



**Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels**

**Fifth Meeting of Advisory Committee**

*Mar del Plata, Argentina, 13 – 17 April 2010*

---

**Title: Breeding Sites Working Group – Report**

**Author: Breeding Sites WG Convenor**

‘This paper is presented for consideration by ACAP and may contain unpublished data, analyses, and/or conclusions subject to change. Data in this paper shall not be cited or used for purposes other than the work of the ACAP Secretariat, ACAP Advisory Committee or their subsidiary Working Groups without the permission of the original data holders.’

## 1. PURPOSE

This draft report briefly outlines inter-sessional progress against the Breeding Sites Working Group (hereafter BSWG) Work Programme agreed at the ACAP Advisory Committee meeting in 2008 (AC 4), and discussions at the BSWG meeting on 10 April 2010 at Mar del Plata, Argentina.

## 2. MEMBERSHIP AND MEETING PARTICIPANTS

The convenor of the BSWG, Richard Phillips introduced the meeting agenda (BSWG3\_Doc\_02\_Rev\_1) and thanked Working Group members and observers for attending. Membership of the BSWG was reviewed, and the updated list appears as Annex 3. Participants at the Mar del Plata meeting were from Argentina (3), Chile (2), UK (3), France (1), New Zealand (2), Australia (2), USA (1), BirdLife International (2), Pro Delphinus (2), ACAP Secretariat (2), Chinese Wild Bird Federation (1), American Bird Conservancy (1) and the World Wide Fund (1), of which eight were Members of the BSWG. There were no additions to the agenda.

## 3. PROGRESS REPORT

### 3.1.1 Breeding sites database: recent updates

A request for review of existing data held by ACAP, and for the provision of new data (see below) was sent to BSWG members from Breeding Range States and to SCAR (for southern giant petrel sites in the Antarctic region). Revisions and updates were received from Argentina, Australia, France, South Africa, UK, SCAR, and on behalf of Ecuador. Most data from southern giant petrel breeding sites in Antarctica were entered by the ACAP Science Officer, based on information presented in Patterson et al. (2008; Marine Ornithology 36, 115-124).

Considerable efforts were made inter-sessionally to improve standardisation of stored data, and the functionality and general ease-of-use of the online database. With regard to listing and management data, the hierarchical relationship between breeding site, island and island group is now established for all sites; there is improved matching of breeding sites with previously submitted data on Status and Trends (which should be complete once the database is modified to cope with population trend data collected in study areas or colonies that are only part of the listed site), and; revisions and updates were received on levels of statutory protection, and the existence and date of management plans. This will be used to help develop breeding site condition indicators (see #5 below). Minor revision of previous criteria to allow for threats that are severely limiting expansion in numbers or distribution in a stable or slightly increasing population on an already occupied island did not result in the listing of additional threats, but may do so once entries for the north Pacific species are complete, and updates are received from New Zealand and Chile. New information was requested to populate a table on

introduced mammal species at each site, including fields on alien species status (definitely present, possibly present or eradicated), year of introduction, year of eradication, whether the eradication was the result of human intervention, the method used, whether an eradication is planned for the future, the proposed year and method. Some of this information will also be used to develop breeding site condition indicators. In addition, information was requested to populate a table on sites from which ACAP species have been extirpated, including year when last known to breed and when last seen (breeding or nonbreeding), the maximum historical count and year, and the suspected reason why the species was extirpated. The great majority of these sites are in the North Pacific (Table 1).

Table 1. Breeding sites listed in the ACAP database from which ACAP species have been extirpated.

