



SUMMARY

This report follows the structure agreed at the First Session of the Meeting of Parties (MoP1, Resolution 1.5, Annex 1) and has been prepared by the Advisory Committee's Chair and Vice-Chair, following the advice of the Sixth Meeting of the Advisory Committee.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations arising from this report are provided for the consideration of the Meeting of the Parties:

- Note the progress, achievements and difficulties found during the last triennium by the Advisory Committee
- Review and approve the Advisory Committee Work Programme proposed for the 2013-15 triennium, detailed in MoP4 Doc 19.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Establishment of the Committee

The Committee was established at the First Session of the Meeting of Parties, 10-12 November 2004.

1.2. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair

Dr Marco Favero (Argentina) was re-elected as Chair, and Mark Tasker (United Kingdom) was re-elected as Vice-Chair at the Fifth Meeting of the Advisory Committee. They have held their posts since that date.

1.3. Members, Alternates, Observers and Experts

The lists of Advisory Committee Members, Alternates, Observers and Experts in attendance at each of the meetings of the Committee in the triennium may be found in Annex 1 of [AC5](#) [AC6](#) Final Reports.

1.4. Review of rules of procedure

The Committee established its rules of procedure at AC1 and they have been reviewed at each subsequent meeting. Since MoP3, the AC RoP have been amended at AC5 and AC6. Latest updated rules can be found at <http://www.acap.ag/instruments/download-document/1195-advisory-committee-rules-of-procedure>.

1.5. Meetings and other correspondence since MOP3

Following MoP3, the AC met formally for its Fifth Meeting on 13 - 17 April 2010 in Mar del Plata, Argentina, and for its Sixth Meeting on 29 August – 02 September 2011 in Guayaquil, Ecuador. Both meetings were preceded by meetings of the Breeding Sites, the Status and Trends and the Seabird Bycatch Working Groups.

There has been considerable formal and informal correspondence in association with the implementation of the Advisory Committee work programme. Informal meetings of the Advisory Committee's Officials (AC Chair and Vice-Chair, Working Group Convenors and the Executive Secretary) were held on a regular basis to co-ordinate the intersessional activities of the Advisory Committee.

2. OVERVIEW OF ACTIVITIES AND MEETINGS OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

2.1. Activities of the Chair and Advisory Committee officials

2.1.1. Recruitment

Following the conclusion of interviews conducted in the margins of MoP3, the Chair of the Advisory Committee finalised the recruitment of the Agreement's Executive Secretary, with the assistance of the Recruitment Sub-committee. The Chair reported back to the Advisory Committee ([AC5 Doc 26](#)) and has prepared a document for the Parties outlining the recruitment process, and offering a series of comments on lessons learned and recommendations for its refinement in future occasions (see MoP4 Doc 25).

2.1.2. Budgets

The Chair has been consulted by the Secretariat on a number of occasions on issues regarding management of the Agreement's budget. In all cases, agreement was reached.

2.1.3. Consultations with the Agreement Secretariat

The Chair has conducted considerable correspondence with the Secretariat (e-mail and telephone conversations on at least on a weekly basis) and others less frequently. The Vice Chair maintained periodic correspondence with AC Officials and the Secretariat as well.

2.1.4. Other activities

The Chair and other AC Officials have represented the Agreement at a number of meetings of Regional Fisheries Management Organisations, as well as at relevant conferences and other international meetings.

2.2. Progress with Actions under Article IX of the Agreement

2.2.1. Provision of scientific, technical and other advice

A summary of progress against the Work Programme for 2010-12 (MoP3 Resolution 3.4) is provided at the end of this document as Annex 1. It should be noted that the Work Programme has developed considerably during the two Advisory Committee meetings held since MoP3 and new tasks were added to reflect the work initiated by the Advisory Committee during this period. The work programme in Annex 1 reflects the latest version, amended at AC6 to address the merging of the Breeding Sites and Status & Trends working groups into the new Population and Conservation Status Working Group and the consequent merging of both work programmes.

