

 <p data-bbox="231 544 470 582">Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels</p>	<p data-bbox="592 248 1398 291">Fourteenth Meeting of the Advisory Committee</p> <p data-bbox="887 309 1398 347"><i>Lima, Peru, 12 – 16 August 2024</i></p> <p data-bbox="646 421 1254 463">Capacity building and outreach.</p> <p data-bbox="743 490 1157 533">Draft Report to MoP8.</p> <p data-bbox="541 622 1366 665">Secretariat, Advisory Committee Chair, Vice-chair</p>
---	---

[DRAFT DOCUMENT TO BE UPDATED FOLLOWING AC14]

SUMMARY

Since MoP7, ACAP and its Secretariat has continued to support capacity-building activities for ACAP Parties and others through financial and technical support for secondments, internships, projects, meetings, workshops, training and other activities. On the other hand, evolution in the number and range of capacity building events undertaken by Parties could not be demonstrated. Consequently, it is suggested that performance indicators for capacity building be reviewed.

This report has been drafted as a document in progress for the Advisory Committee. It contributes to the Advisory Committee meeting its reporting requirements to the Meeting of Parties under item 5.1 of the Agreement's Action Plan. The final version of this report to MoP8 will be prepared after the conclusion of the Fourteenth Meeting of the Advisory Committee (AC14), to reflect inputs from the Advisory Committee, and actions and decisions taken during this meeting.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Advisory Committee:

1. Review this draft document and suggest amendments as appropriate;
2. Discuss and recommended to MoP8 the preferred approach to address difficulties encountered with capacity building indicators; and
3. Agree to request MoP8 to:
 - a. note the ACAP-assisted capacity building activities that have occurred since MoP7
 - b. provide any further updates regarding authorities, research centres, scientists and non-government organisations concerned with albatrosses and petrels to the Secretariat.

1. CAPACITY BUILDING INDICATORS

Article IV of ACAP recognises the importance of capacity building to effectively achieve the Agreement's objectives. The Agreement states that Range States will need assistance through research, training or monitoring and in implementing conservation measures. As such, Parties agreed to prioritise capacity building activities.

The Agreement's Action Plan also references capacity building activities in paragraphs 6.3 and 6.4 stating that Parties shall:

'... cooperate with each other, the Secretariat and others with a view to developing training programmes and exchanging resource materials';

and

'...arrange for training programmes to ensure that personnel responsible for the implementation of this Action Plan have adequate knowledge to implement it effectively.'

To collate and monitor capacity building activities by ACAP and its Parties, a suite of indicators was developed. A contact group (Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Chile, New Zealand and the United Kingdom) developed two performance indicators for capacity building under the Agreement. The 'State – Pressure – Response' approach was endorsed by the Sixth Session of the Meeting of the Parties ([MoP6 Doc 21](#)):

INDICATOR 1 - RESPONSE

Number of meetings, workshops, training and other events **where ACAP has assisted technically or financially** to build capacities among Parties.

Key question addressed by this indicator

What technical and financial assistance has been provided to Parties (and Range States) to build capacity to facilitate the objective of the Agreement?

Target audience

Governmental agencies of ACAP Parties and Range States.

INDICATOR 2 - STATE

Evolution in the number and range of meetings, workshops, training and other capacity building events since the Party ratified the Agreement.

Key question addressed by this indicator

Since the ratification of the Agreement, which capacity building actions and/or processes have been carried out?

Target audience

Parties to the Agreement (environment and fishery management agencies) and NGOs.

The ACAP database has been collecting information from Parties and Range States on capacity building activities as part of their reporting to the Advisory Committee. Since 2011, Parties were asked to answer the following question (in annual report SECTION D: OTHER ANNUAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS), which addresses Indicator 2:

Question 3. Since the last report has the Party undertaken or funded any capacity building activities relevant to ACAP?

Additional information can be provided for each activity in this question: funding source, amount of assistance provided (or in-kind), funding recipients, purpose of activities funded (e.g. bycatch mitigation etc).

Following AC11 in 2019, another question was added to allow separate reporting on assistance obtained specifically from ACAP by each Party or Range State, which would address Indicator 1:

Question 4. Since the last report has the Party received any funding or technical assistance for capacity building from ACAP?