Species	Breeding site
<i>Diomedea dabbenena</i>	Tristan da Cunha
<i>Macronectes giganteus</i>	Ile Gouveneur
<i>Macronectes giganteus</i>	Tristan da Cunha
<i>Macronectes halli</i>	Nelly Island (Stewart)
<i>Phoebastria albatrus</i>	Agincourt Island/ P'eng-chia-Hsu
<i>Phoebastria albatrus</i>	Byosho Island
<i>Phoebastria albatrus</i>	Iwo Jima/Sulphur Island
<i>Phoebastria albatrus</i>	Kita-daitojima
<i>Phoebastria albatrus</i>	Kitanoshima
<i>Phoebastria albatrus</i>	Kobisho
<i>Phoebastria albatrus</i>	Minami-daitojima
<i>Phoebastria albatrus</i>	Mukojima
<i>Phoebastria albatrus</i>	Nishinoshima / Rosario
<i>Phoebastria albatrus</i>	Okino-daitojima
<i>Phoebastria albatrus</i>	Uotsurijima
<i>Phoebastria albatrus</i>	Yomeshima
<i>Phoebastria immutabilis</i>	Johnston Atoll
<i>Phoebastria immutabilis</i>	Minami Torishima
<i>Phoebastria immutabilis</i>	Torishima
<i>Phoebastria nigripes</i>	Anijima
<i>Phoebastria nigripes</i>	Iwo Jima/Sulphur Island
<i>Phoebastria nigripes</i>	Minami Torishima
<i>Phoebastria nigripes</i>	Nishinoshima / Rosario
<i>Phoebastria nigripes</i>	Northern Mariana Islands
<i>Phoebastria nigripes</i>	Johnston Atoll
<i>Procellaria aequinoctialis</i>	Campbell Island

### 3.1.2 Data gaps and addition of new fields, including recording of prospecting birds and mixed pairs

The ACAP Information Officer (John Cooper) is collating records of ACAP species prospecting at new sites, those that have formed a mixed pair with an established species, and movements of banded birds between island groups. Given the risk of inconsistency in future reporting of number of recorded breeding sites, these data will be stored in spreadsheet format rather than be incorporated into the main breeding sites database (although sites will have the same id as those in the main database).

## 4. ACAP PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AND NATIONAL REPORTING

AC5 Doc 28 summarises the background to the requirement to develop a system of indicators to measure the success of the ACAP Agreement. It also provides suggestions for potential categories of indicators and some examples of specific indicators relating to these. AC5 Inf8 extends this approach and provides additional suggestions for potential indicators, especially those relating to the marine environment and to capacity and resource aspects. In addition, it was recognised that AC5 Doc16, proposing improvements to reporting on the implementation of the Agreement, contains a number of suggestions explicitly relevant to the development of basic performance indicators.

Accordingly the WG: a) endorsed the general principles outlined in Doc 28 Annex B; b) supported the proposition that, whenever possible, indicators should be aligned with and/or developed from the existing initiatives of the ACAP and its WGs and incorporated into the appropriate mechanisms of ACAP reporting and data collection; (c) recommended that indicator categories should, as far as possible, conform with the State Pressure Response (SPR) system, while recognising that in some cases important indicators would need to relate to monitoring the progressive acquisition of relevant data to enable the development of SPR indicators.

In respect of potential indicators of relevance to breeding sites, the WG recommended that an appropriate suite of indicators should be developed from amongst the following categories:

State: 1. Number and proportion of sites with alien species, including separate subindicators for habitat modifiers and known/potential predators

Pressure: 2. Levels of threat to species/sites. Develop indicators to track changes in the number and proportion of threats, taking account of the different ACAP categories (Low, Medium, High, Very High) involved. It is envisaged that an indicator for threats at ACAP sites could be developed and treated in a manner analogous to that of the IUCN Red List Index for species.

Response: 3.1 Actions to mitigate/eliminate threats. Although this indicator might also be included within the elements of 3.2, relating to implementation of management plans, such eradication actions may be viewed as of sufficient importance to warrant a separate category. 3.2 Actions to protect and manage sites. Potential indicators might include: a) number and proportion of sites with formal Protected Area status, b) level (quality) of protection (e.g. IUCN WCPA category), c) existence of Management Plan (and its inclusion of specific actions relating to ACAP species), d) progress with implementation of actions relating to ACAP species, e) status of elements of biosecurity protocols relevant to ACAP species

Data relevant to the development of several of these indicators are already available, at least in part, from the ACAP database. Currently standard database queries can derive information on breeding site indicators such as summarised in Table 2.

