Orcasound Lab | podcast\_round3 | 48.525 | -123.159 | 8 | 32 |  | 2020-09-07 | 2017-09-27 |
|  | Orcasound Lab | podcast\_round5 | 48.525 | -123.159 | 8 | 32 |  | 2020-09-08 | 2020-07-25 |
|  | Orcasound Lab | podcast\_round6 | 48.525 | -123.159 | 8 | 32 |  | 2019-07-05 | 2020-09-01 |
|  | Orcasound Lab | podcast\_round7 | 48.525 | -123.159 | 8 | 32 |  | 2017-09-27 | 2020-09-07 |
|  | Port Townsand | podcast\_round9 | 48.135 | -122.760 | 8 | 32 |  | 2020-07-25 | 2020-09-29 |
|  | Bush Point | podcast\_round10 | 48.031 | -122.608 | 12.5 | 32 |  | 2020-09-01 | 2020-09-28 |
|  | Bush Point | podcast\_round11 | 48.031 | -122.608 | 12.5 | 32 |  | 2020-09-05 | 2020-10-18 |
|  | Port Townsand | podcast\_round12 | 48.135 | -122.760 | 8 | 32 |  | 2020-09-29 | 2020-10-08 |
| ONC | Berkley Canyon | Berkley Canyon | 48.426 | 126.174 | 40 | 64 | Ocean Sonics SC2 | 2013-05-20 | 2014-12-04 |
| DFO CRP | West Vancouver Island | WVanIsl | NA | NA | 114 | 16.384 | AURAL-M2 | 2011-05-18 | 2012-05-24 |
|  | Northern Mainland British Colombia | NorthBc | NA | NA | 35 | 16 | SM2M | 2013-10-10 | 2014-02-03 |
| DFO WDLP | Carmanah Point | CarmanahPt | NA | NA | 55 | 192 | SoundTrap 6249 | 2022-03-08 | 2022-06-29 |
|  | Strait of Georgia North 1 | StrGeoN1 | NA | NA | 72 | 256 | AMAR | 2021-09-05 | 2021-10-01 |
|  | Strait of Georgia North 2 | StrGeoN1 | NA | NA | 72 | 256 | AMAR | 2021-11-27 | 2021-11-28 |
|  | Strait of Georgia South 1 | StrGeoS1 | NA | NA | 193 | 256 | AMAR | 2021-11-11 | 2021-11-18 |
|  | Strait of Georgia South 2 | StrGeosS2 | NA | NA | 193 | 256 | AMAR | 2021-09-04 | 2021-09-16 |
|  | Swansen Channel | SwanChan | NA | NA | 245 | 256 | AMAR | 2021-11-13 | 2022-01-09 |
| JASCO/Malahat | Station 3 | Stn\_3 | 48.686 | 123.274 | 237 | 64 | AMAR | 2015-10-14 | 2016-10-08 |
|  | Station 4 | Stn\_4 | 48.507 | 123.211 | 188 | 64 | AMAR | 2015-10-15 | 2017-02-11 |
|  | Station 5 | Stn\_5 | 48.495 | 124.540 | 213 | 64 | AMAR | 2015-10-14 | 2016-02-16 |
|  | Station 6 | Stn\_6 | 48.775 | 123.343 | 74 | 64 | AMAR | 2016-02-16 | 2017-02-10 |
| SIMRES | Tekteksen (East Point), Saturna Island, BC | Tekteksen | 48.780 | 123.052 | 27 | 128 | Ocean Soncics IC Listen | 2022-06-24 | 2022-06-24 |

