Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels

Fourth Meeting of the Parties
Lima, Peru, 23 – 27 April 2012

Initial Report on the Implementation of the Agreement 2008-2011

Advisory Committee Officials, Secretariat

The following report was submitted for consideration at the Sixth Meeting of the Advisory Committee to aid its preparation of the Summary Report on Implementation of the Agreement 2010 – 2012 (MoP4 Doc 11).

SUMMARY

This report has been compiled pursuant to Article X (j) and in fulfilment of Articles VII (1)(c) and IX (6)(d) of the Agreement. The information contained within Part 1 of this report has been obtained by the Secretariat from Parties pursuant to Article VII (1) (c) and Article VIII (10). Part 2 contains information provided by Parties to the Advisory Committee (AC) on an annual basis to assist it with its work. A key function of the Advisory Committee (AC) is to report to the Meeting of the Parties (MoP) on the implementation of the Agreement. This document contains information that the Secretariat and AC Officials consider relevant to informing Parties on progress with implementing the Agreement.

OBJECTIVE

The key objectives for reporting on the implementation of the Agreement are to: (1) provide information regarding the assessment of progress towards the objectives of the Agreement; (2) gather information on lessons learned, including successes and failures, in order to conduct albatross and petrel conservation in the most efficient and effective manner; (3) identify further research to be carried out; and (4) provide a resource of material on albatross and petrel conservation.

METHODS

At MoP3 it was agreed that improvements to the reporting process were required in order to meet the collective needs of Parties and the Advisory Committee. It was agreed to develop and test a new reporting system for reporting to MoP4. Australia led intersessional work on an electronic reporting system and with the support of the Secretariat implemented the new system in 2010-11. The information provided by Parties, Range States and others is detailed in full in Information Papers submitted to AC6. A summary of this information was prepared

by the Secretariat and is presented below for the consideration of the Meeting of the Parties in addressing the above-mentioned objectives.

1. PART 1 – SUMMARY OF REPORTS ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AGREEMENT

Implementation reports were received from nine Parties. In addition, one Range State and one international Non-Government Organisation (NGO) provided reports on actions they had taken relevant to the Agreement's work. The reports received followed the reporting format prescribed in Annex 8 of the record of the Third Meeting of the ACAP Advisory Committee (AC3), and covered the period April 2008 to March 2011, as well as earlier information where relevant. Not all respondents reported against every reporting item. A summary of the information received is provided below.

1.1. Overview of implementation of Agreement and Action Plan

1.1.1. Has action been taken to implement the decisions of previous MoPs?

Those who responded to this question indicated that all decisions taken by MoP have been implemented. Specific examples of action taken include:

Argentina – Yes. Actions taken are specifically referred to in the answers to following questions.

Australia - Domestic treaty ratification action has been taken to give effect to the provisions of the Headquarters Agreement between it and the Agreement's Secretariat.

South Africa –A permit system has been established to reduce seabird bycatch in the domestic swordfish and tuna longline fisheries.

Spain – Continuous data gathering through the observers aboard fishing vessels occurs on the incidental capture of seabirds and the use of mitigation measures.

United Kingdom (UK) –An ACAP Coordination Project has been funded to ensure coherence of action between the UK and its overseas territories, particularly in regard to planning and implementation of ACAP-related work, such as leading on critical seabird bycatch mitigation work, both in domestic and international fora.

NON-GOVERNMENT ORGANISATIONS

BirdLife International – Has undertaken, a) capacity building, through the Albatross Task Force (ATF) which operates in seven countries to build technical capacity to reduce seabird bycatch; and through the support of observer training and exchange programmes between national programmes from Ecuador and Argentina; b) provision of expert knowledge to aid development of ACAP's conservation priorities process; c) identification of ACAP Internationally Important Breeding Sites (IBAs); d) assisting with the development and implementation of the waved albatross action plan; e) supporting the development of indicators, through update of the IUCN Red List and through work with ACAP Parties; f) provision of information for ACAP species assessments; g)

development and use of the Global Procellariiform Tracking Database to support ACAP's work; h) engagement with Regional Fisheries Management Organisations; i) leading on the development of NPOA Best Practice Technical Guidelines for seabirds and assisting ACAP Parties with the development and implementation of NPOA-Seabirds; j) initiating and developing seabird bycatch mitigation fact sheets; and k) encouraging the participation of Range States in ACAP meetings.

1.1.2. Is action for national implementation planned to occur in the next three years?

Respondents reported a wide range of actions being proposed to implement the Agreement and its Action Plan over the next three years. Actions being proposed follow:

Argentina – The national plan for the conservation of the Southern Giant Petrel was finalised. Training and outreach programmes were introduced to the Federal Fisheries Council targeting observers and the fishing industry (this is a formal continuation of actions already conducted in previous years). New areas are planned to be added to the extant marine protected areas system.

Australia – Continued monitoring of the status of breeding populations, eradication of non-native taxa at a major breeding site, and continuing to reduce fisheries bycatch of ACAP listed species.

South Africa – Continued monitoring of ACAP species at the Prince Edward Islands.

Spain – The elaboration of a national report on seabird bycatch is programmed. Spain participated in the consultation process for the adoption of the EU POA for the reduction of seabird bycatch in fisheries.

UK – Development, adoption and implementation of ACAP action plans for each of the UK's overseas territories will continue. Work will focus on areas such as management of threats at breeding sites; monitoring of status and trends of populations; analysis of foraging ranges and overlap with fisheries; and reducing seabird bycatch, including through further development and implementation of bycatch mitigation measures.

PARTICIPATING NON-PARTY

United States of America (USA) – Rat eradication programs at Palmyra Atoll (2011) and Wake Atoll (2012).

1.2. Species conservation

1.2.1. Has the Party provided any exemptions to prohibitions on the taking or harmful interference with albatrosses and petrels?

PARTICIPATING NON-PARTY

Only one exemption was reported – the USA approved the take of 45 Laysan albatross eggs under permit in 2010 near military airstrips on Kaua'I and O'ahu, Hawaii to ensure the safety of aircraft operations.

1.2.2. Has any use or trade in albatrosses or petrels occurred?

No reports were provided of trade in albatrosses and petrels occurring.

1.2.3. Has the Party implemented any new single or multi-species conservation strategies / Action Plans?

Argentina – The Secretary of Environment and the Under Secretariat of Fisheries developed the NPOA-Seabirds based on a technical document elaborated by National Universities and the National Research Council (CONICET). The NPOA-S was formally adopted by the Federal Fisheries Council in 2010 (Resolution 15/2010). A plan of Action for the Southern Giant Petrel is currently under development.

Australia reported a revised national recovery plan for albatrosses and giant petrels is expected to be finalised and adopted in early 2011. It will detail key conservation actions necessary to monitor the status of Australia's breeding populations, to reduce at-sea and on-land threats within Australia's jurisdiction, to educate fishers and others and to encourage increased international conservation efforts.

South Africa reported the adoption of a national plan for reducing the incidental catch of seabirds in longline fisheries in 2008.

The UK reported that action plans have been developed for each of its overseas territories, with the following action being taken:

- Tristan da Cunha. The Biodiversity Action Plan 2006-2010 is presently in the process of being reviewed and updated.
- South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]. Strategy documents for the period 2010-2015 have been developed. Key aspects of the strategy include: to conserve, and where practical restore, the biodiversity of the island, to ensure safe and sustainable management of fisheries to ensure minimal impact on non-target species and habitats.
- Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1]. A Biodiversity Strategy was published in 2008 which sets out the desired future for biodiversity in the Islands, and identifies priority species, habitats, threats and management actions for the period 2008-2018. A stakeholder workshop was scheduled in April 2011 to review the Biodiversity Strategy and to develop action plans to address priority threats and manage important habitats, sites and species in the islands.

PARTICIPATING NON-PARTY

The USA reported the installation of a predator exclusion fence at Ka'ena Point, O'ahu seabird colony (2011) and invasive weed control of *Verbesina enceliodes* at Midway Atoll (ongoing).

[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 Sandwich del Sur) and the surrounding maritime areas".

1.2.4. Has the Party taken any emergency measures involving albatrosses or petrels?

PARTICIPATING NON-PARTY

The USA reported the emergency rescue of Laysan and blackBlack-footed albatrosses injured and trapped in debris as a result of the March 2011 tsunami.

1.2.5. Has the Party conducted any re-establishment schemes?

PARTICIPATING NON-PARTY

USA - Social attraction for shortShort-tailed albatrosses at Midway Atoll was initiated in 2000. In 2010, an egg was laid and a chick hatched in February 2011. This is the first successful nesting of a short-tailed albatross in the USA. In 2010, a pair of shortShort-tailed albatrosses also laid two eggs at Kure Atoll. However, this pair is a female x female pair and the eggs did not hatch.

1.2.6. Has the Party introduced any new legal or policy instruments for species protection of albatrosses and petrels?

Argentina – Regulations relative to the protection of breeding sites, fishing area closures, and environmental pollution presented in the 2008 report are still in force. Adoption of a measure of the Under Secretariat of Fisheries 127/2009 regulates the use of mitigation measures to reduce seabird bycatch in longline fisheries (this measure regulates a Resolution of the Federal Fisheries Council (CFP 8/2008).

Australia – yes, refer to information provided at 2.3.

Spain – Yes. The European Directive on the conservation of wild birds (2009/147/CE), with Annex I including procellariform species. Spain has recently adopted the Law for the Protection of the Marine Environment (41/2010).

UK – Yes. A number of instruments that have been introduced including:

- Tristan da Cunha. In July 2009 the St Helena, Ascension and Tristan da Cunha Constitution Order 2009 was enacted.
- South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]. The Wildlife and Protected Areas Ordinance was drafted and made available for public comment in May 2010. The Ordinance is intended to provide protection for all of the Territory's native wildlife, and to enable the declaration of Specially Protected Areas and Marine Protected Areas. The Ordinance is expected to be approved and enacted in 2011.
- Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1]. refer to 2.3 above. The National Plan of Action for reducing incidental catch of seabirds in trawl was revised in 2009 and following stakeholder consultations was adopted in February 2010. This NPOA extends from 2009 to 2012, with a major review due in 2013. The National Plan of Action for reducing incidental catch of seabirds in longline fisheries (originally published in 2004) has been formally reviewed, and the revised version is in the process of being finalised.

PARTICIPATING NON-PARTY

USA – Yes. See: http://www.fakr.noaa.gov/frules/74fr13355.pdf and http://www.fakr.noaa.gov/frules/72fr71601.pdf Refinements and revisions to seabird avoidance gear requirements in longline fisheries (for groundfish and halibut) off Alaska.

1.2.7. Has the Party implemented any legal or policy instruments for environmental impact assessments?

Argentina – Regulations reported in 2008 remain in force.

Australia – No new legal instruments. An environmental impact statement was prepared prior to the commencement of the project to eradicate alien invasive pests at Macquarie Island, a major Australian subantarctic breeding site for ACAP-listed species. A review of the eradication project activities in 2010, including the unexpectedly high impact on non-target species (including ACAP-listed species) was completed in late 2010.

UK – Yes. A number of instruments that have been introduced including:

- South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]. An Environmental Impact Assessment for the eradication of rodents from South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1] was undertaken. Following a public consultation process, conditional approval was provided for Phase 1 of the rodent eradication proposal.
- Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1]. Over the reporting period, a total of five Environmental Impact Statements (EISs) were submitted by four companies in relation to offshore drilling for hydrocarbons. A number of changes and updates are presently being considered for environmental regulations pertaining to offshore drilling and related activities (e.g. seismic surveys).

1.2.8. Does the Party have any species it would like to submit for addition to Annex 1?

Spain – Yes. Balearic Shearwater (*Puffinus mauretanicus*). Species assessment forwarded.

NON-GOVERNMENT ORGANISATIONS

BirdLife International – At MoP3 there was discussion about the inclusion of *Puffinus* shearwaters. Depending on the outcome of discussions on the potential scope of the Convention on Migratory Species at forthcoming meetings, BirdLife may wish to suggest to AC6 the consideration of including additional seabird species within ACAP.

