



Interim Secretariat provided by the Australian Government

Scientific Meeting

Hobart, Australia, 8-9 November 2004

*Agenda Items: - ScM1 9
- MOP1 14*

ACAP/ScM1/Doc.7
ACAP/MOP1/Doc.15

Science Meeting Chair /Interim Secretariat

Report of the Scientific Meeting

AGREEMENT ON THE CONSERVATION OF ALBATROSSES AND PETRELS

REPORT OF THE INFORMAL SCIENTIFIC MEETING (Hobart, Australia, 8 to 9 November 2004)

1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

1.1. The informal scientific meeting on albatrosses and petrels was held in Hobart, Tasmania, Australia from 8 to 9 November 2004 under the Chairmanship of Prof. John Croxall (UK).

1.2. Participants attended from Australia, Brazil, France, Namibia, New Zealand, Norway, Republic of South Africa, Spain, UK, the USA, the Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition (ASOC), BirdLife International, the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR), Institute for Antarctic and Southern Ocean Studies (IASOS), the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR), and Southern Seabird Solutions (SSS). Dr. Robin Doughty also attended in an individual capacity.

1.3. The List of Participants (ScM1/Doc. 5/Rev. 3) is given at Annex 1. The List of Documents (ScM1/Doc. 4/Rev. 3) is given at Annex 2.

1.4. The Chairman welcomed all delegates and conveyed apologies for the late withdrawal of Prof. Colin Galbraith (UK) due to unforeseen personal difficulties.

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

2.1. The Provisional Agenda (ScM1/Doc. 1/Rev 2) had been distributed prior to the meeting and was adopted with the addition of one item, "Other business", as a new item 7 and the renumbering of the succeeding agenda items.

3. EMERGENCY CRITERIA

3.1. The meeting considered the requirement of Article VIII, paragraph 11(e) of the Agreement that the first session of the Meeting of Parties, "adopt criteria to define emergency situations that require urgent conservation measures and determine the

modalities for assigning responsibility for action to be taken”. The meeting addressed this in two parts as set out in paragraphs 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4.

3.2. The meeting suggested that the following criteria be used to define an emergency situation:

- a) an unexpected event that threatens albatrosses and petrels at the population level; and
- b) requires urgent conservation measures; and
- c) is of such a magnitude that it exceeds a Party’s immediate capacity to adequately respond; and
- d) for which international resources and/or assistance are required.

3.3. The meeting noted that threats to albatrosses and petrels may be classified on a scale ranging from chronic to acute. A chronic threat is unlikely to be classified as an emergency situation. It was agreed that mortality from interactions with fishing vessels represents the most serious chronic threat at both the species and population level and that this is the priority to be addressed. The group considered that there was a need to have a set of criteria to define emergency situations when acute threats need to be addressed.

3.4. The meeting recommended that the following geographical criteria be used to determine the assignment of responsibility for action:

- a) within a Party’s terrestrial and maritime boundaries (to the outer edge of the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) or equivalent) — the Party;
- b) in trans-boundary incidents or areas — the Parties affected should negotiate; and
- c) in international waters (high seas) — the Parties affected, coordinated by the Secretariat.

3.5. It was agreed that, in general, preventative actions are the most effective means of avoiding emergency situations and that contingency plans are essential in minimising their impacts.

3.6. The meeting recommended that the Advisory Committee consider possible causes of emergency situations in order that preventative actions could be taken and contingency plans drawn up. Examples include:

- a) alien species;
- b) avian parasites and diseases;
- c) habitat loss including that caused by fires, storms and volcanic eruptions;
- d) sudden escalation of IUU fishing; and
- e) any sudden relevant change in the marine environment.

3.7. It was agreed that sound knowledge of the conservation status of populations and species is necessary to comprehensively assess the impact of a potential emergency event.

3.8. The meeting recognised that rapid changes in population parameters and major mortality events should trigger urgent research to determine the causes and that this may also have requirements for support and resources at an international level.

3.9. The meeting recommended that, on declaring an emergency, the relevant Party or Parties should designate a central point of contact in order to co-ordinate relevant offers of help from other Parties. It was also suggested that the Secretariat could hold a list of Parties' organisations that can be contacted in response to the declaration of an emergency.

3.10. The meeting considered that holding a specially convened international meeting was not likely to be an effective response to minimising the impact of an emergency and that funds for such a meeting could be better used to assist in the provision of technical experts and advice to the emergency area.