Table 3 Summary of annotations for each contributor’s detection and classification dataset. CRP indicateds Cetacean Research Program and WDLP indicates Whald and Detection and Localization Program. Detection dataset annotations are divided into killer whale, other or undetermined biological sounds, abiotic sounds, and humpback whales. Population/Ecotype classification task includes annotations for southern resident killer whales (SRKW), Bigg’s, northern resident killer whales (NRKW) and offshore killer whales (OKW)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | |  |  | |  | **Species/Class Annotations** | | | | | | | **Ecotype/Population Annotations** | | | | | | |
| **Dataset Provider** | **Dataset name** | | **Detection** | **Annotation Level** | | **KW** | **Und. Bio** | | **Abiotic** | | **HW** | | **SRKW** | **Bigg’s** | | **NRKW** | | **OKW** | |
| Orca Sound | | Podcast 2 | None | | Call (KW)/ File | 435 | | 0 | | 11 | | 0 | 435 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 |
|  | | Podcast 3 | None | | Call (KW)/ File | 436 | | 0 | | 60 | | 0 | 436 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 |
|  | | Podcast 5 | None | | Call (KW)/ File | 0 | | 0 | | 31 | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 |
|  | | Podcast 6 | None | | Call (KW)/ File | 151 | | 0 | | 25 | | 0 | 151 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 |
|  | | Podcast 7 | None | | Call (KW)/ File | 0 | | 0 | | 167 | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 |
|  | | Podcast 9 | None | | Call (KW)/ File | 198 | | 0 | | 89 | | 0 | 198 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 |
|  | | podcast10 | None | | Call (KW)/ File | 510 | | 0 | | 113 | | 0 | 510 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 |
|  | | Podcast 11 | None | | Call (KW)/ File | 0 | | 0 | | 118 | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 |
|  | | Podcast 12 | None | | Call (KW)/ File | 54 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | 54 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 |
| ONC | | Berkley Canyon | None | | Call | 1626 | | 9392 | | 156 | | 2946 | 130 | | 834 | | 0 | | 418 |
| DFO CRP | | WVanIsl | Pamguard WM | | Call | 10384 | | 2757 | | 5054 | | 95861 | 48 | | 5336 | | 4558 | | 258 |
|  | | NorthBc | Pamguard WM | | Call | 6886 | | 10696 | | 1178 | | 26058 | 0 | | 2309 | | 3501 | | 947 |
| DFO WDLP | | CarmanahPt | Pamguard WM | | Detection | 2668 | | 33 | | 297 | | 0 | 1610 | | 694 | | 364 | | 0 |
|  | | StrGeoN1 | Pamguard WM | | Detection | 4777 | | 0 | | 190 | | 131 | 4184 | | 593 | | 0 | | 0 |
|  | | StrGeoN1 | Pamguard WM | | Detection | 324 | | 0 | | 1 | | 42 | 0 | | 324 | | 0 | | 0 |
|  | | StrGeoS1 | Pamguard WM | | Detection | 350 | | 0 | | 3 | | 221 | 159 | | 191 | | 0 | | 0 |
|  | | StrGeosS2 | Pamguard WM | | Detection | 2141 | | 0 | | 152 | | 114 | 2070 | | 71 | | 0 | | 0 |
|  | | SwanChan | Pamguard WM | | Detection | 5655 | | 0 | | 383 | | 1660 | 5630 | | 25 | | 0 | | 0 |
| JASCO/Malahat | | Stn\_3 | JASCO | | Call | 7446 | | 3 | | 852 | | 39 | 2574 | | 937 | | 0 | | 0 |
|  | | Stn\_4 | JASCO | | Call | 15788 | | 0 | | 1177 | | 231 | 7647 | | 318 | | 0 | | 0 |
|  | | Stn\_5 | JASCO | | Call | 3039 | | 0 | | 3311 | | 1084 | 395 | | 994 | | 0 | | 0 |
|  | | Stn\_6 | JASCO | | Call | 1333 | | 0 | | 607 | | 26 | 519 | | 242 | | 0 | | 0 |
| SIMRES | | Tekteksen | None | | Call | 3578 | | 21 | | 0 | | 0 | 3418 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 |

# References

Au, W. W. L., Ford, J. K. B., Horne, J. K., & Allman, K. A. N. (2004). Echolocation signals of free-ranging killer whales (Orcinus orca) and modeling of foraging for chinook salmon (Oncorhynchus tshawytscha). *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *115*(2), 901–909. https://doi.org/10.1121/1.1642628

Baird, R. W., & Stacey, P. J. (1988). Variation in saddle patch pigmentation in populations of killer whales (Orcinus orca) from British Columbia, Alaska, and Washington State. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, *66*(11), 2582–2585. https://doi.org/10.1139/z88-380

Balcomb III, K. C., & Bigg, M. A. (1986). Population biology of the three resident killer whale pods in Puget Sound and off southern Vancouver Island. *Behavioral Biology of Killer Whales. Alan R. Liss, New York, New York*, 85–95.

