



Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels

Fourth Meeting of Advisory Committee

Cape Town, South Africa, 22 – 25 August 2008

Title: Report of the Status and Trends Working Group

Author: Status and Trends WG Convenor

1. Welcome and Opening Remarks

A Status and Trends Working Group (STWG) meeting was convened on the 17th August 2008 at Hermanus in South Africa

The convenor of the STWG, Dr. Rosemary Gales, introduced the meeting agenda (STWG Doc 1) and thanked Working Group members and observers for attending. The meeting was attended by members of the STWG from Argentina, Australia, France, New Zealand, South Africa, United Kingdom, Birdlife International and the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR). Observers from Canada and the United States of America and members of the Interim Secretariat also attended the STWG. The STWG discussed and accepted the proposed agenda.

2. Progress Report

The meeting discussed the activities undertaken in the 2007/08 intersessional period. This report outlines intersessional progress that has been achieved against the Status and Trends Working Group Work Programme that was endorsed at the AC3 meeting in 2007. The report also describes discussions and recommendations arising from the STWG meeting on 17 August 2008 (Hermanus, South Africa).

Background

MoP2 (November 2006) endorsed a proposal (see MoP2 Inf 2) to develop Species Assessments as part of the AC work program for 2007-2009 (MoP2 report paras 3.7.2 and 6.1.22). Subsequently, at AC3, in relation to progressing the work of the STWG, the Committee (see AC3 report para 9.2.1):

- a) endorsed the recommendation that the Secretariat develop and implement a data storage and management system for data acquired by the Working Groups;
- b) endorsed the recommendation that the Secretariat engage a contractor to assist in the development of the full suite of species assessments;
- c) endorsed the establishment of a Species Assessment Coordinating Group to guide and support the Contractor, and
- d) noted the STWG report and endorsed the revised Work Program for the STWG.

Progress to date

Considerable progress has been achieved since AC3. Annex 1 details the specific progress for each of the action items in the Status and Trends elements of the AC Work Program. This has been largely achieved via the significant contributions of the ACAP Interim Executive Officer, the Convenors of the three other ACAP Working Groups, the species assessment coordinator, and the ACAP Chair and Vice Chair.

- A Species Assessments Coordinating Group has been established to review the draft assessments and appoint external reviewers as per **Item 2.4** in the AC Work Program. The group comprises convenors of the four working groups, the Executive Secretary, and a STWG member from Parties with endemic ACAP listed species, plus a Spanish speaking representative (see Annex 2).
- A Species Assessments project coordinator, Dr Wieslawa Misiak, was contracted by the ACAP Secretariat (August 2007- August 2008) to facilitate the development and compilation of the 26 species assessments as per **Item 2.5** in the AC Work Program.

- Species Assessments have been incorporated within the web based ACAP database framework that harmonises Status and Trends, Breeding Sites and Taxonomy data (see **Item 2.2 and 2.3** in the AC Work Program). This has facilitated search and data querying options across multiple species or breeding sites and allows analysis to be undertaken of the status of each species based on the most up to date information currently available to ACAP.

Nine Species Assessments have been completed, three assessments are currently under review and the remaining 14 drafts are in progress. Through the invaluable assistance from members from Argentina, Chile and France, four assessments have been translated into Spanish and one into French. This is well ahead of the proposed AC Work Programme schedule, as translations were not scheduled to commence until December 2008 (see **Item 2.7**).

During the intersessional period, there has been extensive liaison with BirdLife International to facilitate the provision of amended distribution and satellite tracking maps for all 26 species.

During the intersessional period, all National Representatives on the STWG (Argentina, Australia, Chile, Ecuador, France, New Zealand, South Africa and UK) were approached with a request for updated demographic and annual population data for all species breeding within their territories as per Item 2.1 in the AC Working Program. All parties, with the exception of New Zealand, Chile and Ecuador, provided data which have been incorporated into the ACAP database.

In the meeting, New Zealand committed to providing all outstanding population data by the end of 2008. The working group noted the requirement to undertake further engagement with Chile and Ecuador in order to update population data for species breeding in their territory.

Progress with US draft assessments

Using the Species Assessment templates, as agreed at the AC3, during the intersessional period, US and Canadian observers, guided by the Species Assessment coordinator, facilitated the development of three information papers that provided comprehensive data on the population status and trends of the Short-tailed (Vulnerable) Black-footed (Endangered) and Laysan (Vulnerable) albatrosses (AC docs 44, 45, 46).

These papers were presented to the Working Group, who congratulated the US and Canadian observers on their comprehensive drafts. It was recognised that these information papers will greatly assist the AC in consideration of the listing of these threatened albatross species on Annex 1 of the Agreement. The Working Group was also advised that these information papers are scheduled to be revised with new data from the Japanese breeding sites. All authors will be listed as contributors when the species assessments are rebranded under ACAP.