Further details can also be provided as for Question 3.

A large proportion of capacity building actions are implemented through the Small Grants and Secondments programmes (see **AC14 Inf 01**). Although projects funded by the Small Grants Scheme can include capacity building aspects in research, education, training and outreach, it is the ACAP Secondment Programme in particular that is aimed at capacity building within Parties, and which addresses Indicator 1. **Table 1** summarises assistance provided by ACAP in the last 12 years of the Agreement. Between 0 and 6 actions per year are supported technically or financially (Secondment Programme is not offered in all years).

Table 1. Indicator 1: Number of meetings, workshops, training, and other events where ACAP has assisted technically or financially to build capacity among Parties and Range States.

Year	Number of activities supported with a description of each activity	
2012	1	Azócar Secondment Chile – Secretariat (seabird bycatch observer protocols)
2013	0	
2014	2	Jiménez Secondment Uruguay – UK (overlap of <i>Diomedea exulans</i> with pelagic longlines in southwest Atlantic)
		Participation/presentation: CCSBT Effectiveness of Seabird Mitigation Measures Technical Group meeting, Tokyo, Japan.
2015*	3	Cortés Secondment Spain – ATF Chile (reducing petrel bycatch in artisanal fisheries)
		Serafini Secondment Brazil – UK (pathogen surveillance)
		Four workshops on establishing capacity in South America to build knowledge on albatross and petrel health and prevent disease introduction - Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Peru (Small Grant No. 2013-20)
2016*	1	Participation/presentation: Common Oceans Tuna Project - Workshop on Effective Seabird Conservation in Tuna Fisheries, Suva, Fiji.
2017*	2	Participation/presentation: Common Oceans Tuna Project Regional Bycatch Pre-assessment Workshops: South Africa and Vietnam

2018	6	Paz Secondment Argentina – Chile (habitat selection of <i>Thalassarche malanophris</i> and fishing activity)
		Adasme Secondment Chile – NZ (Risk assessment of seabirds in South Pacific)
		Marquez Secondment Brazil – UK (priority areas for albatross conservation in relation to fisheries bycatch) (in progress)
		López Secondment Chile – USA (<i>Ardenna creatopus</i> - outreach, understanding threats and mitigation measures)
		Suazo Internship Chile - Secretariat/NZ (update of ACAP Seabird Bycatch Identification Guide, bilateral Chile – NZ collaboration on seabird bycatch matters)
		Participation/presentation: Common Oceans Tuna Project Seabird Bycatch Data Preparation Workshop Cusco, Peru
2019	4	Hernández Secondment Argentina – NZ (ERA of incidental mortality of seabirds in Argentine fisheries)
		Pereira Secondment Brazil – NZ (improving museum curatorial skills)
		Alemán Lucero Secondment Ecuador – Brazil (seabird rehabilitation and ID of pathogenic diseases) – not completed
		Participation/presentation: Common Oceans Tuna Project Final Seabird Bycatch Assessment Workshop, Kruger National Park, South Africa
2020	0	
2021	1	Participation/presentation: CCAMLR e-group on net monitoring cables
2022	4	Quiñones Secondment Peru - New Zealand (mitigation techniques applicable to the artisanal longline fishery off Peru and integrated bi-national seabird distributions of Chatham, Buller's and Salvin's Albatrosses)
		Iwan Secondment Argentina – Australia (abordaje social de la problemática de la captura incidental de aves marinas en pesquerías comerciales de Argentina)
		Suazo Secondment Chile – Argentina (multi-fishery interactions of sympatric black-browed and grey-headed albatrosses from the Diego Ramírez Islands) – not yet completed
		Cordeiro Secondment United Kingdom – New Zealand (burrowing bird censuses using detection dogs)
2023	3	Expert Group Secondment IAPC7 - Training workshop offered to Parties representatives, and other relevant stakeholders, on the risks and biosecurity measures applied to ACAP Species in the context of the High Pathogenicity Avian Influenza (HPAI H5N1)
		Participation/presentation: by SBWG Co-convenor in an Albatross Task Force workshop for fishers in Namibia
		Ongoing from 2023 - 2025, supporting partner for CCSBT project under Common Oceans Tuna Phase 2, to improve implementation of seabird bycatch mitigation measures.