Barrett-Lennard, L. G., & Ellis, G. M. (n.d.). *Population Structure and Genetic Variability in Northeastern Pacific Killer Whales: Towards an Assessment of Population Viability*.

Barrett-lennard, L. G., Ford, J. K. B., & Heise, K. A. (1996). The mixed blessing of echolocation: Differences in sonar use by fish-eating and mammal-eating killer whales. *Animal Behaviour*, *51*(3), 553–565. https://doi.org/10.1006/anbe.1996.0059

Bergler, C., Schröter, H., Cheng, R. X., Barth, V., Weber, M., Nöth, E., Hofer, H., & Maier, A. (2019). ORCA-SPOT: An Automatic Killer Whale Sound Detection Toolkit Using Deep Learning. *Scientific Reports*, *9*(1), 10997. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-47335-w

Biffard, B., Morgan, M., Muzi, L., Dakin, T., & Buren, P. V. (2022). An Integrated Hydrophone Calibration System for Ocean Observing: ONC HydroCal. *OCEANS 2022, Hampton Roads*, 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1109/OCEANS47191.2022.9976955

Brookes, K. L., Bailey, H., & Thompson, P. M. (2013). Predictions from harbor porpoise habitat association models are confirmed by long-term passive acoustic monitoringa). *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *134*(3), 2523–2533. https://doi.org/10.1121/1.4816577

Deecke, V. B., Ford, J. K. B., & Slater, P. J. B. (2005). The vocal behaviour of mammal-eating killer whales: Communicating with costly calls. *Animal Behaviour*, *69*(2), 395–405. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2004.04.014

Filatova, O. A., Miller, P. J. O., Yurk, H., Samarra, F. I. P., Hoyt, E., Ford, J. K. B., Matkin, C. O., & Barrett-Lennard, L. G. (2015). Killer whale call frequency is similar across the oceans, but varies across sympatric ecotypes. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *138*(1), 251–257. https://doi.org/10.1121/1.4922704

Foote, A. D., & Nystuen, J. A. (2008). Variation in call pitch among killer whale ecotypes. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *123*(3), 1747–1752. https://doi.org/10.1121/1.2836752

Ford, J. K. (1987). *A catalogue of underwater calls produced by killer whales (Orcinus orca) in British Columbia* (Canadian Data Report of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 633; p. 165). Department of Fisheries and Oceans,. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285709635\_A\_catalogue\_of\_underwater\_calls\_produced\_by\_killer\_whales\_Orcinus\_orca\_in\_British\_Columbia

Ford, J. K., Ellis, G. M., Barrett-Lennard, L. G., Morton, A. B., Palm, R. S., & Balcomb III, K. C. (1998). Dietary specialization in two sympatric populations of killer whales (Orcinus orca) in coastal British Columbia and adjacent waters. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, *76*(8), 1456–1471. https://doi.org/10.1139/z98-089

Gillespie, D., Caillat, M., Gordon, J., & White, P. (2013). Automatic detection and classification of odontocete whistlesa). *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *134*(3), 2427–2437. https://doi.org/10.1121/1.4816555

Gillespie, D., Mellinger, D. K., Gordon, J., McLaren, D., Redmond, P., McHugh, R., Trinder, P., Deng, X., & Thode, A. (2009). PAMGUARD: Semiautomated, open source software for real‐time acoustic detection and localization of cetaceans. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *125*(4\_Supplement), 2547. https://doi.org/10.1121/1.4808713

Gudivada, V. N., Apon, A., & Ding, J. (2017). *Data Quality Considerations for Big Data and Machine Learning: Going Beyond Data Cleaning and Transformations*.