3.11. The meeting suggested that caution should be exercised in seeking to define, at this time, more explicit criteria for emergency situations.

4. TAXONOMY

4.1 The meeting noted that Article IX, paragraph 6(b) of the Agreement requires that the Advisory Committee “shall endorse a standard reference text listing the taxonomy and maintain a listing of taxonomic synonyms for all species covered by the Agreement”. The Advisory Committee will use these as the basis for advice to Meetings of Parties.

4.2 Discussion of relevant taxonomic work at the recent Third International Albatross and Petrel Conference in Montevideo, Uruguay was reported. Several views have emerged about the number of albatross species with suggestions including either 14, 21 or 24 albatross species (paper ScM1/Doc. 8, “The need for the Parties to the Agreement on Albatrosses and Petrels to establish a robust, defensible and transparent decision-making process for the construction of their species lists” refers). It was agreed that consensus is highly desirable but may not be possible, at least in the short term.

4.3 It was agreed that, given the importance that species lists have upon conservation policy and scientific communication, taxonomic decisions must be based on robust and defensible criteria. It is important to resolve differences in a scientific and transparent manner with appropriate use of peer-reviewed publications.

4.4 The meeting also noted that albatross and petrel species tend to exhibit less genetic differentiation than many other avian species. Thus, the delineation of albatross and petrel species should not be based on genetic criteria alone, and should consider all available ecological, morphological and behavioural data.

4.5 The meeting agreed to recommend to the first Meeting of Parties that, as suggested in the paper “The need for ACAP Parties to agree a robust, transparent and defensible decision-making process for the construction and maintenance of their species lists” (ScM1/Doc. 8), the Advisory Committee should establish a working group or sub-committee whose aim is to establish “a transparent, defensible and highly consultative listing process”. The makeup of such a working group or sub-committee

was also discussed, with agreement that it was essential to include both taxonomic and more general expertise. It was suggested that appropriate experts in the field included Mike Double (Australia), Peter Ryan (South Africa), Geoff Chambers (New Zealand) and Mark Tasker (United Kingdom) and a nomination from Birdlife International was also invited.

4.6 The meeting further recommended that, as a first step, this working group or sub-committee should aim to reach consensus about the three most contentious albatross species splits; namely, *Diomedea antipodensis/gibsoni*, *Thalassarche cauta/steady* and *T. bulleri/platei*. The results of recent genetic analysis in conjunction with all other available biological information should be considered as part of this work.

5. RESEARCH PRIORITIES

5.1 The meeting noted that Article IX, paragraph 6(c) of the Agreement requires that the Advisory Committee shall “make recommendations to the Meeting of Parties concerning the Action Plan, implementation of the Agreement and further research to be carried out”.

5.2 Before recommending such research priorities it was agreed that it is necessary for ACAP to identify:

- a) gaps in existing knowledge, where the baseline data fall under two broad headings: land based (population status and trends) and range data (includes telemetry, at sea surveys, band recoveries); and
- b) a structure for collecting and synthesising, and where appropriate analysing, the above data.

5.3 The meeting endorsed the recommendations of “Towards a Global Review of Population Trends of Albatrosses and Petrels as a Basis for Identifying Gaps in Knowledge and Priorities” (ScM1/Doc. 9) that a further global review of the species listed in Annex 1 of the Agreement be undertaken to update previously published reviews of population status and trends^{i,iii}. The meeting agreed that the further review

ⁱ Gales, R. 1993 *Co-operative Mechanisms for the Conservation of Albatrosses*. ANCA, 132 pp

should also include critical population demographic parameters, including adult survival and juvenile recruitment; this would enable the identification of priority gaps in information on population trends and demographic parameters.

5.4 The meeting discussed the need to promote best practice methods in population monitoring programs, and to promote adoption of newly validated assessment techniques. It was agreed that the proposed review of population status and trends should provide sufficient detail of the methodology used to facilitate synthesis and comparison of datasets, where appropriate. It was additionally agreed that if Table 1 of “Towards a Global Review of Population Trends of Albatrosses and Petrels as a Basis for Identifying Gaps in Knowledge and Priorities” (ScM1/Doc. 9) is to provide the template for a data request form, it should be amended to include additional survey information; i.e. year specific data and/or population trends with confidence intervals and time frame.