*[The above section of the report has been transferred verbatim to AC5 Inf 16, and will be discussed under AC5 Agenda 14.]*

Prior to AC5, and following discussion with BirdLife International (Stuart Butchart) and the ACAP Science Officer (Wieslawa Misiak), a list of potential breeding site condition indicators that can be extracted by standard database queries, and hence are updateable, were derived from the ACAP database, at species level (Table 2). Note that the number of Island groups and sites excludes those where there is a single breeding pair and where the species has been extirpated, i.e. all % calculations are based on number of sites with >1 pairs. The data should be considered preliminary for several reasons: (i) a single island may hold more than one breeding site, or a breeding site may include several small islands; (ii) the global population may be underestimated as it excludes birds breeding on islands where population size is unknown; (iii) management information was unavailable for the north Pacific species, and updates have not yet been received from several Breeding Range States and for most Antarctic breeding sites for southern giant petrel.

One characteristic of a reliable condition indicator is that it is able to track changes over time. Currently the ACAP database in theory holds information for each site on when the management plan was published and when an invasive alien was introduced or eradicated, but not when the site was granted statutory protection. All future updates to protection status, presence of invasive mammals, and threats can be recorded automatically.

Table 2. Potential breeding site 'condition' indicators derived from the ACAP database.

Species	No of Island Groups	No of sites	Global Population	% sites with mgmt plans	Mgmt plans pre-2000 (%)	Mgmt plans post-2000 (%)	% sites with statutory protection	% sites with alien species	% population with mgmt plans	% population with statutory protection	% population with alien species
<i>Diomedea amsterdamensis</i>	1	1	30	100	0	100	100	100	100	100	100
<i>Diomedea antipodensis</i>	3	5	8,273	100	100	0	100	0	100	100	0
<i>Diomedea dabbenena</i>	1	1	1,763	100	100	0	100	100	100	100	100
<i>Diomedea epomophora</i>	2	4	7,886	100	100	0	100	0	100	100	0
<i>Diomedea exulans</i>	5	30	8,042	80	6.7	73.3	90	46.7	90.3	99.7	61.5
<i>Diomedea sanfordi</i>	3	6	5,823	33.3	33.3	0	33.3	0	0.6	0.6	0
<i>Macronectes giganteus</i>	24	121	50,200	36.4	4.1	30.6	44.6	33.9	29.6	64.7	48.1
<i>Macronectes halli</i>	9	51	11,889	76.5	9.8	66.7	78.4	37.3	78.6	78.8	49.6
<i>Phoebastria albatrus</i>	2	2	470	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<i>Phoebastria immutabilis</i>	5	17	637,280	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<i>Phoebastria irrorata</i>	1	2	9,608	50	0	50	50	50	100	100	100
<i>Phoebastria nigripes</i>	4	13	64,235	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<i>Phoebetria fusca</i>	6	15	13,260	73.3	26.7	46.7	86.7	73.3	76.2	98.6	88.5
<i>Phoebetria palpebrata</i>	8	71	15,449	19.7	9.9	9.9	21.1	8.5	74.1	100	51
<i>Procellaria aequinoctialis</i>	6	76	1,171,820	15.8	2.6	13.2	18.4	14.5	63.4	63.4	53.5
<i>Procellaria cinerea</i>	8	17	79,720	35.3	17.6	17.6	47.1	35.3	99.7	100	33.4
<i>Procellaria conspicillata</i>	1	1	10,090	100	100	0	100	100	100	100	100
<i>Procellaria parkinsoni</i>	1	2	1,458	0	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
<i>Procellaria westlandica</i>	1	1	4,000	0	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
<i>Thalassarche bulleri</i>	4	10	30,460	50	30	20	50	0	44.6	44.6	0
<i>Thalassarche carteri</i>	4	6	39,315	66.7	16.7	50	100	33.3	31.2	100	68.7
<i>Thalassarche cauta</i>	1	3	12,595	66.7	66.7	0	100	0	58.7	100	0
<i>Thalassarche chlororhynchus</i>	2	6	34,050	33.3	33.3	0	50	66.7	18.8	86.3	98.1
<i>Thalassarche chrysostoma</i>	8	29	97,552	62.1	10.3	51.7	69	31	74.3	82.4	43.7
<i>Thalassarche eremite</i>	1	1	5,407	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Thalassarche impavida</i>	1	2	22,093	50	50	0	50	0	100	100	0
<i>Thalassarche melanophris</i>	14	66	593,002	47	4.5	42.4	54.5	34.8	13.4	35.6	46

**AC5 Doc 13 Rev1**  
**Agenda item 8.1**

<i>Thalassarche salvini</i>	3	4	31,953	50	25	25	50	0	0.9	0.9	0
<i>Thalassarche steadi</i>	3	5	97,113	80	80	0	80	0	100	100	0

Table 2 (cont.). Potential breeding site 'condition' indicators derived from the ACAP database.

