

 <p>Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels</p>	<p>Thirteenth Meeting of the Advisory Committee <i>Edinburgh, United Kingdom, 22 – 26 May 2023</i></p> <p>Report of the Joint Eleventh Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group and Seventh Meeting of the Population and Conservation Status Working Group</p> <p><i>SBWG and PaCSWG Convenors and Vice-convenors</i></p>
---	---

1. WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS	2
2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA	2
3. OVERLAP OF BIRDS AND AT-SEA THREATS	2
3.1. Review of tracking studies for risk assessments	2
3.2. Offshore energy infrastructure developments and associated risks	5
3.3. Other at-sea threats	6
4. ACAP PRIORITY POPULATIONS	6
4.1. Review key research and management actions for current ACAP Priority Populations.	6
4.2. Development of an ACAP strategy for Priority Populations – reporting template and priority fisheries	6
4.3. Proposals for High Priority Populations	7
5. LISTING OF SPECIES ON ANNEX 1	7
5.1. List of candidate species.....	7
5.2. Proposals to list species on Annex 1	8
6. REPORTING TO AC13	8
7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS	8
8. CLOSING REMARKS	9
<i>ANNEX 1. LIST OF JOINT SBWG11/PaCSWG7 MEETING PARTICIPANTS</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>ANNEX 2: PROPOSED REPORTING TEMPLATE FOR ACAP'S HIGH PRIORITY POPULATIONS</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>ANNEX 3: 2023 LIST OF CANDIDATE PROCELLARIIFORMES FOR LISTING ON ANNEX 1 OF ACAP</i>	<i>13</i>

Joint Eleventh Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group and Seventh Meeting of the Population and Conservation Status Working Group

Edinburgh, United Kingdom, 18 May 2023

1. WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

This Report documents discussions and recommendations of the Joint Eleventh Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group and Seventh Meeting of the Population and Conservation Status Working Group, held in Edinburgh, United Kingdom on 18 May 2023.

SBWG Co-Convenors, Igor Debbski (New Zealand) and Sebastián Jiménez (Uruguay), SBWG Vice-convenors Juan Pablo Seco Pon (Argentina) and Dimas Gianuca (Brazil), PaCSWG Co-convenors Patricia Serafini (Brazil) and Marco Favero (Argentina), and PaCSWG Vice-convenor Richard Phillips (UK) welcomed all meeting attendees (**ANNEX 1**) to the Joint Meeting of SBWG11 and PaCSWG7.

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The Meeting adopted the proposed agenda and meeting documents (**SBWG11/ PaCSWG7 Doc 01** and **SBWG11/ PaCSWG7 Doc 02 Rev 1**).

3. OVERLAP OF BIRDS AND AT-SEA THREATS

3.1. Review of tracking studies for risk assessments

Meeting participants were reminded that ACAP has nine High Priority Populations. These represent >10% of global numbers, are in steep decline (> 3% a year) and face a major threat from bycatch in fisheries.

SBWG11/PaCSWG7 Doc 04 illustrated the overlap of eight of the nine ACAP High Priority Populations with EEZs, and areas of competence of RFMOs (Regional Fishery Management Organisations) and CCAMLR (Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources). Six of these eight populations spent more time in the high seas than in any EEZ during the year. The Meeting noted that the analyses were based on the year-round (breeding and nonbreeding) distributions of adults, and did not account for potential differences in the year-round distributions of juveniles and immatures. The Meeting agreed that the information in the document was essential to communicating conservation issues, particularly the risk from fisheries, to different target audiences, guiding the engagement strategy with RFMOs, as well as better understanding those Parties and Range States where urgent action is needed. The Meeting agreed that the effectiveness with which ACAP communicates the conservation crisis needs to be improved. Ideas for improvements included:

- (i) Use of economic arguments when engaging with fisheries managers;
- (ii) Making clear that setting an 'allowable catch' of seabirds would be impractical because the same ACAP species or population can be bycaught in multiple regions and fisheries, and by different flag states (from which independent data on bycatch rates would be required), and would risk public opprobrium;
- (iii) Use of arguments from, and cooperation with, sympathetic individuals in the fishing industry that could be ambassadors for seabird conservation;
- (iv) Ensuring ACAP Resolutions include clear messages on the albatross and petrel conservation crisis;
- (v) Greater and targeted use of infographics;
- (vi) Targeted communications for managers of priority fisheries and individuals involved in the supply chain;
- (vii) Collaboration with other entities focused on conservation and reducing bycatch of other taxa;
- (viii) Working with other programmes (including NGOs) to generate educational products in support of a comprehensive, coordinated ACAP education strategy.

Communication activities need to be prioritised. The meeting considered that an intersessional sub-group including ACAP's Communications Advisor and members of ACAP Working Groups is essential for the further development of a comprehensive communication strategy.