1.2.9. Are there any other conservation projects for ACAP species not already mentioned?

Argentina - Yes. A Seabird Conservation Programme developed by Aves Argentinas. A Programme for the identification of IBAS led by Aves Argentinas/BirdLife International with the collaboration of Wildlife Conservation Society and local and international researchers. Inter-Jurisdictional System of Marine Protected Areas (Project ARG/10/G47

funded by the UNDP. Breeding areas of the Southern Giant Petrel are included within the areas protected by this system.

Australia – Yes. Baiting operations commenced in 2010 at subantarctic Macquarie Island as part a multi-year project to eradicate alien invasive pests (rabbits, rats and mice). Of particular relevance to ACAP was the impact of baiting on (non-target) ACAP-listed species. In the first season only 8% of bait was able to be spread due to bad weather halting helicopter operations, however 947 poisoned bird carcases (16 Southern Giant Petrels, 298 Northern Giant Petrels, 226 subantarctic skuas, 385 kelp gulls, 22 mallard and black duck) had been discovered on the island by 9 February 2011, with 4 SGPs (1 banded bird from Macquarie Island) discovered dead in the New Zealand subantarctic and which tested positive for brodifacoum, the bait used at Macquarie Island. An unknown number of other birds is likely to have died at sea. The full eradication (including bait spreading) project is now scheduled to be implemented between April and September 2011, with increased mitigation measures to minimise impacts on non-target species.

PARTICIPATING NON-PARTY

USA – Yes. Refer Arata, J., P. Sievert, and M. Naughton. 2009. Status Assessment of Laysan and black-footed albatrosses, North Pacific Ocean, 1923-2005. U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigation Report 2009-5131.

1.3. Habitat conservation

1.3.1. Has the Party introduced any legal or policy instruments or actions to implement protection and management of breeding sites, including habitat restoration?

Argentina – Yes. Adoption of National Law Nº 26446 in 2008 for the creation of the Interjurisdictional Coastal-Marine Park Patagonia Austral (management plan under development). Actions were also undertaken in the Staten Island Provincial Reserve with the purpose of improving logistic conditions to facilitate the development of research projects.

Australia – Yes. Refer to Q2.9.

Spain – Yes. Law 41/2010 for the Protection of Marine Environment creates the network of Marine protected areas in Spain. It is expected that this network will include the Specially Protected Areas for Seabirds according to the European Directive. Spain continues developing Project LIFE+INDEMARES (2009-2013) on the inventory of “Red Natura 2000 marina en España" for the identification of important areas for seabirds.

UK – Yes. A number of actions that have been taken including:

- Tristan da Cunha have led a process to assess and monitor the impact of House Mice on a range of species at Gough Island, including the ACAP-listed Tristan Albatross, to conduct research to determine the feasibility and best approach to eradicate House Mice from the island, and to collect baseline information in advance of an

eradication operation. The project has recently been expanded to evaluate the impacts of mice at Steeple Jason in the Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1] and at South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]. This (OTEP funded) project funding has also supported continued efforts to eradicate Sagina from Gough Island. The Tristan Conservation Department have undertaken a range of activities to strengthen biosecurity measures at Inaccessible and Nightingale Islands (both currently free of rodents), and to manage invasive alien plant species at Tristan da Cunha and Nightingale Island, both important breeding sites for ACAP species. In 2008, Gough and Inaccessible islands and their territorial waters were designated Wetlands of International Importance under the Ramsar Convention by the UK Government. Formal listing by the Convention followed in September 2009 as site number 1868 (Gough) and 1869 (Inaccessible).

- South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]. An eradication programme has been developed with plans to eradicate all rodents (Norway Rats and House Mice) from South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]. Conditional approval has been given for the first phase of the eradication programme to proceed, the fieldwork for which commenced in February 2011. A document has also been produced reviewing the impact of Reindeer at South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1], and the options available for their management. A Reindeer Management Plan is currently being developed.
- A range of biosecurity measures have also been developed that are enforced through the permitting system. The range of biosecurity measures already in place are being formally taken up in a legislative review currently underway, and will thus have legislative power once the new conservation legislation is enacted. The Wildlife and Protected Areas Ordinance is also in the process of being finalised, and is expected to be approved and enacted in 2011. See also section 2.7.
- Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1] - Four islands (Carcass, Lively, the Speedwell/George/Barren group and Sea Lion islands - three of which are ACAP breeding sites), have been identified as priority sites requiring special biosecurity and quarantine attention. Island-specific Biosecurity Plans have been developed for Carcass and Sea Lion Islands (the latter an ACAP breeding site). The plans include actions to minimise the risk of rodent introductions, surveillance work to check for the presence of rodents (bait stations), and a contingency component to be implemented in the event of any incursions. A South Atlantic Invasive Species Strategy and Action Plan was developed at a regional meeting of the South Atlantic OTs on Ascension Island in May 2009. The strategy aims to provide a focus for the SAOTs to develop and implement effective prevention and response mechanisms to reduce the impact of invasive alien species.

PARTICIPATING NON-PARTY

USA – Yes. Refer to question 2.3.

NON-GOVERNMENT ORGANISATIONS

BirdLife International – Yes. Have led on the development of several management plans for important breeding sites for ACAP species. This includes the production of a management plan for Sea Lion Island (a breeding island for Southern Giant petrel and has and recently designated as a National Nature Reserve), and the development of a Management Plan for Steeple Jason and Grand Jason Islands(important breeding sites

for Black-browed albatross and Southern Giant petrels). Have also collaborated with the RSPB and the Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) to investigate the impacts of house mice on the avifauna of Steeple Jason Island, under the Darwin Initiative Project "Building Capacity for Eradication of Mice in the UK OTs". To date, RSPB and its affiliated scientists have spent 10 weeks on Steeple Jason monitoring the distribution of mice and their impact on nesting birds.

1.3.2. Has the Party implemented any sustainable management measures for marine living resources which provide food for albatrosses and petrels?

Argentina – Yes. There is ongoing development of resolutions for the sustainable use of resources. A mandatory use of selectivity devices for fishing vessels targeting the hake *Merluccius hubbsi* was adopted with a resolution of the Federal Fisheries Council CFP 8/2010.

Australia – Yes. Australia's fisheries are managed according to ecosystem-based management principles which seek to ensure that maximum sustainable yields for target species are not exceeded and that there is adequate escapement of target species to maintain ecosystem relationships, including with dependent and associated species (such as seabirds).

South Africa – Yes. Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries) requires mitigation measures that reduce the bycatch of seabirds to be implemented (see 1.1 above)

Spain – Yes. As a member of the Antarctic Treaty and CCAMLR, have administrated marine living resources according to measure imposed by both conventions. Spain is also a member of different RFMOs and follows all regulations adopted by these Organizations.

UK – Yes. The following actions have been taken:

- The Tristan da Cunha Fishery Limits Ordinance, 1983 (as amended in 1991, 1992, 1997 and 2001) defines the fishery limits of Tristan da Cunha as 200 nautical miles around each of the islands, and makes provision for the regulation of fishing activities within these limits.
- South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]. CCAMLR measures are adopted as a minimum standard.
- Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1]. - the Fisheries (Conservation and Management) Ordinance 2005 has as a key objective that exploitation of fisheries resources and related activities are conducted in a manner consistent with the need to have regard for the impact of fishing activities on non-target species and the long term sustainability of the marine environment.

PARTICIPATING NON-PARTY

USA – Yes. The BSAI Fishery Management Plan (FMP) and the GOA FMP include management objectives to protect the integrity of the food web through limits on harvest of forage species.

1.3.3. Has the Party implemented any management or protection of important marine areas for albatrosses and petrels?

Argentina – Yes. A number of fishing areas are closed. Since these areas may change through the year, the closure areas for October 2010 are provided as example. National law refers in point 3.1 includes the land, maritime and aerial spaces in the north of San Jorge Gulf. The Burdwood Bank area was closed for fisheries according to resolution of the Under-Secretariat of Fisheries Nº 250/2008.

South Africa – Yes. South Africa has several marine protected areas utilized by albatrosses and petrels where no fishing is allowed.

UK – Yes. CCAMLR Subarea 48.3 is closed to fishing between September and April each year (the breeding season for albatrosses and petrels at South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]) to minimise seabird-fishery interactions during this critical period. Ongoing research work will be used to inform the possible development of MPAs around South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1].

Spain – At the national level it is planned to declare Specially Protected Areas for seabirds, based on the scientific knowledge provided by Project Life "IBA for marine species in Spain", including eight procellariform species, the Balearic Shearwater among them.

PARTICIPATING NON-PARTY

USA – Yes. Pacific Remote Islands and Rose Atoll Marine National Monuments were established in 2009. These areas provide important habitat for seabirds nesting on these islands.

NON-GOVERNMENT ORGANISATIONS

BirdLife International - Royal Forest and Bird New Zealand have developed a marine Important Bird Area framework for New Zealand and identified all sites for ACAP species which qualify as Important Bird Areas. They have also established a Site Support Group for the main Westland petrel breeding site, with a network of volunteers to assist with monitoring and research programmes. Aves Argentinas is collaborating with the Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) to identify and map marine IBAs, which include 30 candidate sites for seaward extensions from breeding colonies, including three Southern Giant petrel breeding sites.

1.4. Management of human activities

1.4.1. Has the Party completed any new environmental impact assessments related to albatrosses and petrels?

Argentina – An ERA is under development for the demersal longline fishery (completion estimated in late 2011).

Australia – Yes. Refer to Q2.7.

Spain – Yes. Resolution 1028/2007 establishing procedures for the development of wind generated power plants in offshore areas requires environmental impact assessments to be undertaken.

Uruguay – Yes. Risk analysis is conducted for the assessment of impacts arising from the pelagic longline fishery on albatrosses and petrels.

1.4.2. Has the Party implemented any new measures to minimise discharge of pollutants and marine debris (MARPOL)?

Argentina - No. However, the capacities of operators were strengthened with a training programme in 2010 addressing spills of oil and other hazardous substances organised by the National Coast Guard and National and Provincial Governments.

Spain – Yes. On 1 May 2009 there came into force the declaration of the Mediterranean Sea as a Special Zone in relation to MARPOL Annex V, with the introduction of more restrictive measures for the discharge of waste from vessels. In 2010 a new measure came into force in relation to MARPOL Annex IV (RD 1084/2009 amending RD1381/2002). In 2010, the revised and more restrictive MARPOL Annex VI came into force.

UK – Yes. A range of actions have been taken as follows:
- South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]. A stakeholder consultation process on the future use and carriage of heavy fuel oil by vessels has been undertaken and a policy on this issue is being developed.
- Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1]. Following an oil spill from a sunken fishing vessel in 2008 a process to review and update the oil spill contingency plan for the islands was initiated. A National Oil Spill Contingency Plan came into effect in early 2010.

PARTICIPATING NON-PARTY

USA – Yes. Have implemented or are in the process of implementing several measures, including: 1) ban on use or carriage of HGO in the Antarctic Area. 2) review of and amendments to Annex VI (air emissions) will institute limits on the sulphur content of marine fuel globally. 3) instituted an Emission Control Area for the area 200nm off the coast of the US which will limit SOx, NOx, and particulate matter. 4) are participating in the final review of and amendments to Annex V limiting the types of garbage that can be disposed of at sea.

1.4.3. Has the Party introduced any new measures to minimise the disturbance to albatrosses and petrels in marine and terrestrial habitats?

Argentina - Yes. Refer to Measures detailed in points 2.6, 3.1, 3.3.

UK – Yes. A range of actions have been taken as follows:
- South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]. The tourism management policy was updated in 2009. Tourist landings may only be made at one of the approved tourist landing sites, after a permit has been granted.
- Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1]. Funding has been provided to erect a fence at Grave Cove around the Black-browed Albatross colony, to protect the nesting habitat and courting and nesting birds from grazing sheep and sheep-gathering activities.

1.5. Research programmes

1.5.1. Does the Party have any ongoing research programmes relating to the conservation of albatrosses and petrels not already reported on?

Argentina - Yes. Monitoring and risk analysis of the demersal longline fishery for the period 2001-2010. • Analysis of the dynamics of trawl fishery and seabird incidental mortality, including effectiveness of mitigation measures. • Analysis of use of fishery discards by seabirds in longline and trawl fisheries through molecular indicators. • Spatial modeling of attendance and incidental mortality of seabirds in trawl fisheries. Study of interactions between seabirds and fisheries in the Austral Patagonia. • Design and investigation on mitigation measures in freezer trawlers and bird scaring lines in longliners.