Scientific and technical advice provided by the Advisory Committee was based largely on the output of its Working Groups:

- Status and Trends Working Group (STWG), Convenor Dr Rosemary Gales, Australia; Vice-Convenor Dr Henri Weimerskirch, France.
- Breeding Sites Working Group (BSWG), Convenor Dr Richard Phillips, United Kingdom. This WG compiles information on the breeding sites of ACAP species including an assessment of threats faced by ACAP species at their breeding sites.
- Seabird Bycatch Working Group (SBWG), Convenor Barry Baker, Australia; Vice-Convenor Dr Anton Wolfaardt, UK. This WG co-ordinates ACAP work in relation to interactions between ACAP species and fisheries.
- Taxonomy Working Group (TWG), Convenor Dr Mike Double, Australia; Vice-Convenor Dr Diego Montalti, Argentina. This WG reviews the taxonomic status of taxa listed on Annex 1 of the Agreement.
- STWG and BSWG merged in AC6 into a single Conservation and Population Status Working Group, with Dr Rosemary Gales, Australia and Dr Richard Phillips, United Kingdom, as Co-Convenors, and Dr Henri Weimerskirch, France, and Dr Flavio Quintana, Argentina as Vice-Convenors.

Excellent progress has been made by all Working Groups and the Advisory Committee during the last triennium. Key achievements since MoP3 are summarised below:

- Completion of the species assessments for all species listed under the Agreement, containing information on population status and trends, distribution, land based and at-sea threats, as well as the conservation measures that are in place to protect the ACAP species. These assessments are available on ACAP's website (<http://www.acap.aq/acap-species>) in English, French and Spanish.
- Development of biosecurity and quarantine guidelines for ACAP listed species breeding sites, aimed to prevent the introduction occurring as far back along the introduction

pathway as possible. These guidelines were endorsed by the Advisory Committee in 2010 and are available on ACAP's website (<http://www.acap.aq/conservation-guidelines>).

- Significant progress achieved in the standardisation of stored data and functionality of the online database (see MoP4 Doc 17). The Advisory Committee highlighted that these changes to the database are integral to the successful development of a suite of breeding site indicators and to the ACAP prioritisation process.
- The complete review of mitigation measures for pelagic long-line, trawl and demersal long-line fisheries (Annexes 6, 8 and 10 and 13, 15 and 17 of [AC5](#) and [AC6](#) Final Reports, respectively) and the development of best practice advice for these fisheries (Annexes 7, 9 and 11, and 14, 16 and 18 of [AC5](#) and [AC6](#) Final Reports, respectively).
- The elaboration in collaboration with BirdLife International of a suit of 14 mitigation fact sheets aimed at fisheries managers to assist in reducing bycatch in longline and trawl fisheries. These fact sheets are available on the ACAP website (<http://www.acap.aq/mitigation-fact-sheets>) and are currently translated into a number of the languages used by large international fishing fleets.
- The review of the strategy for engagement with RFMOs on the basis of experience gained during the last years. Issues identified with the implementation of the strategy included the work-load for the RFMO Coordinators, and the need to improve the transfer of information to ACAP Parties' representatives within fisheries meetings. Outcomes from recent meetings have been particularly encouraging and have highlighted the importance of engaging and fostering collaboration with other organisations with agendas relevant to the Agreement.
- The process for the identification of conservation priorities for the Agreement, commenced in AC4, was addressed in successive Advisory Committee meetings. AC5 analysed the progress achieved until early 2010 and made recommendations for the finalisation of the process. AC6 endorsed the completion of the framework for land based threats and outlined the steps for the definition of priorities for at-sea threats which were endorsed intersessionally by the Advisory Committee prior to MoP4.

2.2.2. Progress with standard reference text on taxonomy of species covered by the Agreement

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. This approach has been subsequently adopted by the Convention for Migratory Species (CMS). The Working Group will seek to identify ways in which to influence other groups to adopt ACAP's approach.

2.2.3. Recommendations concerning the Action Plan and further research

The Advisory Committee developed its work programme for the triennium 2013-15 for consideration and approval by the Parties (MoP4 Doc 19).