It was noted that the waters of Namibia and Angola, two countries that are not yet ACAP Parties, were important for ACAP High Priority Populations. The Meeting encouraged actions to engage with such Range States.

SBWG11 Doc 13 reviewed best practices in evaluating the effects of fisheries on seabirds and other taxa. Recommendations in this document were considered valuable, although the setting of a quantitative population objective for Favourable Conservation Status for albatross and petrel populations could be controversial.

SBWG11/PaCSWG7 Inf 03 highlighted the importance of fine-scale analyses and of covering the full range of life-history stages. Use of loggers that detect vessel radar was considered to be a useful complement to AIS data for mapping vessel overlap as it overcomes to some extent the problem that some vessels do not have, or switch off AIS transmitters.

SBWG11/PaCSWG7 Inf 07 also emphasised the importance of tracking all life-history stages, which in this study revealed a potential bycatch hotspot associated with the Japanese longline fleet in the southeast Atlantic for juvenile and immature grey-headed albatrosses from South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)¹. This would not have been apparent from tracking of adults.

SBWG11/PaCSWG7 Inf 02 described a useful tool for analysing tracking data, and **SBWG11/PaCSWG7 Inf 08** illustrated the use of tracking data in identifying candidate marine protected areas. ACAP should consider developing guidelines for good practice in analysing tracking data and fisheries overlap analyses.

¹ A dispute exists between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland concerning sovereignty over the Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas), South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands (Islas Georgias del Sur e Islas Sándwich del Sur) and the surrounding maritime areas

SBWG11/PaCSWG7 Inf 04 showed that one year of tracking data with a good sample size can be used to describe foraging areas during the breeding season that remain consistent over several years. It was noted that distributions may change over the longer-term, and that this proxy may not work as well at fine scales in some seabird species during the non-breeding season when they do not behave as central-place foragers.

SBWG11/PaCSWG7 Inf 15 demonstrated that coarse-scale tracking data can be useful in fine-scale analysis of interactions between albatrosses and fishing vessels, and **SBWG11/PaCSWG7 Inf 10** further demonstrated that combining at-sea observations and tracking data in the same study provides complementary information and overcomes some of the potential limitations.

SBWG11/PaCSWG7 Inf 05 and **SBWG11/PaCSWG7 Inf 06** both demonstrated progress in understanding drivers of at-sea distribution of seabirds.

SBWG11/PaCSWG7 Inf 16, **SBWG11/PaCSWG7 Inf 17**, **SBWG11/PaCSWG7 Inf 18** and **SBWG11/PaCSWG7 Inf 19** presented developments in understanding the distribution of ACAP species away from their colonies.

SBWG11/PaCSWG7 Inf 13 described a new study that aims to identify flyways for seabirds, including seven ACAP-listed species.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SBWG11 and PaCSWG7 jointly recommend that the Advisory Committee:

1. Use the information on time spent in different national and high seas areas, and in RFMOs and CCAMLR areas to develop a targeted engagement strategy to promote the conservation of the ACAP High Priority Populations.
2. Enhance communication with specific audiences, especially RFMOs and fisheries, developing dedicated material on conservation status and highlighting the responsibilities of these management bodies for addressing the conservation crisis for the ACAP High Priority Populations.
3. Create a group within ACAP to improve communication of the conservation crisis for albatrosses and petrels, refining and implementing the communication strategy.
4. Encourage more ACAP engagement with Angola and Namibia given the importance of their waters for ACAP High Priority Populations.
5. Encourage development of tools for assessing interim, quantitative population objectives for Favourable Conservation Status, and identify regional management units for ACAP-listed species, starting with the High Priority Populations.
6. Encourage and contribute to the use and development of user-friendly tools for spatial analysis of seabird-fisheries overlap at species and population levels.
7. Encourage the further development of ACAP guidelines for seabird-fisheries overlap analysis.

3.2. Offshore energy infrastructure developments and associated risks

SBWG11/PaCSWG7 Doc 03 provided an assessment of offshore wind farm (OWF) infrastructure development in Australia, with risk assessment for ACAP species, based on life-history traits, distribution, and behaviour. Australia is developing arrangements to manage OWFs, and this paper examined potential environmental impacts, including collision risks, barrier and displacement effects. The paper notes the paucity of data for assessing the specific threats to ACAP-listed albatrosses and petrels, and other seabirds in the southern hemisphere. Australia is working towards filling data gaps to assist in the environmental approval and regulation of OWFs domestically.

The Meeting noted the development of offshore wind farms contributing to the industrialization of the marine environment, and the need to reduce knowledge gaps for developing regulations and research program strategies. Key information is lacking about seabirds, such as species flight heights, as well as concerning OWF impacts on seabirds including for modelling of collision risks, barrier effects, and avoidance and displacement behaviours. Innovative technologies are required to fill data gaps and monitor interactions. The Meeting noted that the key to reducing potential impacts was careful consideration of site suitability at an early stage. The Meeting agreed on the value of sharing information, including through a repository on the ACAP website, and of continuing discussions among Parties. CMS (Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals) may also serve as a resource for ACAP as it has set up a special energy-related task force that is considering OWF impacts to seabirds.