Australia – Yes. Long term population monitoring and research programs on ACAP species continue at subantarctic Macquarie Island and at all three breeding sites around mainland Tasmania for Shy albatross. Several research projects are underway to develop improved mitigation of bycatch in pelagic longline fisheries. These include the development of a device to set hooks underwater and further evaluation of different line weighting options to achieve fast sink rates with weight sizes that are acceptable to fishers. The use of automated cameras to assess population levels and trends at a southern giant petrel breeding site in east Antarctica (Hawker Island) is also continuing.

South Africa – Yes. Regular counts of six species of albatross and petrel are undertaken at Marion Island. Counts of seven species of albatross and petrel were made at Prince Edward Island in 2008. Trends in numbers of seven species of albatross and petrel breeding at the Prince Edward Islands up until 2008 were published in 2009.

Spain – Yes. The Institute of Oceanography is undertaking studies on incidental capture of seabirds in the Mediterranean and Gulf of Cádiz (García-Barcelona *et al.* 2010).

UK – Yes. A range of research has been undertaken as follows:
- South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]. Long term monitoring of all ACAP species breeding on Bird Island. Ongoing monitoring of Wandering and Light-mantled Sooty Albatrosses, and Northern and Southern Giant Petrels at Albatross and Prion Islands.

- Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1]. Long term monitoring of all Black-browed Albatrosses at Steeple Jason and New Island. Annual monitoring of population trends and breeding success of Southern Giant Petrels at Steeple Jason. Ongoing studies of the foraging ecology of Black-browed Albatrosses at New Island and more recently at Steeple Jason.
- Tristan da Cunha. Ongoing monitoring of Tristan Albatross, Atlantic-Yellow Nosed Albatross and Southern Giant Petrel at Gough Island, by RSPB and UCT. Ongoing monitoring of Atlantic Yellow-nosed Albatross at Tristan and Nightingale by Tristan Conservation Department.

Uruguay - Within the frame of the National Observers Programme for the fleet targeting tuna (Pelagic Resources Area of National Direction of Aquatic Resources) and in collaboration with Project Albatrosses and Petrels, research is focused on determining of efficiency of bird scaring lines in deterring mortality of albatrosses and petrels. A joint project with Australia investigated other measures such as underwater setting. Research also addressed the effect of reducing the distance of weight-hook in the CPUE of target species and seabird bycatch.

PARTICIPATING NON-PARTY

USA – Yes. For Laysan and Black-footed albatrosses, as follows: • Demographic monitoring at Midway, Laysan, French Frigate Shoals colonies: reproductive success and survival rates. • Demographic monitoring at O'ahu colonies (Laysan albatross only): reproductive success, disease rates, population genetics and survival rates. • Tracking of adult and fledgling albatrosses to determine habitat utilization, inter-annual variation, and post-breeding dispersal. • Plastic ingestion by black-footed albatross:colony comparisons, inter-annual variation. • Analysis of diet from stomach oil, opportunistic wet diet, and stable isotope analysis from blood and feathers in both albatross species. • Analysis of albatrosses caught in fisheries: diet, plastics, stable isotope.

NON-GOVERNMENT ORGANISATIONS

BirdLife International – Yes. Albatross Task Force. 2009-10, the ATF conducted their first year of mitigation research onboard commercial longliners and trawlers to identify best practice mitigation measures for pelagic longline and trawl vessels. Research consisted of the study of: Longline fleet • Effect of different line weighting regimes on the sink rate of baited hooks; • Effect of different line weighting regimes on the seabird attack rate on baited hooks; • Effect of different line weighting regimes on the target species (fish) catch; • Investigating best practice combination of tori lines and line weight to reduce seabird mortality; Trawl fleets • Offal management to reduce seabird mortality • Use of a modified towed device for tori lines; • Use of tori lines to reduce seabird mortality.

Hook Pod and Safe Leads. Since 2005, BirdLife has worked closely with Fishtek (UK) to develop and trial two emerging mitigation measures for pelagic longline fisheries;. In 2008, ACAP granted AUS$20,000 to BirdLife to conduct at-sea trials to test the operational effectiveness of the hook pod. Further trials were conducted in Australia in November 2010. Safe Leads have now been trialled extensively in ATF countries and are ready for commercial sales.

1.5.2. Does the Party have any additional national institutions (authorities or research centres), or NGOs involved in albatross and petrel conservation?

Six Parties and one participating non-Party provided information on the national institutions and NGOs involved in albatross and petrel conservation. Details of those organisations can be found in the respective implementation reports, tabled as AC6 Information Papers.

1.6. Education and public awareness

1.6.1. Has the Party conducted training or provided information for user audiences (e.g. scientists, fishers, etc)?

Argentina – Yes. Aves Argentinas, INIDEP and UNMDP-CONICET conduct training programmes for observers of the National Observer programme. ATF- Aves Argentinas periodically visit large fishing harbors to raise awareness among fishermen on the need for better fishing practices and the conservation of albatrosses and petrels. FVSA, Aves Argentinas and UNMDP-CONICET coordinated a pilot outreach programme in 2010 for raising awareness in crews. In 2008 the Federal Fisheries Council published a series of seabird ID cards elaborated by Aves Argentinas and Fundación Patagonia Natural.

Australia – Yes. Information training sessions provided to all tuna fishers and at-sea observers.

South Africa – Yes. WWF-SA has provided training for fishers.

Spain – Yes. Outreach campaigns targeting the fishing sector are conducted by different NGOs to show interactions between fisheries with seabirds and marine turtles as well as the negative effect of discarding overboard parts of the fishing gear. These campaigns are funded through the Ministry of Environment among other Governmental Organisations.

Uruguay – Yes. Within the framework of the Albatross and Petrels Project and with the collaboration of DINARA, the Atlántico Sur Bulletin is periodically published with the purpose of showing to the industry actions conducted in Uruguay for the reduction of incidental mortality of albatrosses and petrels.

NON-GOVERNMENT ORGANISATIONS

BirdLife International - Albatross Task Force instructors from all seven countries regularly work with fishermen in ports, at-sea and in workshops to raise awareness of the urgent conservation need to introduce mitigation measures to target fisheries. This includes the development of targeted educational materials in English, Spanish and Portuguese. They also provide advice on the adoption of best practice mitigation to fishers, government agencies and national observer programmes. One the legacies of the ATF will be national observer programmes with an improved understanding of the a

range of seabird bycatch related issues, and strengthened data collection protocols to record and analyse seabird bycatch and monitor the adoption of best practice mitigation.

1.6.2. Has the Party conducted training or provided information to the general public?

Argentina – Yes. Outreach presentations in high schools on the conservation of the marine environment and albatrosses and petrels. Photographic exposition on albatrosses in Ecocentro Puerto Madryn. Fundación Patagonia Natural published a calendar in 2011 with some ACAP species included. Hidrobiologic Station Puerto Quequén (Argentinean Museum of Natural Sciences Bernardino Rivadavia) installed a room dedicated to seabirds with the collaboration of Aves Argentinas.

Australia – Yes. A range of seabird conservation information is made available to the general public, principally through publishing on websites.

South Africa – Yes. In 2010, an article "Biological survey confirms Prince Edward Islands an important breeding site" was published in Umlobi.

Spain – Yes. Campaigns for the general public addressing the effect of discarding garbage in the marine environment.

UK – Yes. The process to develop the ACAP action plans involved extensive stakeholder consultation, in which draft versions of the plans and associated information were provided for discussion and comment. As well, the following actions were undertaken:

- South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]. Annual presentations are provided to IAATO on tourist management policies, as well as annual fisheries science meetings being held with industry representatives. Comprehensive training programmes and workshops are provided for prospective fisheries observers. All updated plans, guidelines and other materials are disseminated widely and made available on the web.
- Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1]. Routine training is provided to fisheries observers responsible for monitoring bycatch. Following changes to the licence conditions to require trawlers to use a modified tori line design (from July 2009), consultations were held with skippers and crew of trawl vessels, through a questionnaire, to obtain feedback on the practicability of the new tori line.

Uruguay – Yes. Presentations are given to the general public by DINARA in collaboration with the Albatross and Petrels Project.

NON-GOVERNMENT ORGANISATIONS

BirdLife International – Yes. ATF instructors in all target countries are involved at some level in presenting information to the public For example, in South Africa the ATF team organise and run an annual event called Save our Seabirds (SOS), which lasts for a week in Cape Town and includes demonstrations, displays and presentations to the public to raise awareness of threats facing albatrosses and petrels and then solutions available. The event has been running for two years, is very well attended and raises considerable sponsorship and funds from the event, which are used directly to fund seabird conservation.

1.7. Other

Does the Party have any new information to report on research into observed impacts, or mitigation of, climate change on albatrosses and petrels

Argentina – No, although the Governmental Committee on Climate Change has elaborated a document in 2010 on the National strategy on climate change, its structure, general objectives and resources.

Uruguay – Budgetary limitations restrict progress in research on this issue.

UK – Yes. Nevoux *et al*. 2010 – looks at implications of climate variability for black-browed albatrosses

1.8. Additional Comments

None reported.

2. PART 2 - REPORT ON ITEMS IN SECTION 5.1 OF THE ACTION PLAN

2.1. Assessment and review of the status of populations of albatrosses and petrels (item 5.1.a).

2.1.1. Current Conservation Status

With the addition of the three North Pacific albatross species, there are currently 29 seabird species listed by ACAP in Annex 1 of the Agreement. Of these, 21 (73%) are classified at risk of extinction, a stark contrast to the overall rate of 12% for the 9,799 bird species worldwide. Of the 22 species of albatrosses listed by ACAP, three are listed as *Critically Endangered*, six are *Endangered*, eight are *Vulnerable* and five are *Near Threatened*. Of the seven petrel species, four are currently listed as *Vulnerable,* one as *Near Threatened* (Table 1) and two species as *Least Concern* (see ACX Doc X).

Population declines (historic and/or current), largely driven by interactions with fisheries, are responsible for triggering the unfavourable classification status for at least 11 species. A total of 11 species (38% of ACAP species) are currently showing population declines, with historic population declines responsible for the acutely small population of one species (Amsterdam albatross). The restricted range of breeding locations is also a limiting factor for 17 ACAP species. A series of species assessments have been developed to describe succinctly the state of knowledge of each of the ACAP species. These assessments are available on the ACAP website in the three languages of the Agreement.

2.1.2. Changes in Status and Trends since MoP3

Since MoP3 (2009), there have been changes in the status of seven ACAP species reflecting the addition of the three Pacific species and reviews by BirdLife International, the listing authority for the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN). These species are Laysan, Black-footed, Short-tailed and Chatham Albatross, and Giant petrels (details to be provided following STWG6).

2.1.3. Status of knowledge relating to population size and trends

Since MoP3 there have been significant advances in the extent and capacity of the ACAP database to curate and query information relating to the status and trends of ACAP species. These advances have enabled significantly more comprehensive analyses of current state of knowledge of population size and trends. This text to be completed following STWG6.

ACAP species status data by jurisdiction

An examination of the information available from the ACAP database illustrates the extent of responsibility, by jurisdiction, for management of breeding sites of ACAP species. (see ANNEX 1).

New Zealand has responsibility for a greater number of ACAP species, including endemics, than any other jurisdiction. This wealth of seabird diversity is reflected in the investment by New Zealand into long term population studies, and hence their responsibility for the majority of studies of survival and productivity. However, over a third of the NZ ACAP populations are of unknown size, and the population trend of over 80% is unknown.

France has responsibility for more ACAP breeding populations than any other jurisdiction. The size of most (76%) of these is known, but not the trend because of difficulties accessing remote sites. The long term focus of French researchers at Crozet and Kerguelen has produced important information on survival and productivity of a range of ACAP species.

Australia, South Africa and the **United Kingdom** (excluding Disputed Territories) are also responsible for the breeding colonies of a range of ACAP species, including endemics (UK 3 and Australia 1). There is at least some information on population size for all the 16 UK populations, for 13 South African populations, and for 83% of colonies occurring in Australian jurisdiction, although information on population trend is much more limited. A number of long term demography programs have however at least provided some information on survival rates and breeding success in these regions.