5.5 The meeting agreed to recommend to the first Meeting of Parties, that as suggested in “Towards a Global Review of Population Trends of Albatrosses and Petrels as a Basis for Identifying Gaps in Knowledge and Priorities” (ScM1/Doc. 9), the Advisory Committee should establish a working group or sub-committee with the specific aim of developing a database on the population status and trends of albatrosses and petrels covered by the Agreement.

5.6. The meeting noted the paper prepared by the CCAMLR Ad Hoc Working Group on “Incidental Mortality Arising from Fishing” (SC-CCAMLR-XXIII/BG/22, ScM1/Inf. 13) summarising population and foraging metadata, submitted by Members, of seabird species at risk from longlining in the Convention Area.

5.7 In terms of the availability of priority data on core, at-sea distribution of albatrosses and petrels, the meeting noted that an adequate description of ranges during the breeding season is well advanced. Gaps in the availability of ranging data are summarised in pages 66-67 of the paper “Birdlife International Satellite Tracking

ⁱⁱ Gales R 1998 Albatross Populations: Status and Threats *In* Robertson, G., and Gales, R. (Eds.). *Albatross Biology and Conservation*. Surrey Beatty and Sons, Australia. pp. 20-45

Database” (ScM1/Inf. 11); very few remote tracking data are available on the distribution of immature and juvenile birds and of breeding birds when not breeding, although there are data from at-sea surveys for such birds.

5.8 The meeting also noted SCAR’s previous analyses of long-term population data for Southern Ocean seabird species (“Statistical assessment of the status and trends of Antarctic and sub-Antarctic seabirds” ScM1/Inf. 10), some of which are species listed under Annex 1 of the Agreement.

5.9 It was noted that the Red List Indices (RLIs) recently developed by BirdLife International, which are based on the World Conservation Union (IUCN) Red List categories, highlight the rapid decline in the conservation status of seabirdsⁱⁱⁱ. Such indices, which have been generated to monitor biodiversity declines, should be relevant to work to be conducted by the Advisory Committee on reviewing the population status and trends of albatrosses and petrels.

5.10. The meeting recommended that the Advisory Committee of ACAP work closely with other organisations with experience in synthesis of results of population monitoring programs. This will ensure that collective efforts are complementary, minimise duplication, and are both efficient and mutually beneficial.

5.11. The meeting noted the report on the “Birdlife International Satellite Tracking Database” (ScM1/Inf. 11). It was noted that an aim of ACAP is to identify and harmonise available data sources in a way that is acceptable for all contributing Parties and allows for the most efficient retrieval of data. In this regard, the report serves as a model for combining global datasets.

ⁱⁱⁱ Butchart et al 2004, PLOS Biology, vol 2 Iss 12, www.plosbiology.org

6. ACTION PLAN

6.1 The meeting reviewed the Action Plan and agreed that the following topics were priorities for early implementation:

- a) fisheries interactions;
- b) non-native taxa; and
- c) protection of breeding sites.

These issues are elaborated below.

Fisheries interactions

6.2 A considerable amount of work has already been undertaken on fisheries interactions and the mitigation of adverse effects on albatrosses and petrels (e.g. by CCAMLR as summarised in ScM1/Inf. 13 and MOP1/Inf. 1). In many cases this work continues, both within the work of Parties and by others. The Advisory Committee will need to review how best to organise and integrate ACAP's work within these initiatives.

6.3 The meeting noted that the Agreement on the Conservation of Small Cetaceans in the Baltic and North Seas (ASCOBANS) had reviewed fisheries interactions in a staged process as follows:

- a) review of best practice in establishing and reporting from observer schemes, including the issues of sampling and scaling from samples to fleet level;
- b) review of knowledge of interactions involving albatrosses and petrels on a fishery by fishery level; and
- c) review of mitigation techniques.

Reports on each stage of the review had been passed to fisheries management authorities along with recommendations of areas where priority action should be taken.

6.4 A similar approach could be feasible for ACAP, particularly given that extensive relevant work has already been undertaken, particularly within CCAMLR's ad-hoc Working Group on Incidental Mortality arising from Fishing (WG-IMAF).

6.5 The meeting noted that a vital issue for ACAP is to consider interactions with all relevant Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (RFMOs). It was important to encourage RFMOs to take action on:

- a) implementation of bycatch reduction measures;
- b) collecting, reporting and exchange of information on bycatch (as exemplified in CCAMLR Resolution 22/XXIII, ScM1/Inf. 14); and
- c) consideration of reduced food supply.