Species	No of Island Groups	No of sites	Global Population	% sites by Threat - Natural disaster	% sites by Threat - Habitat loss or destruction by alien species	% population by Threat - Increased competition with native species	% population by Threat - Parasite or Pathogen	% population by Threat - Predation by alien species	% population by Threat - all
<i>Diomedea amsterdamensis</i>	1	1	30	0	0	0	100	100	100
<i>Diomedea antipodensis</i>	3	5	8,273	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Diomedea dabbenena</i>	1	1	1,763	0	0	0	0	100	100
<i>Diomedea epomophora</i>	2	4	7,886	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Diomedea exulans</i>	5	30	8,042	0	0	0	0	50.1	50.1
<i>Diomedea sanfordi</i>	3	6	5,823	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Macronectes giganteus</i>	24	121	50,200	0.8	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Macronectes halli</i>	9	51	11,889	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Phoebastria albatrus</i>	2	2	470	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<i>Phoebastria immutabilis</i>	5	17	637,280	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<i>Phoebastria irrorata</i>	1	2	9,608	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Phoebastria nigripes</i>	4	13	64,235	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<i>Phoebetria fusca</i>	6	15	13,260	0	0	0	3.6	13.3	13.3
<i>Phoebetria palpebrata</i>	8	71	15,449	1.4	1.4	0	0	25.9	35.6
<i>Procellaria aequinoctialis</i>	6	76	1,171,820	0	6.6	0	0	34.1	34.1
<i>Procellaria cinerea</i>	8	17	79,720	0	17.6	0	0	26.5	26.5
<i>Procellaria conspicillata</i>	1	1	10,090	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Procellaria parkinsoni</i>	1	2	1,458	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Procellaria westlandica</i>	1	1	4,000	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Thalassarche bulleri</i>	4	10	30,460	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Thalassarche carteri</i>	4	6	39,315	0	0	0	68.7	68.7	68.7
<i>Thalassarche cauta</i>	1	3	12,595	0	0	0.3	41.3	0	41.6
<i>Thalassarche chlororhynchos</i>	2	6	34,050	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Thalassarche chrysostoma</i>	8	29	97,552	0	3.4	0	0	0	0.2
<i>Thalassarche eremita</i>	1	1	5,407	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Thalassarche impavida</i>	1	2	22,093	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Thalassarche melanophris</i>	14	66	593,002	1.5	1.5	0	0	3.6	3.6
<i>Thalassarche</i>	3	4	31,953	0	0	0	0	0	0

**AC5 Doc 13 Rev1**  
**Agenda item 8.1**

<i>salvini</i>									
<i>Thalassarche steadii</i>	3	5	97,113	0	0	0	0	0	0

However additional work is required to: a) refine the analysis of existing data, b) to ensure that consistency is retained in the application of and changes to threat classification, and c) to acquire the additional information essential for generating time specified baselines (e.g. for entry into force of management plans) and for ensuring that changes over time can be tracked accurately

Ian Hay (Australia) presented AC5 Doc. 16 on the draft revised template for national reporting by ACAP Parties, noting its format and contents had been developed in accordance with the guidance of MoP3. The BSWG noted that some parts of the draft template would be revised to include the results of the two ad hoc, intersessional working groups currently developing the prioritisation framework and the format for national seabird bycatch reporting.

The BSWG reviewed those parts of the template and the suggested basic performance indicators that were relevant to its Terms of Reference. The BSWG discussed the desirability of seeking information from Parties and what type of data and questions would be most appropriate. The BSWG recommended to the Advisory Committee that a few "yes/no" style of questions to seek basic data about the protection of breeding sites and the key provisions of management plans (eg regarding bio-security measures in place) be added to the information sought from Parties. The BSWG endorsed the general format and content of those sections of the revised template relevant to its responsibilities; performance indicators, including those which might measure trends in severity of breeding site threats were discussed separately (see above).