During AC6, the Advisory Committee agreed to a number of recommendations, including those proposed by the Seabird Bycatch Working Group and Breeding Sites and Status and

Trends Working Groups (see Annex 19 of [AC6 Final Report](#)). The framework for identifying at-sea conservation priorities has now been completed and a list of these priorities is provided in MoP4 Doc 17. With regards to conservation priorities for land-based threats, the Advisory Committee recommended that Parties address the high priority threats identified in the prioritisation process, including (1) Avian Cholera at Ile Amsterdam, (2) increased competition from Australasian Gannet at Pedra Branca, (3) habitat loss or destruction, or predation, by introduced Rabbits and Black Rats at Macquarie Island, Pigs at Auckland Island, and House Mouse at Gough Island, and (4) advance programmes to mitigate those threats, including eradication campaigns.

Recommendations for further research are identified in the respective reports of the Working Groups ([AC5 Doc 12 Rev 2](#), [AC6 Doc 11 Rev 4](#) and [AC6 Doc 14 Rev 4](#)).

2.2.4. Development of indicators to assess progress towards achieving and maintaining a favourable conservation status for albatrosses and petrels

The development of performance indicators to measure the effectiveness of the Agreement was considered at MoP3 (see [MoP3 Doc 27](#), [MoP3 Inf 2](#)) and subsequently considered through the past triennium by the AC (see [AC5 Doc 28](#), [AC5 Inf 8](#), [AC5 Inf 16 Rev 1](#), [AC6 Doc 27](#) and [AC 6 Inf 07](#)). At AC5, the Advisory Committee agreed that indicator categories should conform to the State-Pressure-Response system, and that some basic indicators in Annex 15 of the [AC5 Final Report](#) could be adopted and incorporated into the national reporting template. Following further discussion at AC6, the Advisory Committee recommends that MoP4 endorse use of the performance indicators detailed in Section 17 of [AC6 Final Report](#).

2.2.5. Progress with collation of information under Section 5 of the Action Plan and identification of gaps in knowledge

A report on progress with implementation of the Agreement following the framework adopted in MoP2 ([MoP2 Doc 29](#)) is provided as MoP4 Doc 11. The information provided by Parties is being used to improve individual species assessments. The new reporting systems and standardisation of the Agreement's database will allow a better understanding of areas where knowledge is needed and the identification of data gaps.

Although the Agreement has been successful in developing a system to record summary data on seabird bycatch in domestic fisheries the level of data provided so far is very uneven in its amount and quality. Further work is required to improve the quality of data provided. Also, the Agreement does not currently hold any data on seabird bycatch in high seas fisheries. It is critical that ACAP has access to reliable summary information on the distribution of fishing effort, levels of seabird attendance and bycatch for high seas fisheries.

2.3. Meetings of the Advisory Committee

Reports from the Fifth and Sixth Meetings of the Advisory Committee can be found at <http://www.acap.aq/meeting-documents/english/advisory-committee/ac5/ac5-final-report> and <http://www.acap.aq/english/english/advisory-committee/ac6/ac6-report>, respectively.

3. CONCLUSION

3.1. Achievements

We are pleased to say that the great willingness of Parties and others to work together internationally has continued. The interactions between the Meeting of the Parties, the Secretariat and the Advisory Committee were excellent, although further active engagement from some Parties would be appreciated.

The further development of the database and implementation of the more efficient and effective electronic reporting system provides ACAP Parties and other users access to essential information for the effective implementation of the Agreement's Action Plan. As data is progressively added to this database it will allow the Agreement to conduct a detailed analysis of its performance, and most importantly, identify the progress achieved and the gaps/needs required in different regions, as well as for individual Parties.

The maturity of the Agreement is further demonstrated in its ability to provide expert advice on the various measures that can be taken to address threats to albatrosses and petrels, both at sea and on land, information that is readily accessible through the ACAP website. This includes: conservation guidelines for the eradication of predators, and for biosecurity and quarantine; best practice advice for bycatch mitigation measures in longline and trawl fisheries, and mitigation fact sheets developed in conjunction with BirdLife International.

A very large proportion of the actions planned to be undertaken during the 2010-12 triennium were accomplished. Clear examples of the significant progress achieved include: the elaboration of conservation guidelines; the implementation of the strategy to engage RFMOs; agreement on the data reporting system and development of the Agreement's database; the completion of the species assessments, and the development of the Agreement's conservation priorities and performance indicators.