SBWG11/PaCSWG7 Inf 01 provided an ecological risk assessment of OWF infrastructure development in Australia, highlighting the ACAP species at potentially greatest risk of interactions.

SBWG11/PaCSWG7 Inf 09 provided an environmental assessment of proposed areas for OWF off southern Brazil based on ecological niche modelling and a species richness index for albatrosses and petrels. The paper highlighted high priority areas for monitoring and highlighted the value of ecological niche modelling in planning for OWF.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SBWG11 and PaCSWG7 jointly recommend that the Advisory Committee:

1. Recognise the potential adverse effects of offshore wind farm infrastructure on albatrosses and petrels.
2. Recognise the importance of undertaking and sharing research to improve the understanding of the potential impacts of offshore wind farms on albatrosses and petrels.
3. Request that Parties and Observers supply information relating to the effects of offshore wind farm development on ACAP species or other similar seabirds to the Secretariat

3.3. Other at-sea threats

SBWG11/PaCSWG7 Inf 11 presented mitigation standards developed in New Zealand to address the threat of artificial light at sea, which can attract birds, resulting in injuries or contamination of plumage if birds collide with superstructure or land on decks. Mitigation standards regarding artificial light are now applicable to all New Zealand commercial fishing vessels, and have been tailored according to heterogeneous lighting requirements.

SBWG11/PaCSWG7 Inf 12 summarizes the research done by New Zealand to estimate exposure to anthropogenic light at sea for 179 individuals of seven procellariiform species using geolocators. The proportion of each species exposed to artificial light at night was highly variable, with high levels south-east of New Zealand and Australia, and in the northern Pacific.

The Meeting noted that links to existing resources about the impacts and measures to address the impacts of artificial light are available on the ACAP website.

4. ACAP PRIORITY POPULATIONS

4.1. Review key research and management actions for current ACAP Priority Populations.

Several of the Working Documents and Information Papers for this item had already been discussed under previous agenda items, including **SBWG11/PaCSWG7 Inf 14 Rev 1**, **SBWG11/PaCSWG7 Inf 04**, **SBWG11/PaCSWG7 Inf 06**, and **SBWG11/PaCSWG7 Inf 07**. The Meeting noted that documents on the ACAP Priority Populations already discussed under Agenda Item 3 could be used to refine ACAP's RFMO and CCAMLR Engagement Strategy and the identification of priority fisheries.

4.2. Development of an ACAP strategy for Priority Populations – reporting template and priority fisheries

SBWG11/PaCSWG7 Doc 06 presented a revised draft ACAP High Priority Population reporting template for discussion and review. The template had been presented to both SBWG9 and PaCSWG6 for review and endorsement, but no agreement had been reached on the proposed document or reporting responsibilities. The document also proposed, to avoid duplication of effort, that the template be embedded in the ACAP database and form part of the annual cycle of AC reporting. The report could be further linked to the triennial implementation reporting to the Meeting of the Parties in the same way as the wider prioritisation framework for conservation actions.

The Secretariat's Science Officer clarified how the report could be populated and reminded participants that the template was not intended to replace a comprehensive action or management plan for the population or species. Rather than reviewing all actions, the focus is intended to be only on progress against a handful of tasks identified as being of the highest priority.

The Meeting made some suggestions on the report template to both simplify and clarify the questions to be reported against. It was also agreed that a set of instructions would be prepared to accompany the reporting template to help guide those completing the form. The revised template is provided in **ANNEX 2**.

The Meeting noted that as no process was in place to extract information provided in the reports in order to assess progress against actions for the High Priority Populations, it was agreed that the template undergoes a one-year trial by the Parties. Information reported and feedback received can then be used to guide what outputs can be generated. Results from the trial could be presented at the next meeting of the Working Groups and AC14 in 2024.

4.3. Proposals for High Priority Populations

There were no proposals for any additional ACAP High Priority Populations.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SBWG11 and PaCSWG7 jointly recommend that the Advisory Committee:

1. Encourage and contribute to the use and further development of tools and guidelines to address spatial analysis of seabird-fisheries overlap, at ACAP Priority Population level, especially for RFMOs and CCAMLR.
2. Request that Parties use the draft reporting template for Priority Populations, and suggest any changes which should be made.
3. Consider responses to the template and recommend its implementation at the next meeting of the Working Groups and AC14 in 2024.

5. LISTING OF SPECIES ON ANNEX 1

5.1. List of candidate species

The Meeting recalled the unresolved issues with the scoring system used to construct a weighted list of species for listing in Annex 1 as described in **SBWG7 Doc 25**. The issues are primarily linked to the definition of 'threat' and how to score threat where there are few data to inform decisions. The Meeting decided to work intersessionally to resolve these issues.