## **5. MONITORING OF BREEDING SITES**

John Croxall (BirdLife International) presented AC5 Inf\_07 on the Important Bird Area (IBA) Monitoring Framework of BirdLife International. The document describes a standardised way to assign scores for the threats to IBAs, the condition of IBAs and conservation actions taken at IBAs. The BSWG considered that this framework should be borne in mind by ACAP Parties when developing future monitoring programs. The BSWG agreed that there were advantages to adopting standardized, best-practice monitoring protocols at breeding sites, but considered that the development of such guidelines was not a priority for ACAP. The prioritisation process in which ACAP is currently engaged may identify particular sites at which monitoring schemes should be set up or enhanced, and for which some financial support may be required. The New Zealand representative noted the existence of some monitoring protocols for the presence of invasive species at sites under its jurisdiction, and offered to provide further information on availability of relevant documents during the inter-sessional period. The BSWG recognized that monitoring before and after an alien species eradication was important, but accepted that this was often limited by availability of funds.

The BSWG agreed on the importance of improved monitoring of threats to ACAP species. It was also suggested that a document be developed inter-sessionally with an

annotated list of basic site characteristics that could be recorded annually or opportunistically. Existing or planned site monitoring programmes for breeding site data in addition to that on population size and demography could be captured in national reports.

The use of remote sensing techniques to monitor breeding sites was discussed. Chile mentioned the progress of a project to deploy web cams at a breeding site under its jurisdiction, and offered to provide an information document to be considered by ACAP. The Secretariat offered to collate relevant reports and papers on the use of remote systems to monitor breeding sites. Australia volunteered to report on its experience of remote monitoring of southern giant petrels in the Antarctic, and other Parties were encouraged to also report on schemes that they might set up elsewhere.

AC5 Doc 20 reviewed the progress achieved with implementation of the Waved albatross action plan (POA) developed by Ecuador and Peru, in collaboration with ACAP, between 2007 and 2008. More extensive information on actions undertaken by Peru is provided in AC5 Inf 3. The broad participation of stakeholders from the Ecuadorian Government and most importantly from a number of NGOs was highlighted. Also, it was emphasized that in the work programme envisaged in the POA, a high proportion of the actions identified are classified as of high priority. Other issues include the lack of identification of stakeholders leading each task/action and a clear indication of the process for the periodic review of the POA. The creation of a team dealing with the revision and implementation of the POA was discussed. However, considering the early stages in the implementation phase of the POA (only two years since the plan was endorsed in AC4), the BSWG recommended to the Advisory Committee that the revision of the POA should be included in the Advisory Committee Work Programme for the next triennium.

## **6. BEST PRACTICE GUIDELINES**

Anton Wolfaardt (UK) presented AC5 Doc 19, which summarises guidelines on best practice biosecurity management for ACAP breeding sites, and provides a list of useful online resources and further reading on the subject. The approach adopted in the document is to identify the pathways and entry points of potential introductions and to establish effective barriers along these pathways to prevent alien organisms from entering and becoming established in new areas, with the aim of preventing the introduction occurring as far back along the introduction pathway as possible. The document highlights the difficulties and possible solutions surrounding the complex issue of limiting the transfer and establishment of invasive alien species. The BSWG agreed that the document is a valuable resource for the ACAP community, and that implementation of the guidelines by Parties is an important requirement that should be included in the national reporting process. The BSWG suggested that the addition of an appended checklist to the document would be a useful practical resource that would help Parties implement the guidelines. Consequently, the WG tasked the author to append a checklist to the document, before sending it to BSWG members for further inputs and

peer review by biosecurity experts. Following the peer review process, the document will be made available on the ACAP website in a similar accessible format as the Species Assessments and other conservation guidelines, and that it should be readily updateable with links to online resources and reports. The BSWG also highlighted the importance of including explicit biosecurity reporting requirements in the revised format for National Reports on Implementation of the Agreement [see above].

