



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

**Fourth Meeting of Advisory Committee**

*Cape Town, South Africa, 22 – 25 August 2008*

---

**Title: Report on the Implementation of the Agreement  
on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels  
2006-2008**

**Author: Secretariat**



# **REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AGREEMENT ON THE CONSERVATION OF ALBATROSSES AND PETRELS, 2006-2008**

## **Purpose**

This report has been compiled pursuant to Article X (j) and in fulfilment of Articles VII (1)(c) and IX (6)(d) of the Agreement. The information contained within the report has been obtained by the Secretariat from Parties pursuant to Article VII (1) (c) and Article VIII (10). A key function of the Advisory Committee (AC) is to report to the MOP on the implementation of the Agreement. The key objectives for reporting on the implementation of the Agreement are to:

- provide information regarding the assessment of progress towards the objectives of the Agreement;
- gather information on lessons learned, including successes and failures, in order to conduct albatross and petrel conservation in the most efficient and effective manner; and
- provide a resource of material on albatross and petrel conservation.

## **Methods**

Parties, Range States and others were requested to submit a report to the Secretariat using the format revised at AC3 (see AC3 report, Annex 8). Information provided was collated by the Secretariat and presented in tabular format for ease of assessing completeness of reports and progress in achieving the objectives of the Agreement.

## **Results**

Reports were received from eight Parties, three Range States and one international Non Government Organisation. Most of the reports received followed the reporting format prescribed in Annex 8 of the record of the third meeting of the ACAP Advisory Committee (AC3), and covered the period June 2006 to March 2008, as well as including earlier information where relevant. Not all respondents reported against every reporting item.

The reports indicate a substantial amount of work being done to implement the Agreement, and this paper does not attempt to provide an exhaustive summary of that which is contained in the individual reports. Rather, it is a summary of reported activities with specific reference to the Action Plan, the AC Work Programme, and the Agreement, as appropriate. The individual reports should be consulted for detailed information about the various programmes and activities. The relevant documents are as follows: Argentina (AC4 Doc 42), Australia (AC4 Doc 43), Brazil (AC4 Doc 44), Chile (AC4 Doc 32), New Zealand (AC4 Doc 48), Peru (AC4 Doc 37), South Africa (AC4 Doc 51), the United Kingdom (AC4 Doc 53), the United States (AC4 Doc 54), Uruguay (AC4 Doc 43), and BirdLife International (AC4 Doc 55).

As with the report provided to MOP2, in an attempt to gauge the progress of Parties in implementing the Agreement, a brief assessment of Parties' reported actions in response to the major threats to seabirds was conducted and is provided in Table 2. In most cases, the Parties

that submitted information to the Interim Secretariat are addressing these threats to some extent. It is not possible, however, to gauge ACAP Parties' total progress because not all Parties provided information for the preparation of this report.

Although these data represent advances in individual nations' conservation efforts, there still exists a gap in information, either on reported or in actual activities, carried out by those that did not submit a report. It is essential that this gap be filled so that a full and accurate evaluation of the Parties' progress in implementation can be conducted.

The value of the current reporting is difficult to gauge because although it is apparent much is being done by the Parties, Range States and others that did report, it is not possible to assess if the actions taken have been successful in achieving the objectives of the Agreement i.e has a favourable conservation status of albatross and petrels been achieved and maintained (Article II.1). It is only when performance indicators have been developed that the Agreement will be able to determine this.

Paper AC4 Doc 64 outlines a process for identifying priority conservation issues, using information from the Species Assessments prepared recently. The process outlined will analyse each breeding site/population against four key criteria: (1) population trend, (2) demographic parameters, (3) threats at breeding sites, and (4) threats at sea, and establish baseline data against these criteria. As well as being useful for prioritising conservation issues, the process can also be used in future to assess if populations have increased, declined, or remained stable, and if actions by Parties and Range States have seen a reduction in the impact of key threats such as bycatch levels. Such a process is likely to be of greater value in determining progress toward implementation of the Agreement than the analysis of Party reports is currently able to achieve and it is proposed to include the results of this analysis as a component of this report when it is submitted to MoP3.