The Meeting recognised the ongoing value of the current process to construct the weighted list (**AC3 Doc 18**) and the rankings therein, noting the rankings should only be used as guide to listing proposals. The updated list should be presented to each meeting of the Advisory Committee. The current list of candidate species is provided in **ANNEX 3**.

The Meeting noted that ACAP Working Groups can make recommendations to Parties on candidate species to list on Annex 1 and had done so previously. It also agreed that from now on, the Taxonomy Working Group would lead on updating the weighted list of species for inclusion in Annex 1.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SBWG11 and PaCSWG7 jointly recommend that the Advisory Committee:

1. Notes the formation of an intersessional correspondence group to further refine the criteria and scoring for the weighted list of candidate species for inclusion on Annex 1.
2. Notes that from now on, the Taxonomy Working Group, in consultation with other Working Groups, will lead on updating the weighted list of species for inclusion on Annex 1.

5.2. Proposals to list species on Annex 1

There were no new proposals to list additional species on Annex 1.

6. REPORTING TO AC13

This report was prepared for consideration by the Advisory Committee.

7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The Meeting recalled the CMS intersessional group on intentional take and mutilation of bills and asked for an update on any progress achieved. Igor Debski and Sebastián Jiménez were the SBWG representatives on the CMS intersessional group, but other meeting participants also engaged in this task. It was noted that after consultations with several countries a report on the spatial extent of the problem is being prepared to be presented to the next CMS Conference of the Parties (October 2023).

Meeting attendees briefly discussed the value of further joint meetings of SBWG and PaCSWG. There was an agreement about the merit of having joint discussion on cross-cutting issues. It was noted that some of the conservation issues not yet reflected in the terms of reference of any Working Groups, for example Offshore Wind Farm Infrastructure, could be addressed under the PaCSWG agenda.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SBWG11 and PaCSWG7 jointly recommend that the Advisory Committee:

1. Endorse a joint meeting of SBWG12 and PaCSWG8 preceding AC14 to further discuss cross-cutting issues.

8. CLOSING REMARKS

The PaCSWG and SBWG Convenors and PaCWG Vice-convenor thanked those present, and the authors of papers and rapporteurs, for their valuable contributions to the meeting. The Science Officer was thanked for her diligence and commitment to assisting the work of the Meeting. Meeting attendees, the ACAP Secretariat and ACAP officials were thanked for their work during and in preparation of the meeting. Convenors gratefully acknowledged the host Country for the logistics provided, and Cecilia Alal and Sandra Hale for their interpretation services, and the sound technician for his help.

ANNEX 1. LIST OF JOINT SBWG11/PaCSWG7 MEETING PARTICIPANTS

SBWG/PaCSWG Members	
Igor Debski	SBWG Co-convenor, Department of Conservation, New Zealand
Sebastián Jiménez	SBWG Co-convenor, Dirección Nacional de Recursos Acuáticos, Uruguay
Dimas Gianuca	SBWG Co-viceconvenor, BirdLife International
Juan Pablo Seco Pon	SBWG Co-viceconvenor, Instituto de Investigaciones Marinas y Costeras, CONICET-UNMDP, Argentina
Marco Favero	PaCSWG Co-convenor, Instituto de Investigaciones Marinas y Costeras, CONICET-UNMDP, Argentina
Patricia Pereira Serafini	PaCSWG Co-convenor, Brazil
Richard Phillips	PaCSWG Vice-convenor, BAS, United Kingdom
Luis Adasme	Instituto de Fomento Pesquero, Chile
José Carlos Baez	Spanish Oceanographic Institute
Barry Baker	Institute for Marine and Antarctic Studies (IMAS), Australia
Jonathon Barrington	Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water, Australian Antarctic Division, Australia
Ana Carneiro	BirdLife International
Andrés Domingo	Dirección Nacional de Recursos Acuáticos, Uruguay
Caroline Fox	Environment and Climate Change Canada
Eric Gilman	Fisheries Research Group
Verónica Iriarte	United Kingdom
Verónica López	Advisor, Chile
Ed Melvin	University of Washington, USA
Gabriela Navarro	Subsecretaría de Pesca y Acuicultura, Argentina
Tatiana Neves	Projeto Albatroz, Brazil
Cristián Suazo	Albatross Task Force - Chile, BirdLife International
Mark Tasker	Joint Nature Conservation Committee, United Kingdom/ TWG Convenor
Megan Tierney	Joint Nature Conservation Committee, United Kingdom
Advisory Committee Members, Representatives and Advisors	
Orea Anderson	Advisor, United Kingdom
Elizabeth Biott	Alternate Representative, United Kingdom
Kristopher Blake	Alternate Representative, United Kingdom
Robert Crawford	Representative, South Africa
Mike Double	AC Chair