It is expected that the Advisory Committee and its Working Groups will continue to make good progress. Some outcomes expected for the next triennium should include:

- Access to better data from Parties and other fisheries managers on their fisheries and on levels of seabird bycatch, to permit improved evaluation of bycatch numbers and implementation of conservation measures for ACAP listed species. This should include the development of observer programmes or other mechanisms for the adequate gathering of bycatch data and fisheries data.
- The refinement and use of a suite of indicators of the success of the Agreement, partly based on a completed framework for prioritising actions.
- Best practice mitigation measures, developed and periodically updated by the Advisory Committee, are implemented in domestic and high seas fisheries.
- Significant gaps in data on the status and trends of ACAP species are covered, particularly for those showing declines.

3.2. Difficulties found in the last triennium and challenges for the next one

With the listing of the three Northern Hemisphere albatross species at MoP3 the number of potential Parties and Range States with breeding populations of ACAP species was

increased. For instance, the United States, Japan and Mexico are all breeding Range States and the waters of many other States are used by foraging albatrosses. Although USA and Canada are not Party to the Agreement, their high level of participation is very welcome. There is limited, or minimal, engagement by other Range States and ACAP should aim to increase this participation significantly during the next triennium.

This is particularly important for those Range States that possess distant water fishing fleets that operate in the foraging areas of ACAP listed species. Active engagement with these States, their fisheries managers, industry representatives and other stakeholders is essential if ACAP is to achieve their support for the adoption of best practice mitigation and conservation measures. Over the past triennium, a number of ACAP parties adopted National Plans of Action – Seabirds under FAO guidelines, implemented new conservation measures and regulations in breeding sites and fisheries, or developed Plans of Action for individual species. This is excellent news, although this shouldn't be considered as the end of the road, but the beginning. It is critical for the improvement of the conservation status of albatrosses and petrels that those plans and measures be effectively implemented and monitored in a quantitative manner. Otherwise it will be impossible, both for individual Parties and the Agreement, to determine the performance and effectiveness of these measures on ACAP species. The AC has a key role in assisting with this process.

One of the greatest challenges of the past triennium that will likely continue during the next one, is the increasing size and complexity of the Agreement's agenda and the asymmetry with the growth of capacity (both in terms of funds and human resources). Although, in view of the current global economic situation, monetary resources are likely to be restricted during the next triennium, it should be noted that the increased programme of work will not be achievable unless adequate financial and human resources are provided. In this regard, the heavy work load on some individuals could be alleviated if further volunteers could be identified to undertake particular actions.

The development and implementation of the Waved Albatross Action Plan has demonstrated the PoA process to be an effective mechanism for triggering conservation actions in particular regions/fisheries. The Plan of Action for the Amsterdam Albatross was recently adopted and introduced by France during AC6. It should be kept in mind that such Plans of Actions need to be developed thoughtfully, with expert advice informing the planning of conservation actions that ensure the plan can be implemented in an effective manner with priorities clearly set and the allocation of resources optimised.

ANNEX 1. ADVISORY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2010 - 2012.

Text in grey denotes those actions/ tasks already completed.

	Topic/Task	Responsible group	Timeframe	Action detail
1.1	Review the evidence supporting the specific status of the Wandering Albatross complex	TWG led by Convenor	2010	This will conclude the assessment process for all closely related sister taxa listed currently on Annex 1 of the Agreement. Completed 2010.
1.2	Keep the Taxonomy Working Group's bibliographic database updated	TWG led by Convenor	2010-2012	
1.3	Continue the establishment of a morphometric and plumage database	TWG led by Convenor (Secretariat)	2010-2012	This will facilitate the taxonomic process, the identification of bycatch specimens, and the long-term storage of valuable data.
1.4	Consider preparing a paper for peer-reviewed publication on albatross taxonomy	TWG led by Convenor	2011	A scientifically accepted paper would state ACAP's position in the clearest possible way to the scientific community, but other ways might be easier. In particular influencing committees dealing with large parts of the planet such as South American Checklist Committee should be a priority.
1.4a	Respond to queries on ACAP taxonomy	TWG	2011	In early 2010, respond to CMS query.
1.5	Consider additional species for addition to Annex 1 of the Agreement	Parties and AC	2010-2012	Development of papers as required, using species assessment template. Spain to develop document on Balearic shearwater. Draft prepared by Secretariat in 2008.
2.0	To maintain Status and Trends Working Group membership	Parties with assistance of Convenor of STWG	2010-2012	New Zealand, any interested Range States (particularly of North Pacific species).
2.1	Consider gaps in status and trends data submitted to ACAP and request any outstanding data (including from SCAR). Continue to update population data	STWG (Secretariat)	a) End 2009 b) 2010-2012	a) All outstanding existing data to be incorporated into database. b) Parties to provide new population data.