6.6 It was suggested that ACAP consider what advice it could give to RFMOs on, for example, the food requirements of albatrosses and petrels, to ensure that harvesting of these food sources was kept to sustainable levels. It is anticipated that ACAP Parties could usefully co-operate and collaborate where they are members of the same RFMO.

6.7 The meeting noted the draft evaluation by BirdLife International “Regional Fisheries Management Organisations: their duties and performance in reducing incidental mortality of albatrosses” (ScM1/Inf. 5, MOP1/Inf. 6) of 14 RFMOs which overlap albatross areas, assessing their performance in minimizing bycatch. Evaluation criteria were based on the principles of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries and the UN Fish Stocks Agreement and included assessment of data collection methods, measures to manage target fish stocks, and reduce bycatch of non-target species, particularly albatross, and combat IUU fishing. CCAMLR had the highest performance in this assessment.

6.8 The meeting noted the importance of promoting the retention of, and reporting of information on, seabird bycatch specimens; so that species, sexes and life stages can be identified. This is an important contribution to assessing the impact of fisheries bycatch on albatross populations. ACAP should work with CCAMLR which requires each member to nominate a depository for seabird bycatch specimens and provide an annual summary report.

6.9 The meeting noted the requirement in Article III, paragraph 1(h) of the Agreement to support the implementation of the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO) International Plan of Action for Reducing Incidental Catch of Seabirds in Longline Fisheries. It was suggested that the Advisory Committee should

request a report from Parties and Observers attending the FAO Committee on Fisheries (COFI) meeting in March 2005.

Non-native taxa

6.10 Reports should be sought from Parties (and others as appropriate) on current measures to prevent introduction of, and control and/or eradicate non-native animals, plants, hybrids or disease-causing organisms that may be detrimental to populations of albatrosses and petrels.

6.11 These reports should be used to produce best-practice advice on actions in respect of non-native species. This is seen as a priority for ACAP, as, after fishing mortality, the introduction of non-natives is potentially one of the greatest threats to albatross and petrel populations. It was also recommended to seek to prioritise breeding sites for action to tackle non-natives.

Protection of breeding sites

6.12 Parties should report on the management and protection status of breeding sites within their jurisdiction. The Advisory Committee could give consideration to the development of appropriate criteria for the identification of internationally important breeding sites for albatross and petrel populations.

Other issues

6.13 The meeting further considered other issues arising from the Action Plan. These are briefly described below.

6.14 *Use and trade:* Party reports should include details of any exemptions to prohibitions. In addition to information on international trade, details of indigenous harvesting of albatrosses and petrels should also be reported.

6.15 *Re-establishment and re-establishment schemes:* Any Party or other organization proposing a re-establishment scheme for an ACAP species should first draw on relevant expertise from ACAP Parties and others as appropriate. Parties should also follow the IUCN criteria for assessing proposed re-introductions and prepare and follow a detailed

re-establishment plan that includes an impact assessment of proposed actions. Proposals should be submitted for the consideration of the Advisory Committee.

6.16 *Environmental Impact Assessments*: The group noted that environmental assessment could occur at several scales, from the broad geographical policy assessment to the individual local project level. Where relevant, such assessments should include consideration of albatross and petrel issues. It was noted that such assessments are commonly used for energy or mineral extraction developments, but might also be applied to fisheries, especially those in new areas or using new techniques. The Advisory Committee could play a role in commenting on environmental assessments. Parties could submit existing or new assessments to inform this process.

6.17 *Pollutants and marine debris*: The Advisory Committee might identify the most harmful pollutants (including plastics, minerals and chemicals) to albatrosses and petrels and identify the most appropriate means/forums to take further action to reduce the effects of these pollutants.

6.18 *Disturbance*: This issue was a lower priority although human visitors to breeding colonies are potential vectors of non-native taxa and biosecurity is an important consideration. It was recommended that advice be sought intersessionally from Parties with experience of producing codes of conduct for tourists and scientific research in relation to albatrosses and petrels.

6.19 Other issues discussed by the meeting are summarised below.

Marine Protected Areas (MPAs)

6.20 The meeting was apprised of a number of ongoing marine habitat conservation initiatives.

6.21 Spain reported on a number of projects, currently being developed in European waters, seeking to identify important areas for seabirds at sea. On the basis of this information, specific marine areas would be given protected status under EU regulations and would be managed according to the needs identified. Of particular note was the proposal that any new activities developed in those areas (especially all new fisheries opened) should be subject to prior environmental assessment.