There are fewer ACAP species, but large numbers of breeding populations occurring in the **Antarctic, Chile** and **US** with deficiencies in the level of knowledge of population size only for the Antarctic region. Similar to other regions, there is limited information on population trends, particularly from Chilean sites.

Argentina (excluding Disputed Territories), **Ecuador**, **Japan** and **Mexico** are responsible for fewer breeding locations of ACAP species. Information on size is available for all populations under these jurisdictions, but there is much more limited knowledge of trends, although data have been collected for one site in Argentina. There are adult survival and productivity statistics available for the single endemic species in Ecuador, and Argentina has reported productivity data for their single ACAP species.

Significant work has been undertaken on the eight ACAP species that breed in territories whose sovereignty is under **Dispute**. Forty percent of all ACAP populations occur in these regions, and the population size remains unknown for many (39%) of these populations. Several long term monitoring programs have provided important statistics on survival and productivity.

Table 1. *2011 Summary of Status of ACAP Albatross and Petrel species*

		Population decline	Restricted breeding range	Limited population size	Decline in habitat	Endemic to single country	Number of island groups	Annual breeding pairs	Breeding Frequency	Current population trend (within last decade)
	CRITICALLY ENDANGERED									
1	Amsterdam albatross	*	*	*		France	1	30	B	stable
2	Waved albatross	*	*		*	Ecuador	2	9,614	A	declining
3	Tristan albatross	*	*			United Kingdom	1	1,698	B	declining
	ENDANGERED									
4	Northern royal albatross	*	*		*	New Zealand	3	5,303	B	unknown
5	Black-browed albatross	*					14	600,599	A	declining
6	Atlantic yellow-nosed albatross	*	*			United Kingdom	2	34,050	A	declining
7	Indian yellow-nosed albatross	*					4	39,320	A	declining
8	Black-footed albatross						4	67,982	A	increasing
9	Sooty albatross	*					6	13,674	B	declining
	VULNERABLE									
10	Wandering albatross	*					5	7,988	B	declining
11	Antipodean albatross	?	*			New Zealand	3	8,273	B	declining
12	Southern royal albatross		*			New Zealand	2	7,886	B	stable
13	Salvin's albatross		*			New Zealand	3	31,874	A	unknown
14	Campbell albatross		*			New Zealand	1	22,093	A	unknown
15	Grey-headed albatross	*					8	88,143	B	declining
16	Chatham albatross		*		*	New Zealand	1	5,407	A	stable
17	Short-tailed albatross		*	*	*		2	472	A	increasing
18	White-chinned petrel	*					8	1,057,930	A	declining
19	Spectacled petrel		*			United Kingdom	1	14,400	A	increasing
20	Black petrel		*			New Zealand	1	1,458	A	stable?
21	Westland petrel		*			New Zealand	1	4,000	A	stable?
	NEAR-THREATENED									
22	Buller's albatross		*			New Zealand	4	29,948	A	increasing?
23	White-capped albatross	?	*			New Zealand	3	74,885	?	unknown
24	Shy albatross	?	*			Australia	1	12,842	A	stable?
25	Light-mantled albatross	?					9	9,955	B	unknown
26	Laysan albatross						5	650,501	A	stable
27	Grey petrel	?					9	79,570	A	unknown
	LEAST CONCERN									
28	Southern giant petrel						26	50,200	A	increasing
29	Northern giant petrel						9	10,806	A	increasing

2.2. Identification of internationally important breeding sites (item 5.1.b)

The identification of internationally important breeding sites, including the choice of appropriate selection criteria, was discussed in detail initially by the BSWG at AC4, and subsequently by both the STWG and BSWG at AC5, facilitated by papers submitted by BirdLife International that listed sites holding >1% of the global population of ACAP species. The ACAP database now holds virtually all of the existing census data, and can be interrogated to produce updatable lists of the breeding sites that hold 1%, 2%, 5% and 10% of the global population of each ACAP species (ANNEX 2). These analyses indicate that New Zealand and France have jurisdiction over considerably more of these internationally important sites than any other Party (Table 2). Most ACAP species breed at relatively few sites; for 16 of the 29 species, there are only 1-3 sites that hold internationally important numbers (i.e. >1% of the global population). Only for a minority of albatrosses (8 of 22 species) are there ≥5 breeding sites with >1% of the global population, and only for four of the albatrosses and the two giant petrels are there ≥10 sites that hold >1% of the global population. For no ACAP species are there ≥3 sites that each hold >10% of the global population (ANNEX 3).

Table 2. *Number of sites per jurisdiction where the population of any species exceeds 1, 2, 5 and 10% of the global total for that species, i.e. sites where more than one species exceeds the threshold counted only once (Currency of census data calculated for sites meeting the 1% threshold).*

Jurisdiction	% census data pre 2001	% census data post 2001	Number of sites where global population exceeds			
			1%	2%	5%	10%
Antarctic	57.1	0	7	2	0	0
Argentina	0	100	2	1	0	0
Australia	50	50	5	4	4	3
Chile	0	100	6	5	2	1
Disputed	9.3	90.7	33	24	12	8
Ecuador	0	100	1	1	1	1
France	72.7	27.3	14	12	9	4
Japan	0	100	1	1	1	1
New Zealand	43.3	56.7	18	16	15	12
South Africa	7.7	92.3	2	2	2	2
United Kingdom	50	50	4	4	4	4
USA	9.1	90.9	6	6	4	2
Total			99	78	54	38

It should be recognised that (i) census data are unavailable for approximately a third of breeding sites, particularly those of the burrow-nesting *Procellaria* petrels, and (ii) some counts are of low reliability or were collected a decade or more ago. Filling these gaps and obtaining updated population estimates should be considered a priority. There are also some inconsistencies in the scale at which breeding sites were defined by Parties when the ACAP database was set up, such that large islands may be entered as a single site, or split. The process of identifying sites that meet threshold criteria is effectively automated; hence, new

lists of internationally important breeding sites can be produced at the level of different counting units (whole or part island), and can incorporate updated population estimates.

2.3. Reviews to characterise the foraging range and migration routes and patterns of populations of albatrosses and petrels (item 5.1.c).

Considerable progress has been made on the enhancement and development of BirdLife International's *Global Procellariform tracking Database*. Since MoP3 this has included:

- the addition of 17 new remote tracking data sets, of which 13 were ACAP listed species;
- completion of the five RFMO tracking overlap papers for ACAP;
- input into the ICCAT seabird assessment;
- the development of web portal for data access, submission and analysis (www.seabirdtracking.org); and
- production of case studies for presentation to the Convention on Biological Diversity in relation to its 2012 targets for establishing marine protected areas.

Key gaps in the tracking data for albatross and petrels have been identified and ACAP Parties encouraged to submit new data sets as part of the on-going work of the Agreement.

Since MoP3, all 29 Species Assessments have been completed and include distribution maps as well as maps showing satellite-transmitter and other tracking data for breeding and non-breeding birds where available. These maps have been prepared by BirdLife International based on information in the Global Procellariiform Tracking Database. No tracking data is available for Salvin's albatross, Spectacled petrel, and Grey petrel. The Global Procellariiform Tracking Database holds tracking data for breeding birds of the following species: Campbell albatross, Indian yellow-nosed albatross, Black petrel, Westland petrel, Amsterdam albatross, Southern royal albatross, Waved albatross, and Light-mantled albatross. Consequently, maps for non-breeding birds are missing from the assessments. In March 2011, an agreement was reached with BirdLife International whereby data can be easily exported from the Global Procellariiform Tracking Database to the ACAP database to allow an analysis of currency and volume of tracking information per species and region. In return, the ACAP Secretariat reminds data holders to submit any new tracking data to the Global Procellariiform Tracking Database as part of the annual reporting process to the AC.

A gap analysis was carried out at the island group level based on the tracking data submitted to BirdLife. Availability of tracking data for different breeding and other life-history stages was highly variable for island groups which hold >1% of the global population of any ACAP species (n=83 island group-species combinations), as follows 5-6 (6-7% of these island groups) during pre-egg, 30-31 (36-37%) during incubation, 12-19 (14-23%) during brood, 23-31 (28-37%) during post-brood chick-rearing, 21 (25%) for failed birds, 14 (17%) for nonbreeding birds and just 6 (7%) for juveniles/immatures. Sample sizes were often low, particularly in the studies of juveniles and immatures. The species for which tracking data had not been submitted for any, or for only a small minority of the major island groups (i.e., those with >1% of the global population) mainly include the two giant petrels, the *Procellaria* petrels and several albatross species endemic to New Zealand. It should be noted that a

large number of tracking studies are ongoing or recently completed, particularly of nonbreeding birds, from which the data have not yet been submitted to BirdLife.

2.4. Identification and assessment of known and suspected threats affecting albatrosses and petrels (item 5.1.d)

2.4.1. Threats at breeding sites

ACAP has adopted a system for standardising the listing of threats to breeding sites adapted from criteria produced initially by IUCN and the Conservation Measures Partnership. Each threat is assessed according to the Scope (proportion of population affected) and Severity (intensity), that when combined provide an indication of the magnitude of the threat. These consider not only current impact, but also the anticipated impact over the next decade, assuming the continuation of current conditions and trends. Hence threats are only included if: (1) documented either in a scientific paper, report or *in litt*. (if necessary, personal observation), and (2) likely to cause an impact (i.e. a population decline) in the next decade. A breakdown of the proportion of sites, and of the global population that are subjected to threats that meet these criteria are listed below (Table 3). The vast majority of these relate to introduced mammals or disease and are described in section 5.1h) below. The remainder involve natural disasters.

Table 3. *Percentage of sites and populations affected by land threats – only species affected listed.*

Species	No of sites	% sites - Natural disaster	% sites - Habitat loss or destruction by alien species	% sites - Increased competition with native species	% sites - Parasite or Pathogen	% sites - Predation by alien species	% population - Natural disaster	% population - Habitat loss or destruction by alien species	% population - Increased competition with native species	% population - Parasite or Pathogen	% population - Predation by alien species	% population – all threats	% sites – all threats
Diomedea antipodensis	5	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0.9	0.9	20
Diomedea dabbenena	1	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	100	100	100
Diomedea epomophora	4	0	0	0	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Diomedea exulans	28	0	0	0	0	7.1	0	0	0	0	27.3	27.3	7.1
Macronectes giganteus	124	0.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.8
Phoebetria fusca	15	0	0	0	6.7	6.7	0	0	0	3.5	12.4	15.9	13.3

Phoebetria palpebrata	71	1.4	1.4	0	0	0	0	3.7	0	0	0	3.7	2.8
Procellaria aequinoctialis	75	0	6.7	0	0	20	0	17.8	0	0	37.8	37.8	20
Procellaria cinerea	17	0	17.6	0	0	35.3	0	4.3	0	0	26.4	26.4	35.3
Thalassarche carteri	6	0	0	0	16.7	0	0	0	0	68.7	0	68.7	16.7
Thalassarche cauta	3	0	0	33.3	33.3	0	0	0	1.9	40.7	0	42.7	66.7
Thalassarche chrysostoma	29	0	3.4	0	0	0	0	0.1	0	0	0	0.1	3.4
Thalassarche melanophris	66	1.5	1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Thalassarche steadi	5	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	5.6	5.6	20

Green <1%; Orange 1-33%; Red >33%

2.4.2. Threats at sea

Albatrosses and petrels face many threats at sea including ingestion of marine debris including fishing hooks discarded in fish offal, entanglement in lost fishing gear and other marine debris, contamination from pollutants and over-fishing of prey species. However, direct interactions with fishing operations have been identified by ACAP and others as a major threat causing widespread declines in populations throughout the world. All ACAP listed species are at risk from this threat. Work by the Advisory Committee's Seabird Bycatch Working Group was a response to the need to develop and maintain a program of work to address this threat. Since MoP3 much of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group's work has focussed on identifying best practice mitigation advice for industrial fishing gear types, principally demersal and pelagic longline, and trawl gear. Collection of fisheries bycatch data, and engagement with RFMOs, particularly the tuna RFMO's, are also priority issues.