Helble, T. A., Ierley, G. R., D’Spain, G. L., Roch, M. A., & Hildebrand, J. A. (2012). A generalized power-law detection algorithm for humpback whale vocalizations. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *131*(4), 2682–2699. https://doi.org/10.1121/1.3685790

Janik, V. M. (2009). Chapter 4 Acoustic Communication in Delphinids. In *Advances in the Study of Behavior* (Vol. 40, pp. 123–157). Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-3454(09)40004-4

Joy, R., Tollit, D., Wood, J., MacGillivray, A., Li, Z., Trounce, K., & Robinson, O. (2019). Potential Benefits of Vessel Slowdowns on Endangered Southern Resident Killer Whales. *Frontiers in Marine Science*, *6*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2019.00344

Kirsebom, O. S., Frazao, F., Padovese, B., Sakib, S., Su, Y., & Matwin, S. (2022). MERIDIAN open-source software for deep learning-based acoustic data analysis. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *151*(4\_Supplement), A27. https://doi.org/10.1121/10.0010545

Kotila, M., Suominen, K. M., Vasko, V. V., Blomberg, A. S., Lehikoinen, A., Andersson, T., Aspi, J., Cederberg, T., Hänninen, J., Inkinen, J., Koskinen, J., Lundberg, G., Mäkinen, K., Rontti, M., Snickars, M., Solbakken, J., Sundell, J., Syvänperä, I., Vuorenmaa, S., … Lilley, T. M. (2023). Large-scale long-term passive-acoustic monitoring reveals spatio-temporal activity patterns of boreal bats. *Ecography*, *2023*(6), e06617. https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.06617

Lacy, R. C., Williams, R., Ashe, E., Balcomb III, K. C., Brent, L. J. N., Clark, C. W., Croft, D. P., Giles, D. A., MacDuffee, M., & Paquet, P. C. (2017). Evaluating anthropogenic threats to endangered killer whales to inform effective recovery plans. *Scientific Reports*, *7*(1), 14119. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-14471-0

Leu, A. A., Hildebrand, J. A., Rice, A., Baumann-Pickering, S., & Frasier, K. E. (2022). Echolocation click discrimination for three killer whale ecotypes in the Northeastern Pacific. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *151*(5), 3197–3206.

Madrigal, B. C., Crance, J. L., Berchok, C. L., & Stimpert, A. K. (2021). Call repertoire and inferred ecotype presence of killer whales (Orcinus orca) recorded in the southeastern Chukchi Sea. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *150*(1), 145–158. https://doi.org/10.1121/10.0005405

Morin, P. A., McCarthy, M. L., Fung, C. W., Durban, J. W., Parsons, K. M., Perrin, W. F., Taylor, B. L., Jefferson, T. A., & Archer, F. I. (2024). Revised taxonomy of eastern North Pacific killer whales (Orcinus orca): Bigg’s and resident ecotypes deserve species status. *Royal Society Open Science*, *11*(3), 231368. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.231368

Myers, H. J., Olsen, D. W., Matkin, C. O., Horstmann, L. A., & Konar, B. (2021). Passive acoustic monitoring of killer whales (Orcinus orca) reveals year-round distribution and residency patterns in the Gulf of Alaska. *Scientific Reports*, *11*(1), 20284. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-99668-0

*Ocean Networks Canada—Oceans 3.0*. (n.d.). Retrieved June 12, 2024, from https://data.oceannetworks.ca/home

Olson, J. K., Wood, J., Osborne, R. W., Barrett-Lennard, L., & Larson, S. (2018). Sightings of southern resident killer whales in the Salish Sea 1976–2014: The importance of a long-term opportunistic dataset. *Endangered Species Research*, *37*, 105–118. https://doi.org/10.3354/esr00918

*OrcaHello*. (n.d.). Retrieved June 19, 2024, from https://aifororcas.azurewebsites.net/