	Topic/Task	Responsible group	Timeframe	Action detail
2.1a	Ensure population data consistent and accurate with other databases	STWG Convenor, Secretariat and BirdLife International	2011	Work with BirdLife International in particular.
2.1b	Resolve part-site monitoring data to assist with generation of database queries and revision of analyses of status and trends	STWG, BSWG convenor and Secretariat	Before AC6	Science officer to facilitate modification of database and STWG and BSWG convenor to work with Science officer to ensure appropriate generation of queries. (AUD\$ included at 2.2a).
2.2	Incorporate all feedback received into the species assessments, and incorporate new data and update species assessments	STWG Convenor (with species authors) (Secretariat)	2010-2012	Updating species assessments with reference to conservation status and numbers.
2.2a	Add data portal improvements relating to ongoing population monitoring and mark-recapture studies	Secretariat and STWG Convenor	2010	Science Officer to facilitate modification of database to include entry of ongoing status of monitoring and mark-recapture studies (AUD\$5).
2.3	Provide advice to CEP regarding census methods for Antarctic southern giant petrels	STWG, (Secretariat)	End 2008	CEP requested review and advice on census methods prior to their 2009 meeting.
2.4	Supply data and validate ACAP database	STWG Convenor and members (with data holders) (Secretariat)	2010-2012	Liaise with Secretariat.
2.5	Finalise Species Assessments for all ACAP species	Species Assessment Coordinating Group, STWG Convenor, (Secretariat)	End 2009	This to include updating population trends with 2008 data and any new species added to Annex 1.
2.6	Translation of Species Assessments into Spanish and French	Secretariat, Spanish and French speaking Parties, STWG	2012	Includes contributions in kind from Spanish and French speaking Parties. All but two Spanish and nearly all French translations completed by AC5 (AUD\$8).

	Topic/Task	Responsible group	Timeframe	Action detail
2.6a	Analyse ACAP population database to determine those that meet threshold criteria based upon proportions of global population size	STWG and Secretariat	2011	Following 2010 provision of population data to the database to provide analyses of locations of ACAP populations that meet various threshold criteria.
2.7	Reconsider selection of RFMOs whose boundaries are included on distribution maps in Species Assessments	SBWG STWG	2011	Further maps, if required, would need to be commissioned from BirdLife.
2.8	Provide and consider annual reports to AC on STWG activities	STWG and AC	2010-2012	
3.0	To maintain Breeding Sites Working Group membership	Parties with assistance of Convenor of BSWG	2010-2012	New Zealand, any interested Range States (particularly of North Pacific species).
3.1	Revise the database lists and structures	BSWG (Secretariat)	2010-2012	This needed to ensure compatibility with other databases and enable update of Species Assessments.
3.2	Complete, review and update data submission from Parties	BSWG	2010-2012	Largely completed (response still required from Chile, New Zealand, Norway and for the north Pacific species). Published data from southern giant petrels breeding sites in Antarctica added to database.
3.3	Compile and help maintain list of introduced mammals and eradications from ACAP breeding sites	BSWG (Secretariat)	2010-2012	This will inform analysis of past and current risks. Largely completed (response still required from Chile, New Zealand, Norway and for the north Pacific species).
3.4	Compile and maintain list of former (recent) breeding sites of ACAP species and their characteristics	BSWG (Secretariat)	2010-2012	This will enable consideration of further mitigation of land-based pressures and potentially restoration of range largely completed (response still required from Chile, New Zealand, Norway and for the north Pacific species).