## **7. PRIORITISATION**

John Croxall (BirdLife International) introduced AC5 Doc 33 that applied the Important Bird Area (IBA) criteria adopted by BirdLife International to the ACAP colony database. The paper provided information on the breeding sites for the ACAP-listed species that are known to reach designated thresholds (1%, 2%, 5% and 10%) of the global population for each species. Based upon these analyses, it was reported that the jurisdictions of France, New Zealand and Disputed Territories contain the most sites by number that exceed the 1% of global population threshold. The authors recognised that these initial analyses were incomplete as 34% of the breeding sites had no associated population data in the ACAP database. Sites under the jurisdiction of Antarctica, Disputed Territories, France and New Zealand accounted for ca. 90% of these cases. It was recommended that sourcing updated population estimates for these sites, where they exist, should be a priority. The BSWG agreed with the conclusions of the STWG that the most appropriate way to proceed was to ensure all available data were entered into the ACAP database and undertake more comprehensive analyses for AC6 that also consider the accuracy of the population data.

Spencer Clubb (NZ) provided a brief overview of the prioritisation framework project (AC5 Doc 15), including describing the process followed to date to prioritise at-sea conservation actions and the need to now progress with prioritisation of land-based conservation actions. SC noted that much of the information necessary to prioritise land based conservation actions was already contained in ACAP databases, such as information relating to population status and trends, and threats to breeding sites. The key outstanding tasks necessary to develop the land-based framework were therefore to determine the likelihood of success of taking different land-based conservation actions, to test the weighting criteria used to calculate priorities and, potentially, to compare or calibrate land based priorities with at-sea priorities. The BSWG agreed to provide expert advice to progress the land based prioritisation framework, and to hold some initial meetings in the next few days, prior to the commencement of AC5.

## **8. DATA SHARING AGREEMENT**

In light of the progress with data acquisition and recent developments of the ACAP database and data portal, the Secretariat has drafted a policy to inform Parties and data providers about data management practices (AC5 Doc 35). The proposed data policy includes the creation of a metadata catalogue, which will allow data holders to specify

usage and access constraints for their data. The BSWG was very supportive of this initiative; however, the STWG and BSWG convenors expressed concern that the new format might not adequately reflect the data access and usage rules agreed at AC4 (Annex 3). The Science Officer acknowledged that the lack of a functioning catalogue to refer to at this stage made it somewhat difficult to interpret how the existing rules will be transferred into the new system. It was agreed that the WG Convenors will be consulted in the development of the relevant database and data portal components to ensure that the resulting product is comprehensive and transparent, and meets the needs of both WGs. The BSWG also agreed that the proposed data policy be considered by the AC for adoption.

## **9. REVIEW OF TERMS OF REFERENCE**

The existing terms of reference for the BSWG (Annex 4) were reviewed; no changes were made.

## **10. BSWG WORK PROGRAM**

The substantial progress against most tasks in the BSWG work programme agreed at AC4 is indicated in Annex 1. The work programme was updated to address the tasks outlined in this report, and appears as Annex 5.

## **11. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I am very grateful to the BSWG members, the ACAP Secretariat and several others outside the group including Stuart Butchart (BirdLife International), Tara Hewitt (Australian Antarctic Division), Karine Delord (CEBC-CNRS, France), Kate Huyvaert (Colorado State University, USA) and Sally Poncet (South Georgia Surveys) for contributing data and advice. Special thanks must go to Wieslawa Misiak for her unstinting assistance and hard work in developing, updating and querying the database, which were integral to the successful implementation of the work program.