*Orcasound*. (n.d.). Retrieved June 19, 2024, from https://github.com/orcasound

Parijs, S. M. V., Clark, C. W., Sousa-Lima, R. S., Parks, S. E., Rankin, S., Risch, D., & Opzeeland, I. C. V. (2009). Management and research applications of real-time and archival passive acoustic sensors over varying temporal and spatial scales. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, *395*, 21–36. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps08123

Pilkington, J. F., Stredulinsky, E. H., Gavrilchuk, K., Thornton, S. J., Ford, J. K. B., & Doniol-Valcroze, T. (2023). Patterns of winter occurrence of three sympatric killer whale populations off eastern Vancouver Island, Canada, based on passive acoustic monitoring. *Frontiers in Marine Science*, *10*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2023.1204908

Priestley, M., O’donnell, F., & Simperl, E. (2023). A Survey of Data Quality Requirements That Matter in ML Development Pipelines. *J. Data and Information Quality*, *15*(2), 11:1-11:39. https://doi.org/10.1145/3592616

Rice, A., Deecke, V. B., Ford, J. K., Pilkington, J. F., Oleson, E. M., & Hildebrand, J. A. (2017). Spatial and temporal occurrence of killer whale ecotypes off the outer coast of Washington State, USA. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, *572*, 255–268.

Riesch, R., Ford, J. K. B., & Thomsen, F. (2008). Whistle sequences in wild killer whales (Orcinus orca). *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *124*(3), 1822–1829. https://doi.org/10.1121/1.2956467

Saulitis, E. L., Matkin, C. O., & Fay, F. H. (2005a). Vocal repertoire and acoustic behavior of the isolated AT1 killer whale subpopulation in southern Alaska. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, *83*(8), 1015–1029. https://doi.org/10.1139/z05-089

Saulitis, E. L., Matkin, C. O., & Fay, F. H. (2005b). Vocal repertoire and acoustic behavior of the isolated AT1 killer whale subpopulation in southern Alaska. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, *83*(8), 1015–1029. https://doi.org/10.1139/z05-089

Shiu, Y., Palmer, K. J., Roch, M. A., Fleishman, E., Liu, X., Nosal, E.-M., Helble, T., Cholewiak, D., Gillespie, D., & Klinck, H. (2020). Deep neural networks for automated detection of marine mammal species. *Scientific Reports*, *10*(1), 607. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-57549-y

Souhaut, M., & Shields, M. W. (2021). Stereotyped whistles in southern resident killer whales. *PeerJ*, *9*, e12085. https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.12085

Thomsen, F., Franck, D., & Ford, J. K. B. (2001). Characteristics of whistles from the acoustic repertoire of resident killer whales (Orcinus orca) off Vancouver Island, British Columbia. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *109*(3), 1240–1246. https://doi.org/10.1121/1.1349537

Watkins, W. A. (1968). *The harmonic interval: Fact or artifact in spectral analysis of pulse trains*. https://agris.fao.org/search/en/providers/122415/records/64736846e17b74d22254c81f

Wiggins, S. M., & Hildebrand, J. A. (2007). High-frequency Acoustic Recording Package (HARP) for broad-band, long-term marine mammal monitoring. *2007 Symposium on Underwater Technology and Workshop on Scientific Use of Submarine Cables and Related Technologies*, 551–557. https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/4231090/

Williams, R., Lacy, R. C., Ashe, E., Barrett-Lennard, L., Brown, T. M., Gaydos, J. K., Gulland, F., MacDuffee, M., Nelson, B. W., Nielsen, K. A., Nollens, H., Raverty, S., Reiss, S., Ross, P. S., Collins, M. S., Stimmelmayr, R., & Paquet, P. (2024). Warning sign of an accelerating decline in critically endangered killer whales (Orcinus orca). *Communications Earth & Environment*, *5*(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1038/s43247-024-01327-5

# Supplemental Information

## HALLO Annotation Guidelines

The following section contains the annotation guidelines that were provided by expert annotators on the HALLO project.

