Seventh Meeting of the Advisory Committee

La Rochelle, France, 6 - 10 May 2013

Process for evaluating and listing species on Annex 1

Secretariat, AC Chair, Working Group Convenors

Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels

SUMMARY

In the absence of standard procedures to guide the initial phases of the nomination process of new species, particularly in relation to the information to be provided, and the process to be followed by the Advisory Committee in undertaking its evaluation of this information, the Secretariat proposes formalising the process followed for the four species most recently added to the Annex, and formally endorsing the criteria for choosing candidate species previously presented in AC3 Doc 18.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Advisory Committee is requested to:

1. endorse the proposed process for evaluating and listing species on Annex 1, including the use of the total weighted scoring system introduced in AC3 Doc 18; and

2. request the Meeting of the Parties to adopt this process for the evaluation of future nominations for the listing of new species on Annex 1.

---

1. BACKGROUND

Article VIII 13e) of the Agreement provides that at any of its sessions, the Meeting of the Parties may amend Annex 1. Article XII of the Agreement sets out the process to be followed in proposing an amendment to the Meeting of the Parties and states that only Party/s may make proposals for amendment (Article XII 2). The Agreement makes no mention of the role that the Advisory Committee should take in evaluating such nominations, although Article IX 6a) states that the Committee shall provide scientific, technical and other advice and information to the Meeting of the Parties. It is logical that the Meeting of the Parties would expect the Advisory Committee to advise it on the scientific merit of nominations to include additional species on Annex 1.

Since the last Advisory Committee meeting, the Secretariat has received a number of inquiries from Parties regarding the process for listing species on Annex 1 of the Agreement. Currently, there are no standard procedures to guide the initial phases of the nomination process in relation to the information to be provided, and to define the process to be followed by the Advisory Committee in undertaking its evaluation of new nominations. Therefore, the Secretariat proposes formalising the process based on the experience gained during the listing of the four species most recently added to the Annex. The rationale and criteria for choosing candidate species were previously discussed in detail in AC3 Doc 18. Although AC3 agreed to further consider the process for listing new species at its next meeting (AC3 Final Report, para 16.9), the methodology developed in AC3 Doc 18 has not been discussed or formerly endorsed by subsequent AC meetings, nor adopted by the Meeting of the Parties.

2. PROPOSED PROCEDURE FOR NOMINATING SPECIES TO ANNEX 1

The proposed steps in the listing process are:

1. A Party (or Parties) brings a proposed nomination to the AC. This nomination would consist of:

   a. a **meeting document**, stating why or how the species would benefit from being included within the Agreement and include a draft Species Assessment (in any of the Agreement languages) following the format for those species already listed (see http://www.acap.aq/index.php/en/species-assessments).

   b. any other supporting material, e.g. a Recovery Plan, Plan of Action, etc, submitted as **information papers.**

2. All three Working Groups (PCSWG, SBWG, TWG) review the submitted material as per agreed criteria and either support or advise against the listing in their reports to the AC.

3. The Advisory Committee considers the evaluations of the Working Groups, averaging their ranking scores if needed, and makes a recommendation to the Meeting of Parties about the nomination in the AC report to MoP.

4. The nominating Party or Parties submit the nomination to the MoP with a draft resolution to add the species to Annex 1 (e.g. see MoP3 Doc 26 and MoP4 Doc 16).

3. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING CANDIDATE SPECIES

The criteria for selecting candidate procellariiform species for listing on ACAP's Annex 1 has been developed by Cooper and Baker in 2006 (AC2 Doc 21) and further refined in 2007 (AC3 Doc 18). Eight criteria are considered:

1. Global conservation status

2. Listing within the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS)

3. Current population trend

4. Population size

5. Level of endemism

6. Migratory nature

7. Land-based threats

8. At-sea conservation threats

It was suggested that candidate species should be ranked against these criteria, and the use of total weighted scores was recommended as the most practical method of assessing nominations (see Appendix 1 and Table 1a in AC3 Doc 18). The authors also proposed that in addition to the eight criteria outlined, other issues such as domestic priorities could be included in a detailed justification for listing by the proposing Party or Parties.

Nominations which rank below the lowest scoring species already on Annex 1 would not normally be considered as strong candidates for listing.

4. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

1. The Working Groups and the AC might wish to explore the role of the prioritisation framework in the evaluation process.

2. The text of the Agreement does not require nominations to have the support of the Working Groups or of the Advisory Committee. The AC might wish to recommend to the next Meeting of Parties that this is amended and endorsed by the MoP.

3. There is currently no process for removing species from Annex 1. The Working Groups and the AC might wish to consider whether utilising the same criteria for reviewing potential de-listings as those used for new nominations would be appropriate in the future and who would initiate these de-listings.

ATTACHMENT 1. AC3 DOC 18. LISTING OF NEW SPECIES.

Click paperclip icon in Adobe Reader navigation pane to see attached file.