Marcelo Garcia	Member, Chile
Sue Gregory	Advisor, United Kingdom
Andrei Langeloh Roos	Advisor, Brazil
María Andrea Meza	Representative, Peru

Observers

Nicola Beynon	Humane Society International
Bernadette Butfield	BirdLife International
Gabriel Canani	AATM-FURG/Projeto Albatroz, Brazil
Esteban Frere	BirdLife International
Stephanie Good	University of Exeter
Thomas Good	USA
Zoe Jacobs	Independent
Mi Ae Kim	USA
Thierry Micol	BirdLife International
Daisuke Ochi	NRIFR, Japan
Yann Rouxel	BirdLife International
Jonathan Rutter	University of Oxford
Ben Steele-Mortimer	Seafood New Zealand Ltd
Leandro Tamini	BirdLife International
Desmond Tom	Namibia
Sachiko Tsuji	NRIFR, Japan
Susan Waugh	BirdLife International
Yu-Min Yeh	Chinese Taipei

ACAP Secretariat

Christine Bogle	Executive Secretary
Bree Forrer	Communications Advisor
Wiesława Misiak	Science Officer

Interpreters

Cecilia Alal
Sandra Hale

ANNEX 2: PROPOSED REPORTING TEMPLATE FOR ACAP'S HIGH PRIORITY POPULATIONS

ACAP High Priority Population:

Population coordinator (responsible for collating report):

Breeding sites:

ACAP Parties, Range States and management bodies responsible for at-sea range:

Action #:
Is the action at breeding sites or at sea?
Action already identified in existing Action/Management Plan for the species/ population/breeding site? (Reference to document text/page/table)
Is this: Priority research, conservation action, education, policy, other?
What needs to be done?
Timeframe
Have any steps been taken since the last report (date)?
Who by?
For completed actions, was their effectiveness as planned?
If not, why not?
For ongoing actions, what remains to be done?
How will this be achieved?
Compiled by/contributors to this action:
Overall progress for this action: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fully achieved (to schedule and level of desired effectiveness) • Partially achieved • No progress/Failed

ANNEX 3: 2023 LIST OF CANDIDATE PROCELLARIIFORMES FOR LISTING ON ANNEX 1 OF ACAP

List of Procellariiformes following IOC World Bird List v13.1^{1,2}, sorted by suitability of species for inclusion on Annex 1 of the Agreement (descending total weighted score with at-sea threats double weighted). Asterisks and red font indicate species already listed on Annex 1. Cells highlighted in yellow indicate taxonomic and score changes since the table was last presented as **MoP7 Inf 02**.

Common name	Scientific name	IUCN ³ status	CMS ⁴ listing	Endemism	Migratory	Land-based threats	At-sea threats	Weighted Total
Grey-headed Albatross*	<i>Thalassarche chrysostoma</i>	3	1	4	4	3	4	23
White-chinned Petrel*	<i>Procellaria aequinoctialis</i>	2	1	3	4	4	4	22
Grey Petrel*	<i>Procellaria cinerea</i>	1	1	4	4	4	4	22
Wandering Albatross*	<i>Diomedea exulans</i>	2	1	3	4	3	4	21
Southern Giant Petrel*	<i>Macronectes giganteus</i>	0	1	4	4	4	4	21
Sooty Albatross*	<i>Phoebetria fusca</i>	3	1	2	4	3	4	21
Light-mantled Albatross*	<i>Phoebetria palpebrata</i>	1	1	4	4	3	4	21
Northern Giant Petrel*	<i>Macronectes halli</i>	0	1	4	4	3	4	20
Indian Yellow-nosed Albatross*	<i>Thalassarche carteri</i>	3	1	1	4	3	4	20
Black-browed Albatross*	<i>Thalassarche melanophris</i>	0	1	4	4	3	4	20
Salvin's Albatross*	<i>Thalassarche salvini</i>	2	1	2	4	3	4	20
Sooty Shearwater	<i>Ardenna grisea</i>	1	0	3	4	3	4	19
Antipodean Albatross*	<i>Diomedea antipodensis</i>	3	4	0	3	1	4	19
Tristan Albatross*	<i>Diomedea dabbenena</i>	4	1	0	4	2	4	19
Northern Fulmar	<i>Fulmarus glacialis</i>	0	0	4	4	3	4	19
Laysan Albatross*	<i>Phoebastria immutabilis</i>	1	1	2	4	3	4	19
Yelkouan Shearwater	<i>Puffinus yelkouan</i>	2	0	4	4	3	3	19
Flesh-footed Shearwater	<i>Ardenna carneipes</i>	1	0	2	4	3	4	18
Wedge-tailed Shearwater	<i>Ardenna pacifica</i>	0	0	4	4	4	3	18
Scopoli's Shearwater	<i>Calonectris diomedea</i>	0	0	4	4	4	3	18
Short-tailed Albatross*	<i>Phoebastria albatrus</i>	2	2	0	4	2	4	18
Black-footed Albatross*	<i>Phoebastria nigripes</i>	1	1	1	4	3	4	18
Westland Petrel*	<i>Procellaria westlandica</i>	3	1	0	4	2	4	18
Balearic Shearwater*	<i>Puffinus mauretanicus</i>	4	2	0	4	2	3	18
Northern Royal Albatross*	<i>Diomedea sanfordi</i>	3	1	0	4	1	4	17
Waved Albatross*	<i>Phoebastria irrorata</i>	4	1	0	2	2	4	17
Black Petrel*	<i>Procellaria parkinsoni</i>	2	1	0	4	2	4	17
Atlantic Yellow-nosed Albatross*	<i>Thalassarche chlororhynchos</i>	3	1	0	4	1	4	17
Chatham Albatross*	<i>Thalassarche eremita</i>	2	1	1	4	1	4	17
Pink-footed Shearwater*	<i>Ardenna creatopus</i>	2	2	0	4	2	3	16