The US observers suggested that translation of these information papers into Japanese would assist in communicating and progressing conservation actions for these species. The Working Group agreed that this proposal should be considered by the AC with priority for translation being highest for the Short-tailed albatross, followed by Black-footed albatross and then Laysan albatross. It was agreed that funds external to ACAP should be sought to achieve this.

The Working Group discussed the inclusion on maps of the boundaries of relevant non tuna Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (RFMOs) and other fisheries that overlap with

the foraging distribution of North Pacific albatrosses. This concept was supported by the Working Group who recommended that it be progressed following any listing of these species and prior to the finalisation of these species assessments.

Database/web portal development and improvements

Significant progress has been made in the development, data input and application of the relational database to curate and coordinate data from the ACAP Working Groups (see **Item 2.2** of AC Work Program). This has required significant engagement with all Convenors of all four ACAP Working Groups.

A demonstration of the interactive database was presented to the STWG. It was recognised that the capacity to store and manage the data is a requirement of the Action Plan of the Agreement. There was valuable discussion regarding the need for the robust tracking of data incorporation and changes to the data

The Species Assessment framework is incorporated within the web based ACAP database to facilitate data search and querying options across multiple species and breeding sites. When completed, this will allow comprehensive analyses to be undertaken for all ACAP species using the most up to date information available to ACAP. The Working Group considered the need for a compilation of information added to the database to be reported annually to the STWG.

The Working Group recognised that this development greatly assists the collation of information by the AC as well as contributing to education and public awareness as required in the Action Plan of the Agreement. Further, this database is fundamental to the development of conservation strategies for particular species or groups of species of albatrosses and petrels.

The Working Group discussed the nature of the data available to the public and other stakeholders and agreed that such availability must be consistent with agreed conditions of data use and access.

It was recognised that the current rules for access and use of data on albatrosses and petrels provided to the Secretariat (Annex 3) should be reviewed in light of progress with data acquisition and management. Dr Richard Phillips (UK) presented a draft of revised rules that provide more comprehensive and transparent guidance for data contributors with respect to levels of data use and access (Annex 4). Valuable discussion followed which resulted in the refinement of the revised draft rules. The Working Group agreed that the revised draft be considered by the AC for adoption.

3. Population Status and Trends

Prof. John Croxall (BirdLife International) introduced the STWG to the 2008 update of the IUCN Red List that has resulted in three changes to the status of ACAP listed species (AC4 doc 51). Tristan albatross, *Diomedea dabbenena*, was uplisted from Endangered to Critically Endangered, Waved albatross *Phoebastria irrorata*, uplisted from Vulnerable to Critically Endangered and Buller's albatross, *Thalassarche bulleri*, downlisted from Vulnerable to Near Threatened. Details on the reasons for these changes are provided in AC4 Doc51.

Of the 19 species of albatross listed by ACAP, four are listed as Critically Endangered, five are listed as Endangered, six are Vulnerable and four are Near Threatened. For the seven petrel species, four are currently listed as Vulnerable and three as Near Threatened, (AC4 doc 48,

Attachment A) Document AC4 doc 51 also noted the significance of fisheries bycatch, invasive species and disease as threats influencing the survival of these species.

At the first meeting of the STWG in Brazil 2006 the Working Group considered options for analyses of population data. The options considered included both TRIM (a readily available log-linear Poisson regression method) and also an alternative population modelling approach (AC2 doc 32). At that meeting, the Working Group concluded that as long as a robust and defensible process was adopted, it was not necessary to decide at that stage which approach was most appropriate. Consequently, the analyses of population trends presented in the species assessments have included the results from both methods. It was discussed and considered by the Working Group that duplication of effort and potential confusion resulting from presentation of two analyses was not warranted. The Working Group concluded that the TRIM method is widely accepted and readily available and, at present, the most appropriate single analysis to be conducted for the assessment of population trends conducted by ACAP.

The Working Group further considered the classifications of population increase or decline as interpreted by the TRIM software, which is designed to cover a wide range of animal taxa.

Working Group members, including those with considerable expertise in analysis of albatross demographic rates, agreed that the % change limits aligned with different levels of population change by TRIM are inappropriate for application to albatross and petrel species. In these long lived species, with low reproductive output, even small changes in population numbers have significant impacts on conservation status.

The Working Group discussed the implications of analysing data over both long and short time frames. To ensure appropriate selection of time series data, time intervals over which to apply TRIM analyses which shall be presented in the Species Assessments will be agreed by the data contributor and ACAP Secretariat.