2.5. Identification of methods by which these threats may be avoided or mitigated (item 5.1.e)

2.5.1. Threats at breeding sites

Two best-practice documents have been finalised since MoP3. Eradication Guidelines outlines the background, guidelines, useful further reading and a list of online resources relating to the eradication of alien mammals from ACAP breeding sites. This highlights the key issues to consider when designing and implementing a mammal eradication programme and provides a list of online resources for obtaining further information. Biosecurity Guidelines summarises guidelines on best practice biosecurity management for ACAP breeding sites, and also provides a list of useful online resources and further reading. This document identifies the pathways and entry points of potential introductions and the issues and difficulties encountered when establishing effective barriers.

2.5.2. Threats at sea

Resulting from reviews of mitigation developed for pelagic longline, demersal longline and trawl gear types, the SBWG has developing advice on current best scientific approaches to

mitigating bycatch in these gear types to assist RFMOs and ACAP parties in managing bycatch in their fisheries. The advice, including descriptions of measures, current knowledge, implementation guidance and research needs, has been collated in a series of summary tables that are available on the ACAP website as best practice advice and suitable for dissemination to relevant fisheries managers. RFMOs and Parties have been encouraged to use the materials to guide the development of policy and practice within the fisheries under their jurisdiction

2.6. Review and updating of data on the mortality of albatrosses and petrels in fisheries (item 5.1.f).

See ANNEX 4

2.7. Review of data on the distribution and seasonality of effort in fisheries which affect albatrosses and petrels (item 5.1.g)

See ANNEX 5

2.8. Reviews of the status at breeding sites of introduced animals, plants and disease-causing organisms known or believed to be detrimental to albatrosses and petrels (item 5.1.h).

Habitat destruction and predation by introduced mammals are listed far more frequently than any other processes as threats to breeding sites of ACAP species. Those affecting the most breeding sites (site-species combinations) were predation by feral cat *Felis catus,* black rat *Rattus rattus* and brown rat *R. norvegicus*, and habitat destruction by reindeer *Rangifer tarandus* (Table 4). All other threats affected only a few sites, although were severe in some cases (Medium or High according to the agreed threat criteria), which included the effects of avian cholera at Amsterdam Island (Table 5). The species affected at the most breeding sites were the burrow-nesting grey petrel *Procellaria cinerea* and white-chinned petrel *P. aequinoctialis*, mainly because of predation or habitat destruction by introduced mammals. In interpreting the tables below and the conclusions, it should be noted that: (1) threats only include those that are documented and known or likely to cause a population decline in <10 years, (2) values in the tables are the number of breeding sites, equivalent to each species-site combination *i.e.* two species breeding in the same area constitute two breeding sites, (3) although most islands are listed as one site, a small number have been subdivided into separate sites, and (4) no attempt has been made to consider the number of birds or the percentage of the global population at each site.

Table 4. *Number of breeding sites of ACAP species affected by threats of different magnitude (Low to Very high).*

Nature of Threat	Threat subcategory	Threat Species	Number of breeding sites affected:				
			Low	Medium	High	Very High	All
Habitat loss or destruction	Habitat destruction by alien species	Rabbit	3	1			4
		Reindeer	6				6
	Increased competition with native species	Australasian gannet			1		1

Parasite or pathogen	Pathogen	Unknown	1				1
		Avian cholera	1	1			2
Predation by alien species	Predation by alien species	Cat	11				11
		Pig	4				4
		House mouse	1	1			2
		Norwegian rat	7				7
		Black (ship) rat	9	1			10
All			**43**	**3**	**1**	**0**	**48**

Table 5. *Breeding sites of ACAP species affected by threats of Medium or High magnitude*

Nature of Threat	**Threat subcategory**	**Threat Species**	**Breeding sites affected:**	
			Medium	**High**
Habitat loss or destruction	Habitat destruction by alien species	Rabbit	Macquarie Island - Grey petrel	
	Increased competition with native species	Australasian gannet		Pedra Branca - Shy albatross
Parasite or pathogen	Pathogen	Avian cholera	Falaise d'Entrecasteaux (Amsterdam) - Indian yellow-nosed albatross	
Predation by alien species	Predation by alien species	House mouse	Gough Island – Tristan albatross	
		Black (ship) rat	Macquarie Island - Grey petrel	

There have been nine partial or whole island eradications since MoP1 (ANNEX 6), those at Macquarie Island and South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1] having taken place very recently (March-June 2011), and the extent of their success is yet to be confirmed. Feasibility plans have also been produced for a number of other sites, and in some cases planning is well advanced and eradications are scheduled for the next few years (ANNEX 6)**.**

2.9. Reviews of the nature of, coverage by, and effectiveness of, protection arrangements for albatrosses and petrels (item 5.1.i).

Detail on protection arrangements on land and at sea (as reported in the database) by jurisdiction is provided in ANNEX 7 and ANNEX 8. However, Parties will need to provide advice as to the effectiveness of those protection arrangements, prior to MoP4.

See ANNEX 9

2.10. Reviews of recent and current research on albatrosses and petrels with relevance to their conservation status (item 5.1.j)

See 1.5 above and relevant information papers tabled at AC6.

This review is ongoing through all four Working Groups and the Secretariat, who produce Species Assessments, Action Plans and best practice guidelines. The following documents have been completed to date*:*

- Biosecurity and quarantine guidelines for ACAP breeding sites

- Guidelines for eradication of introduced mammals from breeding sites of ACAP-listed seabirds
- 29 Species assessments

The Secretariat maintains a bibliographic reference database of relevant literature which supports the compilation and updating of these documents.

2.11. List of authorities, research centres, scientists and non-government organisations concerned with albatrosses and petrels (item 5.1.k).

The ACAP website provides a comprehensive list of links to various centres, institutions, organisations and websites concerned with albatrosses and petrels. This list is maintained by the Information Officer.

2.12. Directory of legislation concerning albatrosses and petrels (item 5.1.l)

The ACAP database now holds information on legislation relevant to species listed on Annex 1 and their breeding sites.

2.13. Reviews of education and information programmes aimed at conserving albatrosses and petrels (item 5.1.m)

Parties reported on a range of programmes being undertaken, including education, training and outreach. Collaboration between Governmental agencies and NGOs was evident in most of cases. The main targets were observer programmes (training for the identification of species and observation protocols), fishermen and the public in general. See details of these programmes in section 1.6 above.

2.14. Review of current taxonomy in relation to albatrosses and petrels (item 5.1.n).

The Taxonomy Working Group reviewed recent publications pertinent to albatross and petrel taxonomy. This found that there were two schools of thought relating to the taxonomy generally, one of which closely followed the taxonomy adopted by the Agreement. The TWG recommended that the current ACAP taxonomic approach be endorsed given the strong logic behind it.

2.15. Identified gaps in information as part of the above reviews, with a view to addressing these in future priorities (item 5.2).

The following gaps in the information provided were identified:

- Census data are unavailable for approximately a third of breeding sites and some counts are of low reliability or were collected a decade or more ago.
- Gaps in the tracking data for albatross and petrels have been identified and ACAP Parties are encouraged to submit new data sets as part of the on-going work of the Agreement.

- Scarcity of information on seabird mortality in a large number of fisheries…
- Lack of understanding of the magnitude and dynamics of seabird mortality in artisanal fisheries…

ANNEX 1

Monitoring studies by jurisdiction (See Annex 2 MoP4 Doc 11).

Jurisdiction	Species	No of Island Groups	No of sites	Population estimate	% global population	% sites monitored annually since 2000	% Island groups counted in their entirety since 2005	% Island groups counted in their entirety since 2000	ongoing population monitoring sites %	ongoing demographic monitoring sites %
Australia	*Diomedea exulans*	1	1	4	0.05	100	100	100	100	100
Australia	*Macronectes giganteus*	2	3	4,666	10.55	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	0
Australia	*Macronectes halli*	1	1	1,793	16.59	100	100	100	100	0
Australia	*Phoebetria palpebrata*	2	3	1,600	14.3	0	0	0	0	33.3
Australia	*Procellaria cinerea*	1	1	32	0.04	100	100	100	100	0
Australia	*Thalassarche cauta*	1	3	12,842	100	66.7	66.7	66.7	33.3	33.3
Australia	*Thalassarche chrysostoma*	1	1	97	0.11	100	100	100	100	0
Australia	*Thalassarche melanophris*	2	4	787	0.13	25	25	25	25	25

ANNEX 2

IBA sites where the population exceeds 1, 2, 5 and 10% of the global total for that species.

Species	site	Jurisdiction	annual breeding pairs	When censused	1%	2%	5%	10%
Diomedea antipodensis	Adams Island	New Zealand	3277	2009	Y	Y	Y	Y
Thalassarche cauta	Albatross Island (AU)	Australia	5233	2010	Y	Y	Y	Y
Diomedea exulans	Albatross Island (SGSSI (IGSISS))	Disputed	135	2011	Y	N	N	N
Diomedea exulans	Annenkov Island	Disputed	193	2004	Y	Y	N	N
Thalassarche melanophris	Annenkov Island	Disputed	9398	2004	Y	N	N	N
Diomedea antipodensis	Antipodes Island	New Zealand	4565	2009	Y	Y	Y	Y
Phoebetria palpebrata	Antipodes Island	New Zealand	250	1995	Y	Y	N	N
Macronectes halli	Antipodes Island	New Zealand	233	2001	Y	Y	N	N
Procellaria cinerea	Antipodes Island	New Zealand	53000	2001	Y	Y	Y	Y
Macronectes giganteus	Anvers Island	Antarctic	582	1987-2010	Y	N	N	N
Macronectes halli	Baie Larose	France	125	1987	Y	N	N	N
Procellaria aequinoctialis	Barff	Disputed	119594	2007	Y	Y	Y	Y
Macronectes giganteus	Barren Island	Disputed	1504	2005	Y	Y	N	N
Thalassarche melanophris	Beauchene Island	Disputed	108984	2006	Y	Y	Y	Y
Thalassarche melanophris	Bird Island (Falklands/Malvinas)[1]	Disputed	9990	2006	Y	N	N	N
Diomedea exulans	Bird Island (SGSSI (IGSISS))	Disputed	779	2010	Y	Y	Y	N
Macronectes halli	Bird Island (SGSSI (IGSISS))	Disputed	2062	1996	Y	Y	Y	Y
Thalassarche melanophris	Bird Island (SGSSI (IGSISS))	Disputed	8264	2004	Y	N	N	N
Thalassarche chrysostoma	Bird Island (SGSSI (IGSISS))	Disputed	5120	2004	Y	Y	Y	N
Macronectes giganteus	Bird Island (SGSSI (IGSISS))	Disputed	521	1996	Y	N	N	N
Thalassarche bulleri	Broughton Island	New Zealand	518	1997	Y	N	N	N
Diomedea epomophora	Campbell Island	New Zealand	7800	2008	Y	Y	Y	Y
Phoebetria palpebrata	Campbell Island	New Zealand	1600	1996	Y	Y	Y	Y
Macronectes halli	Campbell Island	New Zealand	234	1997	Y	Y	N	N
Thalassarche impavida	Campbell Island	New Zealand	22093	1998	Y	Y	Y	Y
Macronectes giganteus	Candlemas Island	Disputed	1818	2011	Y	Y	N	N
Thalassarche melanophris	Cooper Island	Disputed	10606	2004	Y	N	N	N
Macronectes halli	Courbet Peninsula	France	750	1987	Y	Y	Y	N
Diomedea exulans	Courbet Peninsula	France	354	2011	Y	Y	N	N
Thalassarche steadi	Disappointment Island	New Zealand	70569	2010	Y	Y	Y	Y
Procellaria aequinoctialis	Disappointment Island	New Zealand	100000	1988	Y	Y	Y	N
Diomedea antipodensis	Disappointment Island	New Zealand	352	1997	Y	Y	N	N
Macronectes giganteus	Elephant Island	Antarctic	845	1972	Y	N	N	N
Thalassarche carteri	Falaise d'Entrecasteaux	France	27000	2006	Y	Y	Y	Y