Common name	Scientific name	IUCN ³ status	CMS ⁴ listing	Endemism	Migratory	Land-based threats	At-sea threats	Weighted Total
Cory's Shearwater	<i>Calonectris borealis</i>	0	0	2	4	4	3	16
Southern Royal Albatross*	<i>Diomedea epomophora</i>	2	1	0	4	1	4	16
Shy Albatross*	<i>Thalassarche cauta</i>	1	1	0	4	2	4	16
Campbell Albatross*	<i>Thalassarche impavida</i>	2	1	0	4	1	4	16
Amsterdam Albatross*	<i>Diomedea amsterdamensis</i>	3	2	0	4	2	2	15
Polynesian Storm Petrel	<i>Nesofregatta fuliginosa</i>	3	0	4	4	4	0	15
Spectacled Petrel*	<i>Procellaria conspicillata</i>	2	1	0	4	0	4	15
Buller's Albatross*	<i>Thalassarche bulleri</i>	1	1	0	4	1	4	15
White-capped Albatross*	<i>Thalassarche steadi</i>	1	1	0	4	1	4	15
Short-tailed Shearwater	<i>Ardenna tenuirostris</i>	0	0	0	4	2	4	14
Phoenix Petrel	<i>Pterodroma alba</i>	2	0	3	4	4	0	13
Cape Verde Shearwater	<i>Calonectris edwardsii</i>	1	0	0	4	2	3	13
Cape Petrel	<i>Daption capense</i>	0	0	4	4	3	1	13
Leach's Storm Petrel	<i>Hydrobates leucorhous</i>	2	0	4	4	3	0	13
Bermuda Petrel	<i>Pterodroma cahow</i>	3	2	0	2	2	2	13
Grey-backed Storm Petrel	<i>Garrodia nereis</i>	0	0	4	4	4	0	12
Blue Petrel	<i>Halobaena caerulea</i>	0	0	4	4	4	0	12
Antarctic Prion	<i>Pachyptila desolata</i>	0	0	4	4	4	0	12
Fairy Prion	<i>Pachyptila turtur</i>	0	0	4	4	4	0	12
South Georgia Diving Petrel	<i>Pelecanoides georgicus</i>	0	0	4	4	4	0	12
Tahiti Petrel	<i>Pseudobulweria rostrata</i>	1	0	4	4	3	0	12
Collared Petrel	<i>Pterodroma brevipes</i>	2	0	3	4	3	0	12
White-necked Petrel	<i>Pterodroma cervicalis</i>	2	0	2	4	4	0	12
Black-capped Petrel	<i>Pterodroma hasitata</i>	3	0	1	4	4	0	12
Gould's Petrel	<i>Pterodroma leucoptera</i>	2	0	2	4	4	0	12
Great-winged Petrel	<i>Pterodroma macroptera</i>	0	0	4	4	4	0	12
Kermadec Petrel	<i>Pterodroma neglecta</i>	0	0	4	4	4	0	12
Galapagos Petrel	<i>Pterodroma phaeopygia</i>	4	2	0	4	2	0	12
Great Shearwater	<i>Ardenna gravis</i>	0	0	0	4	1	3	11
Bulwer's Petrel	<i>Bulweria bulwerii</i>	0	0	4	4	3	0	11
Streaked Shearwater	<i>Calonectris leucomelas</i>	1	0	3	4	1	1	11
White-bellied Storm Petrel	<i>Fregatta grallaria</i>	0	0	4	4	3	0	11
Black-bellied Storm Petrel	<i>Fregatta tropica</i>	0	0	4	4	3	0	11
Band-rumped Storm Petrel	<i>Hydrobates castro</i>	0	0	4	4	3	0	11
Fork-tailed Storm Petrel	<i>Hydrobates furcatus</i>	0	0	3	4	4	0	11
Swinhoe's Storm Petrel	<i>Hydrobates monorhis</i>	1	0	3	4	3	0	11
European Storm Petrel	<i>Hydrobates pelagicus</i>	0	0	4	4	3	0	11
Wilson's Storm Petrel	<i>Oceanites oceanicus</i>	0	0	4	4	3	0	11