*Small Grants and/or Secondment Programmes were on hold 2015-2017

In addition, the Secretariat provides ongoing annual support (except in 2021-2022 due to the COVID-19 pandemic) for postgraduate translation interns to spend a week in the ACAP Secretariat and develop translation skills in relation to albatross and petrel conservation

vocabulary. Occasional in-kind support has also been offered to postgraduates by providing desk space at the Secretariat to complete ACAP species-related research reports or manuscripts for publication.

At MoP7, [Doc 16 Rev 2](#) noted that collating information on Indicator 2 was problematic. From the Parties' responses to Question 3 of the annual report, most answers indicated that no capacity building activities relevant to ACAP took place in the previous year. Where Question 3 was answered in the affirmative, the specific number of capacity building events was not always itemised. **Table 2** summarises the number of capacity building activities for each AC reporting year, starting with AC6 in 2011. Nevertheless, it was clear that Parties and Range States assigned resources to capacity building activities, and these were regularly highlighted in their triennial Implementation Reports to MoP, in Section 6, which addresses education and public awareness:

6.1 Has the Party conducted training or provided information for user audiences (eg scientists, fishers)?

However, the number of events was not always specified here either.

Table 2. Indicator 2: Number and range of meetings, workshops, training, and other capacity building events since the Party ratified the Agreement. (Has the Party undertaken or funded any capacity building activities relevant to ACAP?).

	2011	2013	2014	2016	2017	2019	2021	2023	2024
Argentina	0	2	2	1	-	1	1	1	0
Australia	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brazil	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0
Chile	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	-	-
Ecuador	-	-	0	1	2	-	-	-	-
France	-	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	-
New Zealand	-	0	0	0	0	1	>1	0	6
Norway	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Peru	0	-	0	-	1	-	0	2	0
South Africa	-	0	0	-	-	-	0	-	-
Spain	-	-	1-2	>1	>1	0	0	0	-
UK	0	5	2	2	2	2	-	>1	>1
Uruguay	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	-

Question 3 in the annual reporting form is currently not fulfilling the objectives of capacity building indicator 2. **MoP7 Doc 16 Rev 2** invited Parties to discuss suitability of the information collected, feasibility of submitting more quantitative information, and any further actions that may be required but no progress was made at MoP7.

To address this issue, we suggest that:

1. Given that the number of activities remains constantly low, or no activities are reported to have been undertaken, Question 3 be simplified to a yes/no question, with no information collected about individual activities.

OR

2. If it is not feasible for Parties to provide the detailed information as envisaged by capacity building indicator 2, Question 3 be discontinued from the annual reporting form, and no further reporting on Indicator 2 takes place.

OR

3. Question 3 be discontinued from the annual reporting form. A modified capacity building indicator 2 (presence/absence of activities) could instead be derived from the triennial reporting form (*6.1 Has the Party conducted training or provided information for user audiences (eg scientists, fishers)?*). Some elements of Question 3, e.g. purpose of activities funded (bycatch mitigation, bycatch monitoring, population monitoring etc), could be moved across to the triennial form to supplement the presence/absence information.

2. LIST OF AUTHORITIES, RESEARCH CENTRES, SCIENTISTS AND NON-GOVERNMENT ORGANISATIONS CONCERNED WITH ALBATROSSES AND PETRELS (ACTION PLAN 5.1.k)

The [ACAP website](#) provides a comprehensive list of links to various centres, institutions, organisations and websites concerned with albatrosses and petrels. Parties are encouraged to provide any further updates to the Secretariat.

3. REVIEWS OF EDUCATION AND INFORMATION PROGRAMMES AIMED AT CONSERVING ALBATROSSES AND PETRELS (ACTION PLAN 5.1.m)

The Parties have consistently reported on a range of programmes being undertaken, including education, training and outreach; however, no reviews of these programmes were undertaken by the Advisory Committee. Collaboration between governmental agencies and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) was evident in many cases.