	Topic/Task	Responsible group	Timeframe	Action detail
3.5	Assess the threats to breeding sites and identify gaps in knowledge	BSWG (Secretariat)	2010-2012	Threats and knowledge gaps are highlighted in Species Assessments. No known substantive change in threats since AC3, hence no formal update carried out.
3.6	Develop, review and update best-practice guidelines to mitigate selected threats to breeding sites, including biosecurity	BSWG Biosecurity lead UK	2010-2012 Biosecurity completed 2010	First editions of all best-practice guidelines for species/sites on original Annex 1. Review of needs for North Pacific albatrosses required.
3.7	Review evidence for impacts of pathogens and parasites on ACAP species and effectiveness of mitigation measures	BSWG, lead France, Ecuador, Argentina	2011	Initial colony threats analysis indicates this to be an issue at some colonies.
3.8	Consider criteria for prioritisation of internationally important breeding sites	BSWG	2010-2012	BirdLife International to progress analysis of IBAs for later consideration by WG. Update of document on Important Bird Areas for ACAP species provided by BirdLife International for AC5.
3.9	Provide and consider annual reports to AC on BSWG activities	BSWG and AC	2010-2012	
4.1	To maintain Seabird Bycatch Working Group membership	Parties with assistance of Convenor of SBWG	2010-2012	Chile, New Zealand, Brazil, Ecuador, France, Norway, Uruguay to nominate working group members and further interested Range States as observers.

	Topic/Task	Responsible group	Timeframe	Action detail
4.2	Continue to develop and implement the interaction plan for ACAP and relevant Parties to engage and assist RFMOs and other relevant international bodies to assess and minimise bycatch of albatrosses and petrels	SBWG and AC Secretariat	1) End Aug 2008 2) End Mar 2009 3) 4) and 5) 2010-2012	1) Agree initial plan and nominate first RFMO coordinators (AC). 2) Analysis of needs, coordination of work and report back on initial RFMOs (RFMO coordinators intersessionally with SBWG, AC and Parties, as described in AC4 Doc 56). 3) Attendance at selected RFMO meetings (AUD\$25). 4) Review of process and suggest any changes (SBWG). 5) RFMO by RFMO development of strategies for engagement (commenced by AC5).
4.3	Continue to review availability of albatross and petrel tracking/distribution data to ensure representativeness of species/age classes. Prioritise gaps and encourage studies to fill gaps.	SBWG, AC, Parties and BirdLife International	2010-2012	Review status at AC5, AC7, AC9.
4.4	Complete reports on analysis of overlaps of distributions and albatrosses and petrels with fisheries managed by RFMOs	BirdLife / ACAP Secretariat	1) Oct 2008 2) 2011 3) 2011	1) Complete last of initial five reports (already funded) Completed by AC5 2) Analysis of information for remaining RFMOs including those managing trawl fisheries (by AC6) 3) Review if updated overlap analyses required (AC6) (AUD\$5).

	Topic/Task	Responsible group	Timeframe	Action detail
4.5	Develop and keep under review materials (both generic and specific) to assist RFMOs and other relevant international and national bodies in reducing seabird bycatch and to maximise effective participation and consideration of issues relevant to ACAP	NZ / SBWG / UK UK/BirdLife	1) 2011 2) 2010-2012	1) Observer programme designs including protocols for the collection of seabird bycatch data, with consideration of analytical methods for assessing seabird bycatch to be examined first. Info paper from UK in 2011. 2) Summary of risk assessment methods and key contacts in this area. Priority decided inside the RFMO interaction plan. First draft paper considered at AC5. Further editorial work required to develop ERA toolkit. Ideal for 2010 Brisbane Tuna Commissions meeting
4.6	Review and utilise available information on foraging distribution, fisheries and seabird bycatch to assess and prioritise the risk of fishing operations on ACAP species in waters subject to national jurisdiction. Linked to broader prioritisation process	SBWG and Parties	1) 2011 2) 2011	1) Commission initial report on knowledge of fisheries, status of any bycatch mitigation, knowledge of relevant seabird distribution for AC5. Note overlap with 4.4. NPOA seabirds also can be used. 2) Assess needs for waters subject to national jurisdiction and any capacity building requirements.
4.7	Define bycatch data requirements from Parties	SBWG (lead USA), [Science Officer]	2009-10	Requires a clear objective statement of purpose, terms of reference and timeline for the collection of bycatch data. Completed by AC5.
4.8	Collate information (metadata) on bycatch monitoring schemes and data held by each Party	SBWG (lead USA), [Science Officer]	2009	Requires development of a metadata survey form. Completed by AC5.
4.9	Develop a prototype bycatch data collection form with comprehensive instructions for completing the form.	SBWG (lead USA), [Science Officer]	2009-10	Completed by AC5.