6.22 Australia noted that it had adopted, in addition to conventional MPA approaches, a threats-based approach to conservation which has the advantage of dealing with the often transitional nature of the location of resources and threats in the marine environment. An example is the listing of long-line fishing under domestic legislation as a key threatening process for seabirds and the subsequent requirement to develop a Threat Abatement Plan. Management measures developed apply throughout Australia's EEZ offering protection to albatrosses and petrels foraging in these waters. Seabird bycatch has been significantly reduced since the implementation of a Threat Abatement Plan, which has, in effect, created an MPA conforming to IUCN criteria IV or VI, for these birds in Australia's EEZ.

6.23 It was noted that it is important to assess the effectiveness of MPAs but there are few data available to do this. Australia has carried out an assessment of MPAs for grey-headed *Thalassarche chrysostoma* and black-browed albatrosses *Thalassarche melanophris*. The spatial extent of MPAs around Macquarie Island appears to cover much of the foraging distribution of Macquarie Island black-browed albatrosses during the breeding season. Grey-headed albatrosses however spent significantly more time in waters outside these areas and are at higher risk from fisheries activities and other threats. Further information on albatross movements is required to assess the efficacy of MPAs in protecting foraging habitats outside the breeding season.

6.24 CCAMLR has recently taken a step towards the identification of MPAs within its area of application with plans for a workshop in 2005 at which it is expected that at least four proposals will be considered. Several of these will be relevant to ACAP species.

6.25 South Africa announced its intention ("Conserving albatrosses and petrels at sea; towards the creation of a marine protected area around South Africa's subantarctic Prince Edward Islands", ScM1/Inf. 7) to proclaim a large MPA in the territorial waters and EEZ around its sub-Antarctic Prince Edward Islands. Improving the protection of ACAP species from Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated longline fishing was a factor in this decision.

6.26 The meeting noted that the report from BirdLife International "Tracking ocean wanderers: the global distribution of albatrosses and petrels" (ScM1/Inf. 11) contains

90% of remote tracking data for albatrosses (16 species) and petrels (3 species). The report summarises the spatial and temporal distribution of these species, facilitating the identification of critical areas for albatrosses and petrels within potential MPAs and for addressing overlap between seabirds and fisheries.

Implementation (Action Plan section 7)

6.27 There was agreement that ACAP and its subsidiary bodies should seek to be ambitious, active and effective in conserving albatrosses and petrels, while being mindful of available resources and the need to prioritise action based on these. Expanding the membership of the organisation to include all Range States is a priority.

6.28 The requirement of Article IX, paragraph 6(f) of the Agreement for the Advisory Committee to develop a series of indicators to measure the collective success of Parties in implementing the objectives of the Agreement (to maintain favourable conservation status for albatrosses and petrels) was also noted. The Advisory Committee should seek guidance from the Meeting of the Parties and make use, where possible, of existing indicators such as the IUCN/BirdLife Red List criteria.

Future Focus of the Advisory Committee and Mode of Operation

6.29 Noting that the Advisory Committee is the key source of advice for the Meeting of the Parties, the meeting briefly discussed the strategic direction and focus of the work of the Advisory Committee. The meeting recognised that a significant volume of work related to achieving a favorable conservation status for albatrosses and petrels has already been completed or is underway.

6.30 The meeting suggested that to complement and advance the existing work it would be important for the Meeting of the Parties to adopt a work program that enhances and advances current initiatives rather than duplicating them. Within this context, an analysis of the gaps between existing work and the work required to attain a favourable conservation status for albatrosses and petrels is a critical strategic issue for the Meeting of the Parties.

6.31 The meeting noted that such a gap analysis would inform the strategic direction of the Agreement, an issue to be discussed by the Meeting of the Parties. Any such analysis will clearly determine the focus of the future work of the Advisory Committee.

6.32 Noting this initial uncertainty in future focus, and that the Advisory Committee could potentially operate in a wide range of styles, the rules of procedure adopted for the Advisory Committee need to incorporate flexibility to meet any strategic direction determined by the Meeting of the Parties.