The Working Group agreed that revised interpretations of change over a specified number of years would more appropriately be: Stable – no significant change; Increase or Decrease – significant change of less than 2% per annum; Steep increase or decrease – significant change of greater than 2% per annum.

The Secretariat provided the Working Group with a spreadsheet detailing the information held by ACAP on the demographic parameters and population size for the 300+ populations of ACAP albatross and petrel species. The Working Group members were requested to provide feedback to the Secretariat regarding whether all relevant data held by the members had been contributed and was reflected in the summary. Data holders were also requested to clarify whether data gaps reflected data that had not been collected as opposed to data that had yet to be contributed to ACAP. Working Group members agreed to provide this feedback to the Secretariat before October 2008.

Dr. Flavio Quintana (Argentina) noted the incomplete list of Antarctic breeding sites for Southern giant petrels (SGPs). The Working Group acknowledged this deficiency and noted that the Secretariat was requesting SCAR to supply these data to ACAP.

This also relates to the consideration by Antarctic Treaty Parties of the need for adequate management of SGPs and their breeding colonies. Following a meeting by SCAR in May 2008 there was a request to ACAP from the Committee for Environmental Protection (CEP) seeking advice about appropriate census methodology for Antarctic Southern Giant Petrel populations. The Working Group considered and reviewed the advice on methodology provided in STWG

doc 5 (Annex 7). The Working Group recommended that the Secretariat forward this advice to the CEP prior to their meeting in 2009.

4. Prioritisation

The objective of the ACAP agreement is to achieve and maintain a favourable conservation status for albatrosses and petrels. Action 1.1.3 in the ACAP Action Plan requires that the Secretariat coordinate the development, harmonisation and implementation of conservation strategies for these species. To assist in the process of prioritisation, two papers were considered by the WG (AC4 doc48 and AC4 doc15).

The approach outlined by New Zealand in AC4 doc15 focussed on prioritising species based upon conservation status and prioritising conservation management actions. This approach was demonstrated in the document by applying these principles to four New Zealand breeding species. Priority rankings of threats and species were determined by application of a numerical rank resulting in a league table of priorities.

An alternative approach was outlined in AC4 doc 48 where the analyses were conducted at the level of breeding population and sought to assign prioritise in three areas: information gaps, threats at breeding sites and threats at sea.

The Working Group engaged in constructive discussion and considered the merits of each approach. In addition, Greg Balogh (USA) described the process used for prioritisation of actions in the Short-tailed albatross recovery plan that was a combination of expert opinion and scoring system.

The Working Group agreed that a combination of the AC48 and AC15 approaches should be achievable and considered that it is essential that the assessment is based upon objective criteria and validated by expert opinion and agreement.

To progress this task of prioritising ACAP actions, a small break-out group comprising members of all four WGs was initiated to develop options for consideration by the AC.

In order to assist ACAP in achieving conservation gains the WG agreed to contribute to progressing the development of a prioritising framework for consideration by the AC.

If successful, this framework could then be further progressed so that the preliminary results of a prioritisation process could be delivered to MOP3 in April 2009.

Prioritisation of Funding Applications

Five funding applications relevant to the STWG were considered. This consideration resulted in the allocation of a rank of either high, medium or low, as priorities measured against the ACAP action plan. This assessment was then forwarded to the ACAP secretariat for further consideration by ACAP officials and the Advisory Committee.

5. Terms of Reference

The current terms of reference for the STWG (Annex 5) describes the work program, the membership and the timetable for progress of the Working Group. The progress of the Working Group has now exceeded the actions identified in the current ToR and consequently, the Working Group considered the need for updated ToR. It was also recognised that it would be appropriate if there was greater consistency in the STWG ToR with that of other working groups. A draft revised ToR for the STWG (Annex 6) was considered, revised and refined for consideration by the AC.

6. Future and Ongoing work – Revised Work Programme

The following items of the current AC Work Program remain outstanding or involve ongoing work:

Item 2.1 Outstanding data required from New Zealand, France, Chile and Ecuador. Annual update for 2008-09 population data to be requested from all National representatives. Analyses of population trends to be revised with updated information where possible.

Item 2.2 ACAP database to be populated with verified status and trends and breeding sites data. Feedback from AC4 to be incorporated into database where possible.

Item 2.7 The translation of all assessments into Spanish and French will need to be continued and coordinated.

Item 2.10 The integration of the species assessments and the ACAP database will need to be closely managed and maintained for an initial period to ensure updates and amendments are reflected in the end product and any problems that arise are resolved promptly.

Items 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6 The breeding sites and threats for all species will need to be reviewed and updated once new threats data is collated and submitted to the database by the Breeding Sites Working Group.