	Topic/Task	Responsible group	Timeframe	Action detail
4.10	Test and develop bycatch data collection form	SBWG (lead USA), [Science Officer]	2009-2010	A sample of Parties to test and evaluate the utility of the form and appropriateness of its questions based on the sample completed forms and revise as necessary. Approaching completion, but no formal evaluation yet.
4.11	Incorporate bycatch data collection form into standard Party reports	AC	2009-2010	See also Action 6.6.
4.11a	Analyse bycatch information from Party reports to determine if it can deliver the products required in evaluating bycatch	SBWG and Secretariat	By AC6 deadlines	Additional resources may be needed for this analysis (AUD\$10).
4.12	Create and maintain a bibliography of relevant bycatch information	BirdLife/SBWG (Secretariat)	2010-2012	BirdLife producing report /database. To include both published and unpublished literature.
4.13	Complete tabular reviews and develop summary advice on mitigation measures for fishing methods known to impact albatrosses and petrels (demersal longline, pelagic longline, and trawl) Translations of mitigation fact sheets into relevant languages Maintain tabular reviews, summary advice and individual mitigation fact sheets	Leads: New Zealand (trawl), Australia (Pelagic LL), UK (Demersal LL), BirdLife (individual mitigation measures) BirdLife/SBWG Secretariat/BirdLife	2010 2011 2011-2012	Initial versions of each tabular review and summary advice completed by AC5. Individual mitigation fact sheets completed by AC5. (AUD\$18 included in 2009 programme) (AUD\$5 (for ind. fact sheets per year for 5 years))
4.14	Produce report on lessons from mitigation success stories in commercial fisheries	BirdLife/ Australia/ WWF Convenor SBWG	2010-2012	
4.15	Assist in the preparation, adoption and implementation of FAO NPOA-Seabirds or equivalent	SBWG and Parties/ Range States	2010	FAO expert consultation including ACAP input scheduled for September 2008. Completed and published in March 2010.
4.15a	Review existing NPOA seabirds in light of new FAO Technical guidelines	SBWG, Leads: Convenor SBWG, Ben Sullivan	2011	

	Topic/Task	Responsible group	Timeframe	Action detail
4.16	Prepare review of knowledge on deliberate take/killing of ACAP species at sea	Australia/ Brazil/ New Zealand/ Peru/ UK SBWG Needs a clear lead	2011	Review to describe current knowledge (much from unpublished literature) and causes of any deliberate take and to consider possible take reduction strategies.
4.17	Review results of any research funded by ACAP on seabird bycatch issues	SBWG	2010-2012	Draw conclusions and make recommendations to AC as appropriate.
4.17a	Review any other relevant mitigation research	SBWG	2010-12	Draw conclusions and make recommendations to AC as appropriate.
4.18	Maintain review of research needs and priorities for bycatch research and mitigation development	SBWG	2010-2012	Gill-netting to be examined in 2011.
4.19	Provide and consider annual reports to AC on WG activities	SBWG and AC	2010-2012	
4.20	Estimate mortality in previously unobserved fisheries in range of Waved albatross	Ecuador and Peru, BirdLife, AC, American Bird Conservancy	2012	Part of implementation from Waved Albatross Action Plan. Some ACAP-funded work started in 2010 (two projects total value: AUD\$41), original timescale unrealistic.
5.1	Develop strategy for capacity building	AC Chair, New Zealand, Argentina, Ecuador, Chile, UK, WWF	2010	Utilising work on potential projects by Brazil and AC and including potential sources of funding.
5.2	Improve seabird data collection from observer programmes in South America	All South American Parties	2010-2012	Development of a South American seabird bycatch observers course, development of standard methodology (see also 4.5) and exchange of observers between Parties. AUD\$33 total grant in 2009. First stage of the programme completed in 2010 (workshop, Buenos Aires).
5.3	2 nd South American Fishers Forum	All South American Parties, Southern Seabird Solutions, WWF	December 2009	Some support would be welcome. Forum did not take place.