Species	site	Jurisdiction	annual breeding pairs	When censused	1%	2%	5%	10%
Phoebastria nigripes	French Frigate Shoals	USA	4604	2010	Y	Y	Y	N
Macronectes giganteus	George	Disputed	602	2005	Y	N	N	N
Macronectes giganteus	Golden Knob (Elephant Cays)	Disputed	1019	2005	Y	Y	N	N
Procellaria cinerea	Golfe du Morbihan	France	3400	2006	Y	Y	N	N
Macronectes halli	Golfe du Morbihan	France	150	1987	Y	N	N	N
Diomedea dabbenena	Gough Island	United Kingdom	1698	2010	Y	Y	Y	Y
Procellaria cinerea	Gough Island	United Kingdom	17500	2001	Y	Y	Y	Y
Phoebetria fusca	Gough Island	United Kingdom	4999	2001	Y	Y	Y	Y
Macronectes giganteus	Governor (Beaver)	Disputed	723	2005	Y	N	N	N
Thalassarche melanophris	Grand Jason	Disputed	49462	2006	Y	Y	Y	N
Macronectes giganteus	Grand Jason	Disputed	762	2005	Y	N	N	N
Procellaria parkinsoni	Great Barrier Island	New Zealand	1358	2008	Y	Y	Y	Y
Thalassarche bulleri	Great Solander Island	New Zealand	4579	2002	Y	Y	Y	Y
Thalassarche chrysostoma	Hall Island	Disputed	2686	2004	Y	Y	N	N
Macronectes giganteus	Heard Island	Australia	3500	2004	Y	Y	Y	N
Phoebetria palpebrata	Heard Island	Australia	350	1954	Y	Y	N	N
Phoebetria fusca	Ile Amsterdam	France	474	2003	Y	Y	N	N
Macronectes halli	Ile aux Cochons	France	275	1976	Y	Y	N	N
Macronectes giganteus	Ile aux Cochons	France	575	1982	Y	N	N	N
Phoebetria fusca	Ile aux Cochons	France	450	1976	Y	Y	N	N
Diomedea exulans	Ile aux Cochons	France	1060	1981	Y	Y	Y	Y
Macronectes halli	Ile de l'Est	France	190	1981	Y	N	N	N
Procellaria cinerea	Ile de l'Est	France	5500	1982	Y	Y	Y	N
Phoebetria palpebrata	Ile de l'Est	France	900	1984	Y	Y	Y	N
Phoebetria fusca	Ile de l'Est	France	1300	1984	Y	Y	Y	N
Thalassarche chrysostoma	Ile de l'Est	France	3750	1982	Y	Y	N	N
Diomedea exulans	Ile de l'Est	France	329	1982	Y	Y	N	N
Procellaria aequinoctialis	Ile de l'Est	France	33144.5	2004	Y	Y	N	N
Macronectes halli	Ile de la Possession	France	464	2011	Y	Y	N	N
Phoebetria palpebrata	Ile de la Possession	France	794	2011	Y	Y	Y	N
Diomedea exulans	Ile de la Possession	France	347	2010	Y	Y	N	N
Macronectes halli	Ile des Apotres	France	150	1981	Y	N	N	N
Phoebetria palpebrata	Ile des Apotres	France	150	1984	Y	N	N	N
Thalassarche carteri	Ile des Apotres	France	1230	1984	Y	Y	N	N
Diomedea exulans	Ile des Apotres	France	120	1982	Y	N	N	N
Phoebetria fusca	Ile des Pingouins	France	250	1984	Y	N	N	N
Thalassarche carteri	Ile des Pingouins	France	5800	1984	Y	Y	Y	Y
Thalassarche chrysostoma	Ile des Pingouins	France	2000	1982	Y	Y	N	N
Macronectes halli	Ile des Pingouins	France	165	1981	Y	N	N	N
Thalassarche chrysostoma	Iles Nuageuses	France	7860	1985	Y	Y	Y	N

Species	site	Jurisdiction	annual breeding pairs	When censused	1%	2%	5%	10%
Thalassarche chlororhynchos	Inaccessible Island	United Kingdom	1100	1983	Y	Y	N	N
Phoebetria fusca	Inaccessible Island	United Kingdom	501	2000	Y	Y	N	N
Procellaria conspicillata	Inaccessible Island	United Kingdom	4200	2000	Y	Y	Y	Y
Thalassarche melanophris	Isla Bartolome	Chile	43304	2003	Y	Y	Y	N
Thalassarche chrysostoma	Isla Bartolome	Chile	10880	2003	Y	Y	Y	Y
Thalassarche melanophris	Isla Diego de Almagro	Chile	15594	2002	Y	Y	N	N
Phoebastria irrorata	Isla Espanola	Ecuador	9607	2001	Y	Y	Y	Y
Thalassarche melanophris	Isla Gonzalo	Chile	6155	2003	Y	N	N	N
Thalassarche chrysostoma	Isla Gonzalo	Chile	4523	2003	Y	Y	Y	N
Macronectes giganteus	Isla Gran Robredo	Argentina	1700	2005	Y	Y	N	N
Thalassarche melanophris	Isla Grande	Chile	27106	2003	Y	Y	N	N
Macronectes giganteus	Isla Noir	Chile	1000	2005	Y	Y	N	N
Thalassarche melanophris	Isla Norte	Chile	9648	2003	Y	N	N	N
Macronectes giganteus	Isla Observatorio	Argentina	500	2004	Y	N	N	N
Macronectes giganteus	King George Island	Antarctic	1658	1967-2007	Y	Y	N	N
Phoebastria immutabilis	Kure Atoll	USA	14600	2007	Y	Y	N	N
Phoebastria nigripes	Kure Atoll	USA	2540	2007	Y	Y	N	N
Phoebastria nigripes	Laysan Island	USA	22272	2011	Y	Y	Y	Y
Phoebastria immutabilis	Laysan Island	USA	115166	2011	Y	Y	Y	Y
Phoebastria nigripes	Lisianski Island	USA	2126	2006	Y	Y	N	N
Phoebastria immutabilis	Lisianski Island	USA	26500	1982	Y	Y	N	N
Procellaria parkinsoni	Little Barrier Island	New Zealand	100	1998	Y	Y	Y	N
Thalassarche bulleri	Little Solander Island	New Zealand	333	2002	Y	N	N	N
Phoebetria palpebrata	Macquarie Island	Australia	1075	1994	Y	Y	Y	Y
Macronectes giganteus	Macquarie Island	Australia	2166	2009	Y	Y	N	N
Macronectes halli	Macquarie Island	Australia	1793	2008	Y	Y	Y	Y
Thalassarche chrysostoma	Main Island	Disputed	5177	2004	Y	Y	Y	N
Thalassarche melanophris	Main Island	Disputed	14559	2004	Y	Y	N	N
Diomedea exulans	Marion Island	South Africa	2056	2010	Y	Y	Y	Y
Thalassarche chrysostoma	Marion Island	South Africa	7295	2011	Y	Y	Y	N
Phoebetria fusca	Marion Island	South Africa	1701	2011	Y	Y	Y	Y
Phoebetria palpebrata	Marion Island	South Africa	310	2011	Y	Y	N	N
Macronectes giganteus	Marion Island	South Africa	1743	2011	Y	Y	N	N
Macronectes halli	Marion Island	South Africa	434	2011	Y	Y	N	N
Phoebastria immutabilis	Midway Atoll	USA	482909	2011	Y	Y	Y	Y
Phoebastria nigripes	Midway Atoll	USA	28581	2011	Y	Y	Y	Y
Phoebastria albatrus	Minami-kojima	Disputed	15	1991	Y	Y	N	N
Macronectes giganteus	Nelson Island	Antarctic	650	1985 - 2005	Y	N	N	N
Thalassarche melanophris	New Island	Disputed	13331	2008	Y	Y	N	N
Thalassarche	Nightingale	United Kingdom	4000	2007	Y	Y	Y	Y

Species	site	Jurisdiction	annual breeding pairs	When censused	1%	2%	5%	10%
chlororhynchos								
Phoebetria fusca	Nightingale	United Kingdom	150	1974	Y	N	N	N
Thalassarche melanophris	North Island	Disputed	20083	2006	Y	Y	N	N
Thalassarche bulleri	North-East Island	New Zealand	7898	2002	Y	Y	Y	Y
Diomedea exulans	Northwest	Disputed	114	2004	Y	N	N	N
Procellaria aequinoctialis	Northwest	Disputed	146545	2007	Y	Y	Y	Y
Procellaria aequinoctialis	Nunez	Disputed	193838	2007	Y	Y	Y	Y
Thalassarche chrysostoma	Paryadin Peninsula north	Disputed	6721	2004	Y	Y	Y	N
Thalassarche chrysostoma	Paryadin Peninsula south	Disputed	22058	2004	Y	Y	Y	Y
Phoebastria nigripes	Pearl and Hermes Reef	USA	6116	2003	Y	Y	Y	N
Phoebastria immutabilis	Pearl and Hermes Reef	USA	6900	2003	Y	N	N	N
Thalassarche cauta	Pedra Branca	Australia	249	1991	Y	N	N	N
Macronectes giganteus	Penguin Island	Antarctic	698	2000	Y	N	N	N
Macronectes giganteus	Penn (Beaver)	Disputed	1543	2005	Y	Y	N	N
Diomedea amsterdamensis	Plateau des tourbieres	France	30	2009	Y	Y	Y	Y
Macronectes giganteus	Powell Island	Antarctic	613	1983	Y	N	N	N
Macronectes halli	Prince Edward Island	South Africa	180	1991	Y	N	N	N
Macronectes giganteus	Prince Edward Island	South Africa	723	2009	Y	N	N	N
Phoebetria fusca	Prince Edward Island	South Africa	1210	2009	Y	Y	Y	N
Phoebetria palpebrata	Prince Edward Island	South Africa	129	2009	Y	N	N	N
Thalassarche chrysostoma	Prince Edward Island	South Africa	1506	2009	Y	N	N	N
Diomedea exulans	Prince Edward Island	South Africa	1800	2009	Y	Y	Y	Y
Thalassarche carteri	Prince Edward Island	South Africa	5234	2009	Y	Y	Y	Y
Thalassarche salvini	Proclamation Island	New Zealand	2649	2004	Y	Y	Y	N
Procellaria westlandica	Punakaiki	New Zealand	4000	2008	Y	Y	Y	Y
Diomedea exulans	Rallier du Baty Peninsula	France	750	1987	Y	Y	Y	N
Macronectes halli	Rallier du Baty Peninsula	France	550	1987	Y	Y	Y	N
Macronectes halli	Saddle Island	Disputed	192	1987	Y	N	N	N
Procellaria aequinoctialis	Salisbury	Disputed	16365	2007	Y	N	N	N
Macronectes giganteus	Sandy Cay (Elephant Cays)	Disputed	10936	2005	Y	Y	Y	Y
Thalassarche melanophris	Saunders Island	Disputed	10740	2006	Y	N	N	N
Macronectes giganteus	Signy Island	Antarctic	1093	1985	Y	Y	N	N
Thalassarche chrysostoma	Sorn & Bernt coast	Disputed	1625	2004	Y	N	N	N
Thalassarche steadi	South West Cape	New Zealand	4161	2010	Y	Y	Y	N
Procellaria aequinoctialis	Southeast	Disputed	43355	2007	Y	Y	N	N
Thalassarche melanophris	Steeple Jason	Disputed	171286	2006	Y	Y	Y	Y
Macronectes giganteus	Steeple Jason	Disputed	1748	2011	Y	Y	N	N

Species	site	Jurisdiction	annual breeding pairs	When censused	1%	2%	5%	10%
Procellaria aequinoctialis	Stromness and Cumberland	Disputed	64361	2007	Y	Y	Y	N
Diomedea sanfordi	The Big Sister	New Zealand	1540	1991	Y	Y	Y	Y
Macronectes halli	The Big Sister	New Zealand	336	1976	Y	Y	N	N
Diomedea sanfordi	The Forty-fours	New Zealand	1070	2007	Y	Y	Y	Y
Thalassarche bulleri	The Forty-fours	New Zealand	14185	2010	Y	Y	Y	Y
Macronectes halli	The Forty-fours	New Zealand	2000	1993	Y	Y	Y	Y
Diomedea sanfordi	The Little (Middle) Sister	New Zealand	781	1991	Y	Y	Y	Y
Thalassarche bulleri	The Little (Middle) Sister	New Zealand	650	1996	Y	Y	N	N
Thalassarche cauta	The Mewstone	Australia	7360	1996	Y	Y	Y	Y
Thalassarche eremita	The Pyramid	New Zealand	5407	2009	Y	Y	Y	Y
Phoebastria nigripes	Torishima	Japan	1560	2003	Y	Y	N	N
Phoebastria albatrus	Torishima	Japan	418	2009	Y	Y	Y	Y
Thalassarche salvini	Toru Islet	New Zealand	898	2009	Y	Y	N	N
Thalassarche chrysostoma	Trinity Island	Disputed	3309	2004	Y	Y	N	N
Thalassarche melanophris	Trinity Island	Disputed	13960	2004	Y	Y	N	N
Thalassarche chlororhynchos	Tristan da Cunha	United Kingdom	23000	1974	Y	Y	Y	Y
Phoebetria fusca	Tristan da Cunha	United Kingdom	2500	1974	Y	Y	Y	Y
Thalassarche melanophris	West Point Island	Disputed	13928	2006	Y	Y	N	N

ANNEX 3

Number of sites per species where the population exceeds 1, 2, 5 and 10% of the global total for that species. (Currency of census data for each species calculated for sites meeting the 1% threshold).

