

 <p>Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Fifth Meeting of the Parties <i>Santa Cruz de Tenerife, Spain, 4 - 8 May 2015</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Accession of non-Party Range States to the Agreement</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Secretariat, AC Chair, AC Vice-chair</p>
---	---

SUMMARY

At MoP4, the assistance of the Advisory Committee (AC) was sought in identifying which non-Party Range States were of highest priority for engagement and accession to the Agreement. Making use of the Agreement's species assessments and prioritisation database the Advisory Committee identified three potential target groups and recommended a strategy for engaging with the priority countries in each of these groups.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Meeting of the Parties endorse the proposed strategy to encourage the accession of non-Party Range States to the Agreement.

1. BACKGROUND

The last Meeting of the Parties (MoP4) recommended that a strategic approach be taken to encourage the accession of non-Party Range States, given the recent listing of new species on Annex 1 of the Agreement and of the need to engage with non-Party Range States with large fishing fleets operating in waters frequented by ACAP species. MoP4 requested the Advisory Committee (AC) to advise on which non-Party Range States were of highest priority for engagement (see [MoP4 Report](#) para 6.1.15 and 7.12).

The Chair of the AC and the Secretariat drafted a paper developing an engagement strategy to promote the accession of non-Party Range States to aid AC7's consideration of this issue (AC7 Doc 19). Documents (e.g. species assessments) and tools (prioritisation database) developed during recent years by the Agreement hold the information needed for the analysis requested by MoP4. These tools were used to identify those States that are not currently Parties to the Agreement that are considered to have the most relevance to our work. It is worth highlighting that, for high seas fisheries, the prioritisation framework operates primarily at a RFMO scale, so no differentiation was made between national fleets fishing within each RFMO area.

The list of priority countries should be reviewed both with the listing of new species under Annex 1, and after the periodic reviews of the prioritisation framework. For example, if MoP5 agrees to the proposal to list the Pink-footed Shearwater, *Puffinus creatopus* under Annex 1 the list of non-Party Range States would expand to include Guatemala, San Salvador, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Panama and Colombia.

At AC7 the proposed engagement strategy was refined ([AC7 Doc 19 Rev 1](#)) and the meeting agreed to establish an intersessional group, coordinated by the Vice-chair, Chair and Executive Secretary and open to any Party, to refine, develop and implement to the extent possible, a strategy to engage non-Parties. The strategy, as currently developed, is presented below for the consideration and endorsement of MoP5.

2. PROPOSED ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY

2.1. Objective

There are two main interlinked objectives for encouraging greater accession to the Agreement:

- a) increasing ACAP membership (and therefore central funding) in order to increase the effectiveness of the Agreement, and
- b) increasing uptake of priority ACAP conservation actions by the new Parties.,

2.2. Target Groups

There are three principal potential target groups:

- 1) Range States with jurisdictions which include breeding sites for ACAP species, i.e. Japan, Mexico and United States of America.
- 2) Range States with domestic fisheries already identified by ACAP (in the recent prioritisation exercise) as priority targets with respect to seabird bycatch, i.e. Angola, Namibia; and
- 3) Range States with distant water fleets already identified by ACAP (at a RFMO scale through the recent prioritisation exercise) as key targets with respect to seabird bycatch, i.e. China, Japan, Korea.

These groups are not in a priority order and, as noted above, could be added to as circumstances change. It is particularly recommended that advantage is taken of any opportunities to interact with these Range States, especially if there are indications of a successful outcome e.g. the recent success of the Albatross Task Force in engaging with Namibia.

2.3. Implementation Strategy

The following actions are recommended for implementation:

- a) Preparation of a briefing document that outlines the objective of the Agreement and how it works; identifies the relevance of the Range State to the objectives of the Agreement and sets out the steps necessary to join the Agreement (including cost of membership). It is considered important to develop a consistent approach with country-specific sections;

- b) identify which ACAP Parties (and/or Secretariat) are best-placed to approach the Government of these Range States; and
- c) invite those identified in b) above to develop a plan including, as appropriate, country profiles, and time scale for engagement and for reporting back to the Advisory Committee.

This implementation strategy should be followed for all three target groups, however, the emphasis may be different in the development of the briefing document for specific target groups, e.g. whether a technical or political approach needs to be taken. Other issues, such as the need to consult with other stakeholder groups e.g. for Group 2 States, may also need to be considered.