Education and Public Awareness

6.33 The importance of promoting awareness of ACAP and its objectives is recognised. It was agreed however that an ACAP position on this should be agreed before a communication and education strategy is developed. The first step should be to seek information from Parties and others on current actions.

Report Formats

6.34 Noting the requirement for the first Meeting of the Parties to agree a format for the Advisory Committee reports to subsequent Meetings of the Parties, which will include a synthesis of reports from Parties, the meeting considered the draft format provided by the interim Secretariat in “Establishment and reporting of the Advisory Committee” (MOP1/Doc. 17, Attachment 2).

6.35 The meeting took note of South Africa’s report on recent activities it had conducted concerning species listed under Annex 1 of the Agreement (“Status and conservation of albatrosses and the larger petrels in South Africa”, ScM1/Inf. 8). The meeting agreed the document provided a clear and readable summary of such activities and, with the addition of quantitative information, it could be considered to cover many of the requirements of a national report in narrative form.

6.36 It was noted that some sections of the report may need, at least initially, to be mainly narrative. However it was recommended that wherever practicable, the Advisory Committee and Parties should develop an efficient protocol-based reporting system with precise questions. The report format is likely to evolve quite rapidly and may need to include opportunities for focus on particular issues in different years.

6.37 The first Meeting of Parties should be encouraged to set up an informal group to consider the draft report format provided (“Establishment and reporting of the Advisory Committee”, MOP1/Doc. 17, Attachment 2). This should:

- a) identify and eliminate repetitive elements; and
- b) divide remaining issues into 3 categories:
 - (i) those where protocol reporting can be sought now (e.g. population status and trends based on Table 1 in ScM1/Doc. 9);
 - (ii) those where narrative is appropriate (e.g. control/eradication of non-natives); and
 - (iii) those where Parties or others should simply indicate the sources of relevant information, rather than supplying it.

7. OTHER BUSINESS

7.1. The meeting discussed possible changes to the species list in Annex 1 of the Agreement. It was recognised that consideration of changes to Annex 1 would require the development of appropriate criteria. To assist in this process, it was suggested that information on the current status and distribution of relevant threatened species should be circulated to participants in the form of the BirdLife International CD ROM. The Advisory Committee could then use this information to help develop criteria that might be used in assessing submissions for the inclusion of new species.

7.2 It was recognised that the term “petrel” was not defined in the Agreement; it was suggested that it could include shearwaters.

7.3 Spain suggested that the Cory’s Shearwater (*Calonectris diomedea*) was a potential candidate for inclusion on Annex 1 of the Agreement. It was suggested that Spain could prepare a document on the status of this species for submission to the Advisory Committee.

7.4. The meeting recognised that there had been considerable discussion about including North Pacific albatrosses in ACAP Annex 1 during ACAP’s negotiation. The benefits of maintaining close links with the relevant United States agencies (NOAA Fisheries, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of State) and the North Pacific Albatross Working Group and the Short-Tailed Albatross Recovery Team were noted. The meeting encouraged the US’s continued participation in ACAP as an

observer, particularly to facilitate the flow of information between ACAP and US agencies.

8. CLOSING REMARKS

8.1 In closing the meeting, the Chair (Prof. John Croxall) thanked all participants for attending the informal scientific meeting. He noted that a range of Parties, Signatories, Range States and Observers had attended the meeting. This mixture of participants had provided sound discussions on issues relating to the conservation of albatrosses and petrels, in particular on issues of taxonomy, research priorities and the Action Plan of the Agreement.

8.2 On behalf of the meeting, Prof. Croxall also extended thanks to the interim Secretariat for hosting the meeting. He acknowledged that the interim Secretariat staff had worked very well in developing papers under considerable time pressure and ensuring the smooth running of the meeting.

8.3 The Chair, on behalf of the meeting, also thanked the interpreters and translators in providing invaluable interpretation and translation during the meeting.

8.4 He wished the participants a productive First Meeting of Parties and a safe homeward journey.

8.5 Australia, on behalf of the meeting, thanked Prof. Croxall for accepting the task of Chair at such short notice and his efforts to ensure the meeting was productive and well- focused.

8.6 The UK, on behalf of the meeting, thanked Australia for hosting the meeting and fulfilling the role of interim Secretariat prior to, and during, the meeting.