**ANNEX 1: BREEDING SITE WORKING GROUP WORK PROGRAMME  
AGREED AT AC4.**

	<b>Topic/Task</b>	<b>Responsible group</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>	<b>Progress in inter-sessional period</b>
3.1	Revise the database lists and structures	BSWG (Secretariat)	Ongoing	Completed
3.2	Complete, review and update data submission from Parties	BSWG	By AC5 and ongoing	Largely completed (response still required from Chile, New Zealand, Norway and for the north Pacific species). Published data from southern giant petrels breeding sites in Antarctica added to database.
3.3	Compile and help maintain list of introduced mammals and eradications from ACAP breeding sites	BSWG (Secretariat)	By AC5 and ongoing	Largely completed (response still required from Chile, New Zealand, Norway and for the north Pacific species)
3.4	Compile and maintain list of former (recent) breeding sites of ACAP species and their characteristics	BSWG (Secretariat)	By AC5 and ongoing	Largely completed (response still required from Chile, New Zealand, Norway and for the north Pacific species)
3.5	Assess the threats to breeding sites and identify gaps in knowledge	BSWG (Secretariat)	By AC5 and ongoing	Threats and knowledge gaps are highlighted in Species Assessments. No known substantive change in threats since AC3, hence no formal update carried out.
3.6	Develop, review and update best-practice guidelines to mitigate selected threats to breeding sites, including biosecurity	BSWG Biosecurity lead UK	By AC5 and ongoing	Biosecurity and quarantine review provided by UK for AC5
3.7	Review evidence for impacts of pathogens and parasites on ACAP species and effectiveness of mitigation measures	BSWG, lead France, Ecuador, Argentina	AC5	No progress
3.8	Consider criteria for prioritisation of internationally important breeding sites	BSWG	By AC5 and ongoing	Update of document on Important Bird Areas for ACAP species provided by BirdLife International for AC5

**AC5 Doc 13 Rev1**  
**Agenda item 8.1**

3.9	Provide and consider annual reports to AC on BSWG activities	BSWG and AC	AC5	n/a
4.16	Identify and prioritise conservation measures required for each species and by each Party to the Agreement	WG Convenors and <i>ad-hoc</i> group, lead New Zealand	2010-2012	An analysis of threats, data/knowledge gaps and population trends will be reported

**ANNEX 2: LIST OF BREEDING SITE WORKING GROUP MEMBERS**

Updated 11 April 2010.  
 Italics – to be confirmed

Argentina	Flavio Quintana* <quintana@cenpat.edu.ar> Nestor Coria <ncoria@dna.gov.ar>
Australia	Ian Hay* <Ian.Hay@aad.gov.au> Rosemary Gales <Rosemary.Gales@dpiw.tas.gov.au>
Chile	Marcelo Garcia Alvarado* <mgarcia@subpesca.cl>
Ecuador	Augusto Corriere <dgderhum@mrrree.gov.ec>
France	Henri Weimerskirch* <henriw@cebc.cnrs.fr> Martine Bigan <martine.bigand@ecologie.gouv.fr>
New Zealand	<i>tbc</i>
Norway	<i>Oystein Storkersen &lt;Oystein.Storkersen@dirnat.no&gt;</i>
South Africa	John Cooper* <John.Cooper@uct.ac.za> Robert Crawford <Crawford@deat.gov.za>
United Kingdom	Richard Phillips*# <raphil@bas.ac.uk> Anton Wolfaardt <anton.wolfaardt@jncc.gov.uk>
United States of America	Maura Naughton <maura-naughton@fws.gov>
BirdLife International	John Croxall <John.Croxall@birdlife.org>
Peru	<i>Vladimiro Beteta &lt;vbeteta@rree.gob.pe&gt;</i>
Spain	<i>tbc</i>
Brazil	<i>tbc</i>
Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research	<i>tbc</i>

\*national coordinator, # convenor

### **ANNEX 3: RULES FOR ACCESS AND USE OF STATUS AND TRENDS, AND BREEDING SITES DATA SUBMITTED TO, AND MAINTAINED BY, ACAP**

The following revised Rules for Access and Use of data submitted to, and maintained by, ACAP pertaining to population status and trends, and breeding sites management and threats, were adopted by the fourth meeting of the Advisory Committee in August 2008.