Species	Global Population Estimate rated good	% census pre 2001	% census Post 2001	1%	2%	5%	10%
Diomedea amsterdamensis	✓	0	100	1	1	1	1
Diomedea antipodensis	✓	33.3	66.7	3	3	2	2
Diomedea dabbenena	✓	0	100	1	1	1	1
Diomedea epomophora	✓	0	100	1	1	1	1
Diomedea exulans	✓	33.3	66.7	12	9	5	3
Diomedea sanfordi	✓	66.7	33.3	3	3	3	3
Macronectes giganteus	✓	24	64	25	13	2	1
Macronectes halli	✓	77.8	22.2	18	11	5	3
Phoebastria albatrus	✓	50	50	2	2	1	1
Phoebastria immutabilis	✓	20	80	5	4	2	2
Phoebastria irrorata	✓	0	100	1	1	1	1
Phoebastria nigripes	✓	0	100	7	7	4	2
Phoebetria fusca	✓	60	40	10	8	5	3
Phoebetria palpebrata		66.7	33.3	9	7	4	2
Procellaria aequinoctialis		12.5	87.5	8	7	5	3
Procellaria cinerea		25	75	4	4	3	2
Procellaria conspicillata	✓	0	100	1	1	1	1
Procellaria parkinsoni	✓	50	50	2	2	2	1
Procellaria westlandica	✓	0	100	1	1	1	1
Thalassarche bulleri	✓	33.3	66.7	6	4	3	3
Thalassarche carteri	✓	50	50	4	4	3	3
Thalassarche cauta	✓	66.7	33.3	3	2	2	2
Thalassarche chlororhynchos	✓	66.7	33.3	3	3	2	2
Thalassarche chrysostoma	✓	21.43	78.57	14	12	8	2
Thalassarche eremita	✓	0	100	1	1	1	1
Thalassarche impavida	✓	100	0	1	1	1	1
Thalassarche melanophris	✓	0	100	18	11	4	2
Thalassarche salvini	✓	0	100	2	2	1	0
Thalassarche steadi	✓	0	100	2	2	2	1

ANNEX 4

Bycatch data for latest fishing year available, as reported by Parties.

Fishery		Year	Annual Effort	Effort Unit	% obsrvd	Observed bycatch rate	Observed bycatch rate unit (birds/)	Estimated/ observed total birds caught (annual)	Albatrosses caught	ACAP Petrels caught
Argentina	Congeladores - Merluza De Cola, Polaca y Merluza Negra	2008	3 495	observed sets	6	0.1048	set hauled	22	20	0
	Congeladores - Merluza Hubbsi	2009	3 699	observed sets	9.2	0.1433	set hauled	49	42	7
	Congeladores - Palangreros	2009				0.0257	1 000 hooks	271		
	Congeladores - Tangoneros	2009				0.0147	set hauled	98	0	0
	Costeros - Flota Amarilla de Rawson	2009				0.2746	set hauled	134	0	0
	Fresqueros Altura - Merluza Hubbsi	2009	2 297	observed sets	7.7	0.0674	set hauled	12	8	2
Australia	Eastern Tuna and Billfish	2010		hooks set				3	3	0
	Gillnet, Hook & Trap-longline	2010		hooks set				1	0	1
	Great Australian Bight	2010		tows				1	1	0
	Heard Island & McDonald Islands - Longline	2010		hooks set				3	0	0
	Heard Island and McDonald Islands - Trawl	2010		tows					0	0
	South-East Trawl including VIT	2010		tows				12	12	0
	Western Tuna and Billfish	2009	519 588	hooks set	8.6	0.0447	1 000 hooks	2	1	0
Canada	Commercial Pacific Halibut fishery (west coast of Canada)	2009	5 854	sets/tows	10.8	0.1889	set/tow	119	11	0
	Commercial Pacific Salmon gillnet fishery	2010	76 960	sets (estimated by avg. no. sets and no. of boats)	1.4	0.0567	set hauled	63	0	0
	Commercial Rockfish (west coast)	2009	4 749	sets/tows	10.3	0.191	set/tow	93	0	0
Chile	Recursos altamente migratorios, palangre pelagico. Flota artesanal.	2008	214 438	hooks set	21.2	0	1 000 hooks	0	0	0
	Recursos altamente migratorios, palangre pelagico. Flota industrial	2008	846 302	hooks set	100	0.026	1 000 hooks	22	18	2
New Zealand	Deepwater trawl	2008	6 400	tows	44.9	0.0017	tow	5	0	0
	Demersal longline	2008	2 256 397	hooks	18	0.1085	1 000 hooks	44	33	7
	Inshore trawl	2008	48 671	tows	0.2	0	tow	0	0	0
	Middle depth trawl	2008	28 926	tows	18.2	0.0464	tow	245	71	65
	Pelagic longline	2008	2 256 397	hooks	18	0.1085	1 000 hooks	44	33	7
	Pelagic trawl	2008	2 474	tows	31.7	0.0038	tow	3	1	0

Peru	Cerco : Pesca industrial de cerco para anchoveta	2009	47 773	trips with catch		0.5266	set hauled	613	0	0
United Kingdom	Bluenose/Bluefish (Hyperoglyphe antarctica) - Tristan da Cunha	2008	219 634	hooks set	35.6	0.5109	1 000 hooks	40	0	0
	Demersal longline fishery for Patagonia toothfish (Dissostichus eleginoides) - Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1]	2010	456 539	hooks hauled	9.3	0	1 000 hooks	0	0	0
	Demersal longline fishery for Patagonian toothfish - South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]	2010	13 479 391	hooks set	32.9	0.0007	1 000 hooks	3	2	0
	Finfish demersal trawl fishery - Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1]	2010	4 667	vessel days fishing	1.3	0.5763	fishing day	34	31	2
	Finfish pelagic trawl fishery - Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1]	2010	255	vessel days fishing	2	0	fishing day	0	0	0
	Loligo gahi demersal trawl fishery - Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1]	2010	1 215	vessel days fishing	2.6	0	fishing day	0	0	0
	Trawl fishery for Antarctic krill - South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]	2010	414	tows	12.8	0	tow	0	0	0
	Trawl fishery targeting Icefish (Champsocephalus gunnari) in CCAMLR 48.3	2010	14	tows	100	0.1429	tow	2	0	1
Uruguay	Palangre pelagico	2007						403	343	60
USA	Alaska demeresal longline	2010						2	2	0
	Alaska Demersal Groundfish Trawl	2006						149	1	0
	At-Sea Hake Trawl (Motherships & Catcher Processors)	2008	1 489	hauls				1	1	0
	Limited Entry Sablefish-endorsed Fixed Gear	2008	1 162	landings of target species (mt)		0.3803	trip	27	27	0
	Open Access Fixed Gear	2007	56	landings of target species (mt)				1	1	0
	Pacific Longline, Deep Set	2009	37 000 000	hooks set				194	170	0
	Pacific Longline, Shallow Set	2010	1 828 529	hooks set	100	0.0438	1 000 hooks	80	79	0

[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 y Islas Sandwich del Sur) and the surrounding maritime areas".*

ANNEX 5

Annual fishing effort – for last three years (but data for some fisheries available starting 2004).

Fishery		Effort Unit	2008	2009	2010
Argentina	Freezer vessels - crab traps				
	Freezer vessels - Southern trawlers - Hoki, whiting, toothfish	observed sets	3,495	3,050	
	Freezer vessels - trawl - Argentine hake	observed sets	2,227	3,699	
	Freezer vessels - Longline - toothfish				
	Freezer vessels - Squid - (cuttlefish jig?)				
	Freezer vessels - Shrimp Trawl	hauls	73,327		
	Freezer vessels - Trawl - Vieira (*Zygochlamis patagonica*) only				
	Coastal - Rawson Yellow Fleet - Argentine hake and shrimp				
	Artisanal Coastal - Argentine hake				
	Small coastal fisheries - pelagic midwater?				
	Small coastal fishery - crab traps				
	Varied Coastal				
	Fresh Trawl- Argentine hake - no processing on board	observed sets	2,323	2,297	
	RIA Bay - Small boats - Argentine hake				
	RIA Bay - Argentine hake - Longline			1,427	
	RIA Bay - Various coastal - small boats				
Australia	Eastern Tuna and Billfish	hooks set	8,061,611	8,847,469	
	Gillnet, Hook & Trap-longline	hooks set	6,733,179	6,093,898	
	Great Australian Bight	tows	3,640	3,385	
	Heard Island & McDonald Islands - Longline	hooks set	2,123,730	3,661,350	
	Heard Island and McDonald Islands - Trawl	tows	1,080	842	
	Macquarie Island - Longline	hooks set	334,572	472,800	
	Macquarie Island - Trawl	tows	118	174	
	South-East Trawl including VIT	tows	23,939	21,469	
	Western Tuna and Billfish	hooks set	226,061	519,588	
Canada	Commercial Pacific Halibut fishery (west coast of Canada)	sets/tows	17,526	5,854	
	Commercial Pacific Salmon gillnet fishery	sets (estimated by avg. no. sets and no. of boats)		42,401	76,960
	Commercial Rockfish (west coast of Canada)	sets/tows	4,927	4,749	
Chile	Industrial toothfish	hooks set	9,659,141		
	Highly migratory, pelagic longline. Artisanal fleet	hooks set	214,438		
	Highly migratory, pelagic longline. Industrial fleet	hooks set	846,302		
France	Longline fishery - Patagonian toothfish				
New Zealand	Deepwater trawl	tows	6,400		
	Demersal longline	hooks	2,256,397		
	Inshore trawl	tows	48,671		
	Middle depth trawl	tows	28,926		
	Pelagic longline	hooks	2,256,397		
	Pelagic trawl	tows	2,474		
Peru	Purse seine fishing industry for anchovy	trips with catch		47,773	
	Artisanal longline - sharks and mahi-mahi	hooks set		10,923,048	
	Drift gillnet	sets		294,652	

Fishery		Effort Unit	2008	2009	2010
South Africa	Foreign Tuna Longline Vessels - Joint Venture				
	South African Tuna / Swordfish Longline Sector				
Spain	Central-East Atlantic Hake				
	Surface longlines targeting swordfish W. Atlantic				
	Surface longlines targeting swordfish W Indian				
	Surface longlines targeting large pelagics in the Mediterranean (swordfish and bluefin tuna)	observed hooks	514,363		
	Pacific surface longline				
	Purse seine fishery - Tropical Tuna - Indian, Pacific And Atlantic Ocean				
	Demersal longline fishery - Antarctic				
	Northern high Trawl fisheries - Cod, redfish and shrimp				
	Malvinas (Flaklands)[1] hight trawl				
United Kingdom	Finfish pelagic trawl fishery - Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1]	vessel days fishing	276	399	255
	Squid *Illex argentinus* jig fishery - Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1]	vessel days fishing	185	3,442	NI
	Squid *Loligo gahi* demersal trawl fishery - Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1]	vessel days fishing	2,035	1,728	1,215
	Trawl fishery for Antarctic krill - South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]	tows	4,207	18	414
	Icefish *(Champsocephalus gunnari)* trawl fishery in CCAMLR 48.3	tows	301	189	14
	Bluenose/Bluefish (*Hyperoglyphe antarctica*) - Tristan da Cunha	hooks set	219,634	0	0
	Demersal longline fishery for Patagonia toothfish (Dissostichus eleginoides) - Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1]	hooks hauled	1,224,247	1,221,677	456,539
	Demersal longline fishery for Patagonian toothfish - South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]	hooks set	16,959,916	16,115,650	13,479,391
	Finfish demersal trawl fishery - Falkland Islands (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]	vessel days fishing	9,578	9,578	4,667
Uruguay	Hake (M. Hubbsi) demersal trawl				
	Hake *(Merluza negra)* demersal Longline				
	pelagic longline				
USA	Alaska demeresal longline	hooks set			
	Alaska Demersal Groundfish Trawl				
	At-Sea Hake Trawl (Motherships & Catcher Processors)	hauls	1,489		
	California Halibut Trawl				
	Limited Entry Groundfish Trawl				
	Limited Entry Non-Sablefish-endorsed Fixed Gear				
	Limited Entry Sablefish-endorsed Fixed Gear	landings of target species (mt)	1,162		
	Nearshore Fixed Gear				
	Open Access Fixed Gear	landings of target species (mt)	113		
	Pacific halibut (Alaska)	hooks hauled	52,939,536	55,314,012	51,287,381
	Pacific Longline, Deep Set	hooks set	40,078,613	37,000,000	31,891,124
	Pacific Longline, Shallow Set	hooks set	1,350,127	1,767,128	1,828,529

[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 y Islas Sandwich del Sur) and the surrounding maritime areas".*

ANNEX 6

Islands where introduced vertebrates are currently present, have been eradicated since 2000, or eradication is planned (Y) or not (N), with year of planned eradication in brackets. Blank cells - alien not present.