**ANNEX 1
(ACAP/ScM1/Doc.5 Rev 3)**

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS IN SCIENTIFIC MEETING

ScM1 CHAIR Professor John CROXALL
Head of Conservation Biology, Biosciences
Division, British Antarctic Survey
Cambridge, United Kingdom

AUSTRALIA

Representative: Mr Barry BAKER
Seabird Conservation Program
Australian Antarctic Division
Hobart, Australia

Alternative Representative: Dr Rosemary GALES
Department of Primary Industries Water and
Environment
Hobart, Australia

Advisors: Ms Nicola BEYNON
Humane Society International
Sydney, Australia

Ms Tara HEWITT
Australian Antarctic Division
Hobart, Australia

NEW ZEALAND

Representative: Mr Neville SMITH
Senior Scientist
Ministry of Fisheries
Wellington, New Zealand

Alternate: Ms Janice MOLLOY
Department of Conservation
Wellington, New Zealand

Advisor: Mr Spencer CLUBB
Ministry of Fisheries
Wellington, New Zealand

REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

Representative: Dr Robert CRAWFORD
Chief Specialist Scientist
Department of Environmental Affairs and
Tourism
Rogge Bay, South Africa

Advisors: Mr Christian BADENHORST
Department of Foreign Affairs
Pretoria, South Africa

Mr John COOPER
University of Cape Town
Rondebosch, South Africa

Ms Samantha PETERSEN
Birdlife South Africa
Cape Town, South Africa

SPAIN

Representative: Dr Carmen-Paz MARTI
Secretaría General de Pesca Marítima
Madrid, Spain

Advisor: Mr Carles CARBONERAS MALET
Sociedad Espanola de Ornitología
Madrid, Spain

UNITED KINGDOM

Representative: Mr Mark TASKER
Joint Nature Conservation Committee
Aberdeen, Scotland, United Kingdom

Advisors: Dr Andrew DOUSE
Government Advisor
United Kingdom

SIGNATORIES

BRAZIL

Dr Onildo João MARINI FILHO
Brazilian Institute of Environment - IBAMA
Brasilia, Brazil

Mr Roberto PARENTE
Embassy of Brazil
Canberra, Australia

FRANCE

Mr Jean-Claude MIZZI
Ministry of Foreign Affairs – French Embassy
Canberra, Australia

RANGE STATES

NAMIBIA

Dr Ben VAN ZYL
Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources
Swakopmund, Namibia

NORWAY

Mr Øystein STØRKERSEN
Directorate for Nature Management
Trondheim, Norway

UNITED STATES

Ms Kim RIVERA
Seabird Coordinator
NOAA Fisheries
Juneau, Alaska, USA

OBSERVERS – NON-GOVERNMENT ORGANISATIONS

ANTARCTIC AND SOUTHERN OCEAN COALITION (ASOC)

Ms Estelle VAN DER MERWE
ASOC
Claremont, South Africa

BIRDLIFE INTERNATIONAL

Mr John O'SULLIVAN
Birdlife International
Bedfordshire, United Kingdom

Dr Ben SULLIVAN
Birdlife International
Bedfordshire, United Kingdom

CONVENTION ON THE CONSERVATION OF ANTARCTIC MARINE LIVING RESOURCES (CCAMLR)

Dr Denzil MILLER
CCAMLR Executive Secretary

**INSTITUTE OF ANTARCTIC
AND SOUTHERN OCEAN
STUDIES (IASOS)**

Dr Robert HALL
IASOS
Hobart, Australia

Dr Marcus HAWARD
IASOS
Hobart, Australia

**SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE ON
ANTARCTIC RESEARCH**

Dr Eric WOehler
c/o Australian Antarctic Division
Hobart, Australia

**SOUTHERN SEABIRD
SOLUTIONS TRUST**

Ms Janice MOLLOY
Department of Conservation
Wellington, New Zealand

**UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT
AUSTIN**

Professor Robin DOUGHTY
University of Texas at Austin
Austin, USA

INTERIM SECRETARIAT

INTERIM SECRETARIAT

Mr Ian HAY
Australian Antarctic Division
Hobart, Australia

STAFF

Ms Rachael ALDERMAN
Department of Primary Industries Water and
Environment
Hobart, Australia

Mr Steve CAMPBELL
Australian Antarctic Division
Hobart, Australia

Dr Helen RILEY
Scottish Natural Heritage
Edinburgh, Scotland, United Kingdom

Dr Aleks TERAUDS
Department of Primary Industries Water and
Environment
Hobart, Australia