	Topic/Task	Responsible group	Timeframe	Action detail
5.4	Provide assistance and capacity building to ensure drafting and implementation of NPOA-Seabirds	AC and Parties to consider	2010-2012	Capacity building in accordance with the needs identified by interested Parties in order to encourage implementation, particularly in Argentina, Ecuador France, Peru, South Africa, (Mozambique, Madagascar), Tristan da Cunha (UK), and EC external fisheries.
5.5	Technical Cooperation to train observers and develop an observers programme in Ecuador	Argentina, Ecuador, BirdLife International, American Bird Conservancy	2008 - 09	Part of Waved Albatross Action Plan implementation.
5.6	Development of an observers programme in Peru	Peru, BirdLife International, American Bird Conservancy	2009	Part of Waved Albatross Action Plan implementation.
6.1	Identify and prioritise conservation measures required for each species and by each Party to the Agreement	Secretariat, WG Convenors and <i>ad-hoc</i> group, lead New Zealand	2010-2012	An analysis of threats, data/knowledge gaps and population trends will be undertaken (Broadly complete by AC5). By AC6, data validation and finer-scale analysis will occur with integration into ACAP database (AUD\$10).
6.2	Develop and harmonise conservation strategies for particular species or groups of species of albatrosses and petrels	WGs, AC (Secretariat)	2010-2012	Precise definition of what is needed difficult at this range.
6.2a	Draft the Amsterdam albatross National Action Plan	France (for review by AC)	2010-2011	Draft to be examined intersessionally by group led by Chair of Advisory Committee.
6.3	Implement conservation strategies for particular species or groups of species of albatrosses and petrels	Parties, AC	2010-2012	Precise definition of what needed is difficult at this range.

	Topic/Task	Responsible group	Timeframe	Action detail
6.4	Develop a system of indicators for the success of the ACAP Agreement	UK (lead), Australia, South Africa, New Zealand, USA, BirdLife	2011	Drawing on the prioritisation exercise information, considerations within Working Groups and earlier work for the AC, these are required to assess the effectiveness of the Agreement (Completed by 2010). By AC6, test a set of indicators based on available data and further consider high level indicators of gain in capacity/ resources by ACAP.
6.5	Review the effects of climate change on ACAP species	France, UK	2011	This may need updating at regular intervals.
6.6	Improve, in association with the Secretariat, guidance for the provision of information by Parties on the implementation of the Agreement	AC	Initial work by 2010 for agreement in 2011	Information on implementation provided by Parties is currently difficult to assemble and assess, and can prove onerous to Parties to provide. Good progress by 2010, finalisation by late 2010. Some database development required.
6.6a	Assist Secretariat and AC with provision of information on the agreed indicators and national reporting queries	Secretariat, WGs	Before AC6	Following 2010 data provision and database update, provide the Secretariat and AC with information as required to progress the agreed indicator and national reporting parameters that are relevant to status and trends (AUD\$10).
6.7	Review information provided by Parties on implementation of the Agreement and provide a report to MoP	AC	2011	This to carry out responsibilities under Article IX 6 d) of the Agreement.
6.8	Support database of relevant scientific literature	AC, lead: Argentina, UK (Secretariat)	2010-2012	Much exists already in various places. Also relevant for several other actions e.g. 4.12, 4.13.
6.9	Develop a directory of relevant legislation	Argentina, UK (Secretariat)	2010-2012	Parties will need to supply information

	Topic/Task	Responsible group	Timeframe	Action detail
6.10	Develop a list of authorities, research centres, scientists and non-governmental organisations relevant to ACAP	Argentina, UK (Secretariat)	2010-2012	Requires input from AC and Parties
7.1	Budget matters	AC	2010-2012	Shorter-term advice provided by the AC Chair
7.2	Staff matters	AC	2010-2012	Shorter-term advice provided by the AC Chair
7.4	Oversight, advice and guidance of Secretariat in relation to database, web portal	Convenors, chair and vice-chair	2010-2012	
7.5	Management of Advisory Committee work	Chair, Vice-chair and Convenors	2010-2012	Regular teleconferences and email conversations