The reports submitted by Parties contain extensive information that will be difficult to convey to the Meeting of Parties in a form that can be readily synthesised. One way of allowing the MoP to gain an insight into what action is currently being taken to implement the Agreement would be for each Party to provide a short (150-200 word) summary of their activities, or provide an example of a conservation action taken, over the reporting period. Parties could provide this either prior to or at the AC4 Meeting, so that it can be included in a 'Highlights' section of the report provided by the AC to the MoP. At the same time, Parties, Range States and others could check the Secretariat's assessment of their reports in Tables 1 and 2 and correct any misinterpretations, thus avoiding the need for editorial corrections to the report being raised on the floor of the AC meeting.

#### **Action by Parties, Range States and Others**

Parties, Ranges States and Others are requested to:

- check the Secretariat's summary of their reports to ensure that the summary tables accurately reflect the content of their reports; and
- provide a short (150 - 200 word) summary of activities over the reporting period for inclusion in the report on implementation of the Agreement provided to the Meeting of Parties.

Table 1. Reporting by Parties, Ranges States and Others for the period 2006—2008 against items for which information was requested by the ACAP Secretariat. Gaps in the table indicate that reporting was not received, and do not necessarily mean that a Party, Range State of other body did not carry out action against a particular item.

ACAP Contracting Parties, Range States & Others	Species Conservation	Habitat	Human Activities	Research	Education
	Outline of planned activities Management of non-native species Exemptions on take Use and Trade Species conservation plans Emergency Measures Re-establishment schemes Other conservation projects	Measures to protect breeding site  Manage food resources Important marine area management	Environmental Impact Statements Bycatch management IUU Marine Pollution Minimise disturbance	Ongoing Research Programmes	Fisheries bycatch observers  Information/Training user audiences" Information/Training - general public  Implementation Summary
<b>PARTIES</b>					
Argentina	● ● ● ● ● ●	● ● ●	● ● ● ●	●	● ● ● ●
Australia	● ● ● ● ● ● ●	● ● ●	● ● ● ● ●	●	● ● ● ●
Chile	● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●	● ● ●	● ● ● ● ●	●	● ● ● ●
Ecuador	. . . . . . . .	. . .	. . . . .	.	. . . . .
France	● . ● ● ● ● ● ●	● ● ●	● ● ● ● ●	●	● ● ● ●
New Zealand	● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●	● ● ●	● ● ● ● ●	●	● ● ● ●
Norway	. . . . . . . .	. . .	. . . . .	.	. . . . .
Peru	● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●	● ● ●	● ● ● ● ●	●	● ● ● ●
South Africa	● ● . . . . . .	● ● .	● ● ● ● ●	●	● ● ● ●
Spain	. . . . . . . .	. . .	. . . . .	.	. . . . .
United Kingdom	● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●	● ● ●	● ● ● ● ●	●	● ● ● ●

Table 1. continued

ACAP Contracting Parties, Range States & Others	Species Conservation	Habitat	Human Activities	Research	Education
	Outline of planned activities Management of non-native species Exemptions on take Use and Trade Species conservation plans Emergency Measures Re-establishment schemes Other conservation projects	Measures to protect breeding site Exemptions on take Minimise disturbance	Environmental Impact Statements Bycatch management IUU Marine Pollution Minimise disturbance	Ongoing Research Programmes	Fisheries bycatch observers Information/Training user audiences" Information/Training - general public Implementation Summary
<b>RANGE STATES</b>					
Brazil	. . ● ● ● . . ● .	● . . . .	. ● ● ● ● ● .	● . . . .	● . . ● . ● . ●
Uruguay	. . . . ● . . ● .	. . . . .	. ● . . . .	. . . . .	. . . . .
U.S.A.	● . . ● ● ●	. . . . .	● ● ● . .	● ● ● . .	● ● . ● . ● .
<b>OTHERS</b>					
BirdLife	● ● .	● ● ●	●	● ●	● ● ● ●
<b>LEGEND</b>	● Activity has been reported upon ● Activity has been reported upon, but does not relate to ACAP species				

**Table 2. Assessment of the actions undertaken by ACAP Parties, Range States and Others in relation to key conservation issues for Albatrosses and Petrels.**