INTERPRETERS

PACIFIC LANGUAGE SERVICES Mr Demetrio PADILLA
Language Coordinator
Pacific Language Services

Dr Sandra HALE
Spanish Interpreter
Pacific Language Services

TRANSLATORS

**CONFERENCE INTERPRETERS
INTERNATIONAL** Ms Peps DEMIREL
Language Coordinator
Conference Interpreters International

Mr J. C. LLOYD-SOUTHWELL
Spanish Translator
Conference Interpreters International

**ANNEX 2
(ACAP/ScM1/Doc.4 REV3)**

LIST OF SCIENTIFIC MEETING DOCUMENTS

ACAP/ScM1/Doc. 1 Rev 2	Provisional Agenda for the Scientific meeting to the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels	Interim Secretariat
ACAP/ScM1/Doc. 2 Rev 3	Provisional Annotated Agenda for the Scientific meeting to the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels	Interim Secretariat
ACAP/ScM1/Doc. 3 Rev 3	Provisional Schedule	Interim Secretariat
ACAP/ScM1/Doc. 4 Rev 3	List of Scientific Meeting Documents	Interim Secretariat
ACAP/ScM1/Doc. 5 Rev 3	List of Scientific Meeting Participants	Interim Secretariat
ACAP/ScM1/Doc. 6 ACAP/MOP1/Doc. 16	Establishment of Criteria for Emergency Conservation Measures	Interim Secretariat
ACAP/ScM1/Doc. 7 ACAP/MOP1/Doc. 15	Report of the Scientific Meeting	Science Meeting Chair / Interim Secretariat
ACAP/ScM1/Doc. 8	The need for ACAP Parties to agree a robust, transparent and defensible decision-making process for the construction and maintenance of their species lists	Australian Delegation
ACAP/ScM1/Doc. 9	Towards a Global Review of Population Trends of Albatrosses and Petrels as a Basis for Identifying Gaps in Knowledge and Priorities	Australian Delegation

ACAP/MOP1/Doc. 17	Establishment and reporting of Advisory Committee - (Attachment 2: Draft format for the Advisory Committee (and Parties) to report on the implementation of the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels)	Interim Secretariat
#####		
ACAP/ScM1/Inf. 1	Nomenclature and taxonomy of Albatrosses and large Petrels	Birdlife International
ACAP/ScM1/Inf. 2 ACAP/MOP1/Inf. 4	Assessment of role and responsibilities of the Advisory Committee	Birdlife International
ACAP/ScM1/Inf. 3	ACAP Action Plan (Annex 2 of Agreement)	Interim Secretariat
ACAP/ScM1/Inf. 4	Seabirds and Seals at the Prince Edwards Islands (South Africa)	South African Delegation
ACAP/ScM1/Inf. 5 ACAP/MOP1/Inf. 6	Regional Fisheries Monitoring Organisations: Their duties and performance in reducing incidental mortality of albatrosses	BirdLife International
ACAP/ScM1/Inf. 6 ACAP/MOP1/Inf. 3	BirdLife International Global Seabird Programme: its relevance to the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels	BirdLife International
ACAP/ScM1/Inf. 7	Conserving albatrosses and petrels at sea: towards the creation of a marine protected area around South Africa's sub-Antarctic Prince Edward Islands	South African Delegation
ACAP/ScM1/Inf. 8	Status and conservation of albatrosses and the larger petrels in South Africa	South African Delegation
ACAP/ScM1/Inf. 9	Albatross populations: status and threats	Australian Delegation

ACAP/ScM1/Inf. 10	Statistical assessment of the status and trends of Antarctic and sub-Antarctic seabirds	SCAR Bird Biology Observer
ACAP/ScM1/Inf. 11	Tracking Ocean Wanderers – the global distribution of albatrosses and petrels	BirdLife International
ACAP/ScM1/Inf. 12	Summary of Population Data, Conservation Status and Foraging Range of Seabird Species at Risk from Longline Fisheries in the Convention Area (SC-CCAMLR XXIII/BG/22)	CCAMLR
ACAP/ScM1/Inf. 13	Report of the Working Group on Fish Stock Assessment (extract on incidental mortality) (SC-CCAMLR XXIII/4)	CCAMLR
ACAP/ScM1/Inf. 14	Report of the XXIII Commission: Resolution 22/XXIII	CCAMLR