It is recognised that:

1. All status and trends, and breeding sites data submitted to, and maintained by, the ACAP Secretariat, shall be available to ACAP officials (Secretariat, Advisory Committee Chair, Advisory Committee Vice-chair, Working Group convenors and vice-convenors) for analysis and preparation of documents for the Agreement.
2. Inclusion of data, analyses or results from data held by the ACAP Secretariat into working papers, information papers, reports and any other documents tabled at meetings of the Advisory Committee or Working Groups, or circulated inter-sessionally to members of the Secretariat, ACAP officials, Working Group members or invited experts does not constitute publication.
3. Data included in any published reports or scientific papers outside ACAP will be considered to be in the public domain and so may be included in databases maintained by the ACAP Secretariat, and may be released by the ACAP Secretariat to other parties on request without the need to obtain permission from the data holders (owners/originators). Release to other parties will include making the data available through the ACAP web portal.
4. Unless indicated otherwise by the relevant member of the Breeding Sites Working Group, all data, analyses or results concerning breeding site threats and management may be released by the ACAP Secretariat to other parties on request without the need to obtain permission from the data holders. Release to other parties will include making the data available through the ACAP web portal. Other parties will be advised of the source of the original data and will be asked to consult the original dataholder (including on assignation of authorship) before proceeding with publication of documents describing analyses and interpretation of these data.
5. Unless indicated otherwise by the relevant member of the Status and Trends Working Group, the most recent count from each breeding site, summary statistics (mean, statistical errors, range) of population trend, productivity, survival rates and breeding frequency, and trend graphs generated for ACAP Species Assessments may be released by the ACAP Secretariat to other parties on request without the need to obtain permission from the data holders. Release to parties will include making the data available through the ACAP web portal. Other parties will be advised of the source of the original data and will be asked to cite the data contributor and, if required, to consult the original data contributor for further information before proceeding with publication of documents describing analyses and interpretation of these data.
6. No data user shall hold ACAP or the original data provider(s) liable for errors in the data. While every effort has been made to ensure the integrity and quality of the database, ACAP (or whomever maintains the database) cannot guarantee the accuracy of the datasets contained herein.
7. The following statement shall be placed on the cover page of working papers, information papers, reports and any other documents tabled at meetings of the Advisory Committee or Working Groups, or circulated inter-sessionally to members of the Secretariat, ACAP officials, Working Group members or invited experts:

‘This paper is presented for consideration by ACAP and may contain unpublished data, analyses, and/or conclusions subject to change. Data in this paper shall not be cited or used for purposes other than the work of the ACAP Secretariat, ACAP Advisory Committee or their subsidiary Working Groups without the permission of the original data holders.’

## **ANNEX 4: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE BREEDING SITES WORKING GROUP**

The following Terms of Reference were agreed at AC4.

The ACAP Advisory Committee established a Working Group on Breeding Sites at its first meeting.

The aims of this group are:

- to oversee the collection, collation and maintenance of the most up to date information on management of, and threats to, the breeding sites of albatrosses and petrels listed on Annex 1 of the ACAP Agreement
- to assess the threats to breeding sites of the listed species and identify gaps in knowledge
- to consider and apply criteria for the identification of internationally important breeding sites
- to work with other groups in identifying those threats to breeding sites that are priorities for management
- to develop, review and maintain best-practice guidelines to mitigate selected threats to breeding sites

**ANNEX 5: BREEDING SITE WORKING GROUP WORK PROGRAMME  
PROPOSED FOR APPROVAL AT AC5 (can be viewed with Tracked  
Changes from previous programme).**

	<b>Topic/Task</b>	<b>Responsible group</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>	<b>Progress in inter-sessional period</b>
3.1	Revise the database lists and structures	BSWG (Secretariat)	Ongoing	
3.2	Complete, review and update ACAP database	BSWG (Secretariat)	Ongoing	
3.3	Assess the threats to breeding sites and identify gaps in knowledge	BSWG	Ongoing	
3.4	Develop, review and update best-practice guidelines to mitigate selected threats to breeding sites	BSWG	As required (pending review of main threats to North Pacific spp.)	
3.5	Review evidence for impacts of pathogens and parasites on ACAP species and effectiveness of mitigation measures	BSWG, lead France, Argentina	AC6	
3.6	Provide and consider annual reports to AC on BSWG activities	BSWG and AC	AC6	
	Assist Secretariat and AC with development and provision of information on the agreed indicators and national reporting queries	WG Convenors and Secretariat	AC6	
	Identify and prioritise conservation measures required for each species and by each Party to the Agreement	WG Convenors and <i>ad-hoc</i> group, lead New Zealand	AC6 and ongoing	