	Argentina	Australia	Chile	Ecuador	France	New Zealand	Norway	Peru	South Africa	Spain	United Kingdom	Brazil	Uruguay	USA	BirdLife
<b>Species Conservation</b>															
Recovery/Action plans in place															
– for some breeding ACAP species/populations		●			●			●				N/A	N/A	N/A	4
– for all breeding ACAP species/populations						●						N/A	N/A	N/A	
Management of non-native species															
– action underway for populations under threat		●			●	●		N/A			●	N/A	N/A	N/A	4
– quarantine procedures planned for breeding sites								N/A			●	N/A	N/A	N/A	
– quarantine procedures in place for breeding sites		●				●		N/A	●			N/A	N/A	N/A	
Use and trade of Annex 1 Species?	No	No	No	No		No		●			No	No			
Measures underway to eliminate IUU fishing	●	●	●		●	●					3	●		●	
<b>Habitat Conservation</b>															
Legal & policy instruments completed to protect breeding sites	●	●	●		●	●		N/A	●		●	N/A		N/A	4
Sustainable management of marine resources allows for seabird prey species.		●	●					●			2				4
Marine Protected Areas relevant to Annex 1 Species:															
– under consideration						●		●			●	●			4
– established	●	●	●		●										4
Tourist visitation to breeding sites managed/not permitted		●	●			●		N/A			●	N/A	N/A	N/A	

	Argentina	Australia	Chile	Ecuador	France	New Zealand	Norway	Peru	South Africa	Spain	United Kingdom	Brazil	Uruguay	USA	BirdLife
<b>Fisheries Bycatch</b>															
NPOA in place															
– in place, longline method only			●								1		●	●	4
– in place, includes trawling						●					1				4
– under development	●	●						●	●						4
National fishery observer programs															
– Under development			●					●							
– in place, target species only		●				●						●			
– in place, bycatch species included	●	●			●	●						●		●	4
– dead seabirds (killed as bycatch) collected for provenance & other studies		●				●			●					●	
Bycatch levels:															
– quantified, declining		●			●						●			●	
– quantified, increasing															
– quantified, no change over last 5 years															
Mitigation measures															
– being trialled	●	●			●						●	●		●	4
– in use and mandatory	●	●	●		●	●			●		●		●	●	

	Argentina	Australia	Chile	Ecuador	France	New Zealand	Norway	Peru	South Africa	Spain	U.K	Brazil	Uruguay	USA	BirdLife
<b>Research Programmes</b>															
Population monitoring programmes															
– for some breeding ACAP species/populations	●	●	●	●		●		N/A	●		●	N/A			4
– for all breeding ACAP species/populations								N/A				N/A			
Tracking studies															
– planned					●	●			●						4
– underway					●	●			●		●	●			4
Bycatch mitigation research															
– pelagic longline methods		●				●			●		●	●		●	4
– demersal longline methods		●			●				?		●	●		●	4
– trawl methods	●					●			●					●	4
<b>Education and Public Awareness</b>															
Dissemination of information / training for scientists, fishermen, conservation bodies, & decision-makers															
	●	●	●		●	●		●	●		●	●		●	●
Dissemination of information / training for general public															
	●	●			●						●	●		●	●
<b>LEGEND</b>															
●	Activity has been reported upon														
N/A	Not applicable														
1	NPOA prepared for some UK overseas territories in the South Atlantic														
2	Considered in one fishery operating in the South Atlantic														
3	Effective measures to combat IUU in place, with exception of Tristan da Cunha														
4	Working with Parties and Range States to plan and implement conservation action														

## **Annex 1. Summary of activities by ACAP Parties, Range States and Others.**

### **United States of America**

The United States has taken a number of actions relevant to ACAP's objectives. U.S. and Japanese collaborative efforts have resulted in development of successful methods for translocation of short-tailed albatross chicks. U.S. scientists are continuing research on mitigation measures for demersal and pelagic longline fisheries. Research on demersal longlines mitigation has resulting in refined requirements for gear construction to improve effectiveness of mitigation devices, and elimination of mitigation requirements where they were unnecessary to minimize regulatory and cost burdens. Research was also initiated on trawl fishery overlap with foraging albatrosses in Alaska and testing gear that can effectively reduce trawl warp cable interactions with seabirds. US scientists contributed to BirdLife International's Global Procellariiforme Tracking Database which has proven to be an effective tool in identifying fisheries that may potentially impact seabirds. U.S. activities at RFMO meetings were consistent with U.S. goals for international seabird conservation, and ACAP's objectives, including active participation in negotiations of mitigation measures, encouraging other key members to work collaboratively to develop mitigation measures, and supporting assessments of seabirds affected by fisheries. In addition, the U.S. provided species information on the three north Pacific albatross species to assist ACAP Parties in considering whether or not to list these species.