Common name	Scientific name	IUCN ³ status	CMS ⁴ listing	Endemism	Migratory	Land-based threats	At-sea threats	Weighted Total
Slender-billed Prion	<i>Pachyptila belcheri</i>	0	0	3	4	4	0	11
MacGillivray's Prion	<i>Pachyptila macgillivrayi</i>	4	0	1	2	4	0	11
White-faced Storm Petrel	<i>Pelagodroma marina</i>	0	0	4	4	3	0	11
Peruvian Diving Petrel	<i>Pelecanoides garnotii</i>	1	2	1	3	4	0	11
Henderson Petrel	<i>Pterodroma atrata</i>	3	2	1	3	2	0	11
Herald Petrel	<i>Pterodroma heraldica</i>	0	0	4	4	3	0	11
Soft-plumaged Petrel	<i>Pterodroma mollis</i>	0	0	4	4	3	0	11
Hawaiian Petrel	<i>Pterodroma sandwichensis</i>	3	2	0	4	2	0	11
Desertas Petrel	<i>Pterodroma deserta</i>	2	0	1	4	4	0	11
Tropical Shearwater	<i>Puffinus bailloni</i>	0	0	4	4	3	0	11
Audubon's Shearwater	<i>Puffinus lherminieri</i>	0	0	4	4	3	0	11
Christmas Shearwater	<i>Puffinus nativitatis</i>	0	0	4	4	3	0	11
Manx Shearwater	<i>Puffinus puffinus</i>	0	0	4	4	3	0	11
Kerguelen Petrel	<i>Aphrodroma brevirostris</i>	0	0	2	4	4	0	10
Ashy Storm Petrel	<i>Hydrobates homochroa</i>	3	0	1	2	4	0	10
Salvin's Prion	<i>Pachyptila salvini</i>	0	0	2	4	4	0	10
Broad-billed Prion	<i>Pachyptila vittata</i>	0	0	2	4	4	0	10
Trindade Petrel	<i>Pterodroma arminjoniana</i>	2	0	1	4	3	0	10
Fea's Petrel	<i>Pterodroma feae</i>	1	0	1	4	4	0	10
White-headed Petrel	<i>Pterodroma lessonii</i>	0	0	2	4	4	0	10
Magenta Petrel	<i>Pterodroma magentae</i>	4	0	0	4	2	0	10
Black-winged Petrel	<i>Pterodroma nigripennis</i>	0	0	3	4	3	0	10
Little Shearwater	<i>Puffinus assimilis</i>	0	0	1	2	3	0	6
Newell's Shearwater	<i>Puffinus newelli</i>	4	0	1	3	2	0	10
Markham's Storm Petrel	<i>Hydrobates markhami</i>	1	0	1	4	3	0	9
Barau's Petrel	<i>Pterodroma barau</i>	3	0	0	4	2	0	9
Atlantic Petrel	<i>Pterodroma incerta</i>	3	0	0	4	2	0	9
Zino's Petrel	<i>Pterodroma madeira</i>	3	0	0	4	2	0	9
Hutton's Shearwater	<i>Puffinus huttoni</i>	3	0	0	2	2	1	9
Buller's Shearwater	<i>Ardenna bulleri</i>	2	0	0	4	2	0	8
Black Storm Petrel	<i>Hydrobates melania</i>	0	0	1	4	3	0	8
Wedge-rumped Storm Petrel	<i>Hydrobates tethys</i>	0	0	1	4	3	0	8
Tristram's Storm Petrel	<i>Hydrobates tristrami</i>	0	0	1	3	4	0	8
Beck's Petrel	<i>Pseudobulweria becki</i>	4	0	1	2	1	0	8
Chatham Petrel	<i>Pterodroma axillaris</i>	2	0	0	4	2	0	8
Cook's Petrel	<i>Pterodroma cookii</i>	2	0	0	4	2	0	8
Juan Fernandez Petrel	<i>Pterodroma externa</i>	2	0	0	4	2	0	8
Bonin Petrel	<i>Pterodroma hypoleuca</i>	0	0	1	4	3	0	8