Island	Jurisdiction	Cattle	Dog	Goat	Deer	Cat	European hare	House mouse	Stoat	Ferret	Rabbit	Sheep	Reindeer	Polynesian rat	Brown (Norwegian) rat	Black (ship) rat	Pig	Cotton-tail rabbit	Brushtail possum
Amsterdam	France	2010				N									N				
Antipodes Island	New Zealand							N											
Auckland Island	New Zealand					N		N									N		
Barren	Disputed											N							
Bleaker Island	Disputed					2001									Y				
Bottom	Disputed														2001				
Burnt Islet	Disputed	N																	
Campbell Island	New Zealand														2001				
Carcass	Disputed	N										N							
Dyke (Weddell)	Disputed	N										N			N				
East Falkland[1]	Disputed	N				N	N	N			N	N							
George	Disputed	N						N				N							
Gough Island	United Kingdom							Y											
Governor	Disputed														2008				
Grass Island	Disputed														2000				
Great Barrier Island	New Zealand		N			N								N		N	N		
Harcourt Island	Disputed														Y				
Howe Island	France										N								
Ile aux Cochons	France					N					N								
Ile de l'Est	France										N								
Ile de la Possession	France															N			
Inaccessible Island	United Kingdom			N															
Isla de La Plata	Ecuador					2009													
Isla de los Estados	Argentina			N	N										N				
Isla Observatorio	Argentina										N				N	N			

Island	Jurisdiction	Cattle	Dog	Goat	Deer	Cat	European hare	House mouse	Stoat	Ferret	Rabbit	Sheep	Reindeer	Polynesian rat	Brown (Norwegian) rat	Black (ship) rat	Pig	Cotton-tail rabbit	Brushtail possum
Keppel	Disputed					2007									N				
Kerguelen (Grande Terre)	France					N					N		N			N			
Little Barrier Island	New Zealand													2004					
Lively	Disputed	N										N							
Macquarie Island	Australia					2002		Y (2011)			Y (2011)					Y (2011)			
Marion Island	South Africa							N											
New Island	Disputed					N		N								N		N	
Pebble	Disputed	N				N					N	N			N				
Penn	Disputed														N				
Saddle Island	Disputed														Y (2011)				
Saunders Island	Disputed	N				N	N					N			N				
Sea Lion	Disputed	2004										2009							
South Georgia/Isla Georgia del Sur[1]	Disputed							Y					Y		Y (partial, 2011)				
South Island	New Zealand	N	N	N		N			N	N					N				N
Speedwell	Disputed	N										N							
Steeple Jason	Disputed							N											
Swan	Disputed											N			N				
Top (Port William)	Disputed														2001				
Tristan da Cunha	United Kingdom	N						N				N				N			
West Falkland[2]	Disputed					N	N	N			N	N							
West Point	Disputed							N				N			N				

[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 y Islas Sandwich del Sur) and the surrounding maritime areas".*

ANNEX 7

List of Management Plans Applicable to ACAP Breeding Sites by Jurisdiction

Jurisdiction	Plan Title	Year published	Legislation	Plan components
Antarctic	Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Managed Area No. 7 Southwest Anvers Island and Palmer Basin	2010		Management Plan,Visitor access
Argentina	Management Plan	2010		Management Plan
Australia	Heard Island and McDonald Islands Marine Reserve Management Plan	2005	Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act 1999)	Management Plan,Quarantine,Visitor access
Australia	Macquarie Island Nature Reserve and World Heritage Area Management Plan 2006	2006	National Parks and Reserves Management Act 2002 (Tasmania)	Management Plan,Quarantine,Visitor access
Australia	Macquarie Island Pest Eradication Plan - Part A: Overview March 2007	2007		Eradication Plan
Australia	Macquarie Island Pest Eradication Project - Part C: Environmental Impact Statement August 2009	2009		Eradication Plan
Australia	Threat Abatement Plan for the impacts of marine debris on vertebrate marine life May 2009	2009	Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act 1999)	Threat Abatement Plan
Australia	Threat Abatement Plan to reduce the impacts of exotic rodents on biodiversity on Australian offshore islands of less than 100 000 hectares 2009	2009	Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act 1999)	Threat Abatement Plan
Disputed	“South Georgia: Plan for Progress. Managing the Environment 2006-2010”. [1]	2006		Management Plan
Disputed	“Falkland Islands implementation plan for the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP): review of current work and a prioritised work programme for the future”. [1]	2010		Conservation Management Strategy,Management Plan,Threat Abatement Plan
Disputed	“Guidelines for the implementation of the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP) at South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands”. [1]	2010		Conservation Management Strategy,Management Plan,Threat Abatement Plan
Disputed	Sea Lion Island National Nature Reserve Management Plan	2011		Management Plan
Ecuador	Plan de Manejo Parque Nacional Galapagos: Un Pacto por la conservaciÃ³n y desarrollo sustentable del archipelago	2005		Management Plan
France	Management Plan		Decret no 2006-1211	Management Plan

Jurisdiction	Plan Title	Year published	Legislation	Plan components
France	Plan National dâ€™action pour la conservation de lâ€™albatros dâ€™Amsterdam	2011	Decret no 2006-1211	National Plan of Action
New Zealand	Conservation Management Strategy: Subantarctic Islands 1998-2008.		Conservation Act 1987	Conservation Management Strategy
New Zealand	Fiordland National Park Management Plan		National Parks Act 1980	Management Plan
South Africa	Prince Edward Islands Management Plan	1996		Management Plan
United Kingdom	Gough and Inaccessible Islands World Heritage Site Management Plan.	2010	The Conservation of Native Organisms and Natural Habitats (Tristan da Cunha) Ordinance 2006	Management Plan
United Kingdom	Tristan da Cunha implementation plan for the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP): review of current work and a prioritised work programme for the future.	2009		Conservation Management Strategy,Management Plan,Threat Abatement Plan
USA	A Conservation Action Plan for Black-footed Albatross (*Phoebastria nigripes*) and Laysan Albatross (*P. immutabilis*), Ver. 1.0.	2007		Action Plan
USA	Papahanaumokuakea Marine National Monument Management Plan	2008		Management Plan,Visitor access

[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 y Islas Sandwich del Sur) and the surrounding maritime areas".*

ANNEX 8

Protection arrangements at sea by jurisdiction

Jurisdiction	Plan Name	Year published	Legislation	Plan components
Australia	Threat Abatement Plan (2006) for the incidental catch (or bycatch) of seabirds during oceanic longline fishing operations	2006	Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act 1999)	Threat Abatement Plan
Australia	Threat Abatement Plan for the impacts of marine debris on vertebrate marine life May 2009	2009	Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act 1999)	Threat Abatement Plan
Argentina	Plan de AcciÃ³n Nacional para reducir la interacciÃ³n de aves con pesquerÃas en la RepÃºblica Argentina 2010	2010		National Plan of Action
Argentina	Conservation measure for longline fisheries	2010		Management Plan
Brazil	National Plan of Action for the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (NPOA-Seabirds Brazil)	2006		National Plan of Action
Canada	National Plan of Action for Reducing the Incidental Catch of Seabirds in Longline Fisheries	2007		National Plan of Action
Chile	Plan de AcciÃ³n Nacional para reducir las capturas incidentales de aves en las pesquerÃas de palangre	2007		National Plan of Action
Disputed	"FAO International Plan of Action - Seabirds: An assessment for fisheries operating in South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands". [1]	2008		Assessment
Ecuador-Peru	Action Plan for Waved Albatross	2009		Action Plan
Japan	Japan's National Plan of Action for Reducing Incidental Catch of Seabirds in Longline Fisheries - Revised Version	2009		National Plan of Action
South Africa	National Plan of Action for Reducing the Incidental Catch of Seabirds in Longline Fisheries	2008		National Plan of Action
Uruguay	Plan de AcciÃ³n Nacional para Reducir la Captura Incidental de Aves Marinas en las PesquerÃas Uruguayas (PAN - Aves Marinas Uruguay)	2007		National Plan of Action

[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 y Islas Sandwich del Sur) and the surrounding maritime areas".*

ANNEX 9

Percentage of sites with management plans for each jurisdiction

Jurisdiction	2011 % sites with management plans	2011 % pop with management plans	Sites with no plans
Argentina	100	*Macronectes giganteus* 100	
Australia	100	*Diomedea exulans* 100	
		Macronectes halli 100	
		Macronectes giganteus 100	
		Procellaria cinerea 100	
		Phoebetria palpebrata 100	
		Thalassarche cauta 100	
		Thalassarche melanophris 100	
		Thalassarche chrysostoma 100	
Chile	0		
Disputed	98.3	*Diomedea exulans* 100	
		Macronectes halli 100	
		Macronectes giganteus 100	
		Phoebetria palpebrata 100	
		Procellaria aequinoctialis 100	
		Thalassarche melanophris 100	
		Thalassarche chrysostoma 100	
Ecuador	66.7	*Phoebastria irrorata* 99.9	Isla de la Plata
France	98.85	*Diomedea amsterdamensis* 100	
		Diomedea exulans 100	
		Macronectes halli 100	
		Macronectes giganteus 100	
		Procellaria cinerea 100	
		Phoebetria palpebrata 100	
		Phoebetria fusca 100	
		Procellaria aequinoctialis 100	
		Thalassarche carteri 100	
		Thalassarche melanophris 94.2	Loranchet Peninsula?
		Thalassarche chrysostoma 100	
		Thalassarche salvini 100	
New Zealand	79.6	*Diomedea antipodensis* 99.99	Pit Island
		Diomedea epomophora 100	
		Diomedea sanfordi 99.1	Taiaroa Head?
		Macronectes halli 100	
		Procellaria cinerea 100	
		Phoebetria palpebrata 100	
		Procellaria aequinoctialis 100	
		Thalassarche bulleri 99.95	Rosemary Rock

Jurisdiction	2011 % sites with management plans	2011 % pop with management plans	Sites with no plans
		Thalassarche eremita 100	
		Thalassarche carteri 100	
		Thalassarche melanophris 100	
		Thalassarche chrysostoma 100	
		Thalassarche salvini 100	
		Thalassarche steadi 100	
		Thalassarche impavida 100	
Norway	0		
South Africa	100	*Diomedea exulans* 100	
		Macronectes halli 100	
		Macronectes giganteus 100	
		Procellaria cinerea 100	
		Phoebetria palpebrata 100	
		Phoebetria fusca 100	
		Thalassarche carteri 100	
		Thalassarche chrysostoma 100	
United Kingdom	100	*Diomedea dabbenena* 100	
		Macronectes giganteus 100	
		Procellaria cinerea 100	
		Procellaria conspicillata 100	
		Phoebetria fusca 100	
		Thalassarche chlororhynchos 100	
USA	43.75	*Phoebastria immutabilis* 99.8	
		Phoebastria nigripes 99.8	