**Annotation Guidelines**

* Draw a box specifying the time and frequency boundaries that contain the call/sound
* Assign labels to the box in the 4 label columns (or as many as possible)
* Although the table below contains values for a variety of species for the ‘Sound.ID.Species’ field, our focus remains on Killer whales. Don’t go out of your way to annotate every single dolphin and vessel noise. All labels other than KW are basically there to add a bit of extra information on difficult cases. So, if there are humpback calls sneaking amidst killer whale calls and you think ‘Oh, this could be confusing! I think it’ll be helpful to mark this right here as a humpback’, please go ahead and label it! But you don’t need to chase down every single signal that is not a KW.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Label field | Possible values |  |
| Sound\_ID\_Species | KW | Killer whale |
|  | KW? | potential killer whale (if it was unknown but had the potential to be KW, it fell into this category) |
|  | HW | Humpback whale |
|  | HW? | potential humpback whale (certainly not a KW, possibly a HW) |
|  | HW/KW? | either HW or KW, cannot determine |
|  | PWSD | Pacific White Sided Dolphin |
|  | PWSD? | potential Pacific White Sided Dolphin |
|  | KW/PWSD? | either KW or PWSD, too faint or in descript to determine |
|  | GW | Grey Whale |
|  | GW? | potential Grey Whale |
|  | HW/GW? | either HW or GW, cannot determine without further review |
|  | Odontocete | vocalizations from a small unidentified odontocete, not PWSD |
|  | Echolocation | Echolocation clicks that can’t be safely identified as KW |
|  | Odontocete? | potential vocalizations from a small unidentified odontocete, not PWSD |
|  | Rissos | Risso’s Dolphin |
|  | SPW | Sperm Whale |
|  | Vessel Noise | Vessel Noise |
|  | Clang | some metallic-like anthropogenic clang with unknown source |
|  | Mooring | noise likely derived from the instrument’s mooring equipment |
|  | Sonar | Noise likely due to sonar activity |
|  | Unknown | unable to identify or attribute sound to a definitive class |
| KW\_ecotype  (For Killer whales only) | KWSR | Southern Resident Killer Whale |
|  | KWNR | Northern Resident Killer Whale |
|  | KWT | Transient (Bigg’s) Killer Whale |
|  | KWU | Outercoast Transient (Bigg’s) Killer Whale |
|  | KWO | Offshore Killer Whale |
|  | Unknown | unable to identify or attribute sound to a definitive class |
| Pod  (for KWSR only) | J | J pod |
|  | K | K pod |
|  | L | L pod |
|  | Unknown | unable to identify or attribute sound to a definitive class |
|  | K/L | K or L pod (because of the call types they have in common) |
| Call\_Type | S1 | S1 call |
|  | S2 | S2 call |
|  | ... |  |
|  | EL | Echolocation clicks |
|  | Unknown | unable to identify or attribute sound to a definitive class |
| Confidence | High  Medium  Low | Refers to the entry in the field of highest resolution (eg call\_type if there is something in there, otherwise in KW\_ecotype if that’s the last field that has info, etc).  Confidence to be indicated only if the field has no question mark. If there is a question mark, it is assumed that the confidence is very low.  If there is no question mark and confidence level field is blank, it will be assumed to be high. |

# Notes to Authors

Group Discussion Points

Clarification: calls, whistles, pulsed calls. I would classify pulsed calls and whistles as ‘calls’. Is the typical jargon ‘pulsed calls’ simplified to ‘calls’? Need consistency across labelling or a better understanding

Each section in the methods should contain the following sections

What other figures/tables should we include?

ONC double annotation effort – I’m still vague here. Please someone fill in the blanks. If April and Jenn annotated only some of what Jasper did, then we need to define these as two different datasets – which is fine but we need to know what that is.

**Deployment –** sample rate, deployment depth, hydrophone, recorder, are all files included or only files with annotations?

**Processing –** How ere the data processed? Filters? Detectors (.e.g Pamguard version, whistle moan detector including settings parameters)

**Annotation-** Which type of signals were annotated? KW pulsed calls only? KW whistles and pulsed calls? What was annotated, the detections? The file only?