Common name	Scientific name	IUCN ³ status	CMS ⁴ listing	Endemism	Migratory	Land-based threats	At-sea threats	Weighted Total
Stejneger's Petrel	<i>Pterodroma longirostris</i>	2	0	0	4	2	0	8
Pycroft's Petrel	<i>Pterodroma pycrofti</i>	2	0	0	4	2	0	8
Murphy's Petrel	<i>Pterodroma ultima</i>	0	0	1	4	3	0	8
Subantarctic Shearwater	<i>Puffinus elegans</i>	0	0	1	4	3	0	8
Townsend's Storm Petrel	<i>Hydrobates socorroensis</i>	3	0	0	3	1	0	7
New Zealand Storm Petrel	<i>Fregatta maoriana</i>	4	0	0	2	1	0	7
Ainley's Storm Petrel	<i>Hydrobates cheimomnestes</i>	2	0	0	4	1	0	7
Matsudaira's Storm Petrel	<i>Hydrobates matsudairae</i>	2	0	0	4	1	0	7
Elliot's Storm Petrel	<i>Oceanites gracilis</i>	0	0	1	4	2	0	7
Snow Petrel	<i>Pagodroma nivea</i>	0	0	3	4	0	0	7
Common Diving Petrel	<i>Pelecanoides urinatrix</i>	0	0	3	4	?	0	7
Mascarene Petrel	<i>Pseudibulweria aterrima</i>	4	0	0	1	2	0	7
Vanuatu Petrel	<i>Pterodroma occulta</i>	0	0	0	3	4	0	7
Mottled Petrel	<i>Pterodroma inexpectata</i>	1	0	0	4	2	0	7
Townsend's Shearwater	<i>Puffinus auricularis</i>	4	0	0	1	2	0	7
Barolo Shearwater	<i>Puffinus baroli</i>	0	0	1	4	2	0	7
Persian Shearwater	<i>Puffinus persicus</i>	0	0	2	4	1	0	7
Galapagos Shearwater	<i>Puffinus subalaris</i>	0	0	0	4	3	0	7
Bryan's Shearwater	<i>Puffinus bryani</i>	4	0	1	2	0	0	7
Jouanin's Petrel	<i>Bulweria fallax</i>	1	0	0	4	1	0	6
Southern Fulmar	<i>Fulmarus glacialoides</i>	0	0	2	4	0	0	6
Cape Verde Storm Petrel	<i>Hydrobates jabejabe</i>	0	0	0	4	2	0	6
Ringed Storm Petrel	<i>Hydrobates hornbyi</i>	1	0	1	3	1	0	6
Magellanic Diving Petrel	<i>Pelecanoides magellani</i>	0	0	1	2	3	0	6
Fiji Petrel	<i>Pseudobulweria macgillivrayi</i>	4	0	0	1	1	0	6
Providence Petrel	<i>Pterodroma solandri</i>	0	0	0	4	2	0	6
Fluttering Shearwater	<i>Puffinus gavia</i>	0	0	0	2	2	1	6
Heinroth's Shearwater	<i>Puffinus heinrothi</i>	2	0	1	2	1	0	6
Black-vented Shearwater	<i>Puffinus opisthomelas</i>	1	0	0	3	2	0	6
Rapa Shearwater	<i>Puffinus myrtae</i>	4	0	0	0	2	0	6
Least Storm Petrel	<i>Hydrobates microsoma</i>	0	0	0	4	1	0	5
Monteiro's Storm Petrel	<i>Hydrobates monteiroi</i>	2	0	0	1	2	0	5
Fulmar Prion	<i>Pachyptila crassirostris</i>	0	0	1	2	2	0	5
Masatierra Petrel	<i>Pterodroma defilippiana</i>	2	0	0	1	2	0	5
Antarctic Petrel	<i>Thalassoica antarctica</i>	0	0	0	4	0	0	4
Boyd's Shearwater	<i>Puffinus boydi</i>	0	0	0	2	2	0	4
Bannerman's Shearwater	<i>Puffinus bannermani</i>	3	0	0	0	1	0	4
Grey-faced Petrel	<i>Pterodroma gouldi</i>	0	0	0	3	0	0	3

Common name	Scientific name	IUCN ³ status	CMS ⁴ listing	Endemism	Migratory	Land-based threats	At-sea threats	Weighted Total
New Caledonian Storm Petrel	<i>Fregatta lineata</i>	0	0	0	2	?	0	2?
Pincoya Storm Petrel	<i>Oceanites pincoyae</i>	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Extinct								
Guadalupe Storm Petrel	<i>Hydrobates macrodactylus</i> ⁵	4	0	0	2	2	0	8
Jamaica Petrel	<i>Pterodroma caribbaea</i> ⁵	4	0	0	2	2	0	8
Olson's Petrel	<i>Bulweria bifax</i>							
St. Helena Petrel	<i>Pseudobulweria rupinarum</i>							

¹ Gill, F, D Donsker, and P Rasmussen (Eds). 2023. IOC World Bird List (v 13.1). Doi 10.14344/IOC.ML.13.1. <http://www.worldbirdnames.org/>

² The taxonomic treatment used currently for species already listed on Annex 1 remains unchanged

³ IUCN 2023. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2022-2. <https://www.iucnredlist.org>

⁴ Effective 22 May 2020 www.cms.int/sites/default/files/basic_page_documents/appendices_cop13_e_0.pdf

⁵ CR according to IUCN 2023