In addition, the following tasks have been identified and will need to be undertaken in order to progress fulfilment of the Terms of Reference of the Status and Trends Working Group, and the ACAP Action Plan:

Work Plan for Status and Trends Working Group 2009-2012

Indicative costs (in \$AUD x 1000) are for central budget only.

Additional tasks supporting the work of the STWG to be undertaken by the

| Status and trends | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|---------------------------------------|---|
| 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 2008 b) ongoing, annual | a) All outstanding existing data to be incorporated into database. b) Parties to provide new population data (AU\$0) |
| 2 | Incorporate all feedback received into the draft species assessments, and incorporate missing data | STWG Convenor (with species authors) (Secretariat) | By MoP3 (April 2009) | Feedback from AC4 and incorporate data that are currently missing (AU\$0) |
| 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 (AU\$0) |
| 4 | Supply data and validate ACAP database | STWG Convenor and members (with data holders) | ongoing | (AU\$0) |
| 5 | Complete 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 (AU\$0) |
| 6 | Translation of Species Assessments into Spanish and French | STWG (Secretariat) | Ongoing | Includes contributions in kind from Spanish and French speaking Parties (AU\$8) |
| 7 | Reconsider selection of RFMOs whose boundaries are included on distribution maps in Species Assessments | SBWG STWG | 2009 | Further maps, if required, would need to be commissioned from BirdLife (AU\$5) |
| 8 | Provide and consider annual reports to AC on STWG activities | BSWG and AC | AC5 and ongoing | (AU\$0) |

Therefore, whilst considerable progress has been achieved, much work remains to be completed and further funding will be required.

In summary, the progress of a wide range of issues by the Working Groups has effectively set the framework for progressing important elements of the ACAP Action Plan. For example, following AC4 it is likely that the substantial progress can be achieved in the following overarching Action Items of the ACAP Action Plan:

Action Item 1.1.3 – Species Conservation and Prioritisation – Secretariat coordination of development, harmonisation and implementation of albatross and petrel conservation strategies;

Action item 5.2 – Collation of Information by the Advisory Committee – The AC should identify gaps in information as part of reviews, with a view to addressing these in future priorities;

Action Item 6.1 – Education and Public Awareness – Make information on the conservation status of albatrosses and petrels, the threats facing them, and the activities undertaken under the Agreement, available to the scientific, fishing and conservation communities, as well as to relevant local authorities and other decision makers, and to neighbouring states (*note: this information shall require to be updated as required*);

Action Item 7.1 – Implementation – The AC shall develop conservation guidelines to assist the Parties in the implementation of the ACAP Action Plan.

7. Vice Convenor

There is currently no Vice Convenor for the STWG. The Convenor asked the members to consider nominating potential candidates for the position. Filling the position of a Vice Convenor is important to the efficient and effective running of the WG and also for succession planning in the management of the Working Group.

8. Recommendations

That the tasks detailed in this report be considered for incorporation into the AC Work Programme.

9. Closing Remarks - Acknowledgements

The Convenor of the STWG thanked the Members and Observers for their valuable contributions at the meeting and in developing the report. She also thanked Rachael Alderman for comprehensively documenting the WG discussions and Wieslawa Misiak for presenting the ACAP database. The Members also thanked the Convenor for her leadership and commitment in progressing the work of the Working Group.

ANNEX I: STATUS AND TRENDS WORKING GROUP WORK PROGRAM ADOPTED AT AC3

| | Action | Who | When | Action Detail | Progress |
|-----|---|--|------------------|---|--|
| 2.1 | Continue population data collection | Parties and Range States with breeding populations | 2007 and ongoing | Parties to provide outstanding and new population information. | In progress. At the time of writing, all parties except New Zealand, Chile and Ecuador have provided some new or updated data. |
| 2.2 | Progress development of an ACAP database to be held within, and managed by, the Secretariat | Australia assisting Secretariat and WG Convenors | July 2007 | Develop relational database curate and centralise data from ACAP WGs. Central to progressing development of Species Assessments (see 7.1) | In progress. Relational database under development. Completion of phase one of database forecast for July 2008. Presentation of database at AC4. |
| 2.3 | Progress IT framework for web-based Species Assessments | Australia | July 2007 | Develop framework to enable web based printer friendly species Assessments (\$AUD 11,200) | In progress. Expected completion July 2008 Software limitations may prevent the production of publication quality assessments on the web; however this will continue to be reviewed. |
| 2.4 | Establish Species Assessments Coordination Group | Secretariat and STWG Convenor | July 2007 | Establish coordination group with representation from the 4 ACAP WG Convenors and representatives from France, NZ, UK and South America. | Completed. Coordination Group established. |
| 2.5 | Engage contracted employee for development of Species Assessments | Secretariat and STWG Convenor | July-August 2007 | Identify and contract person coordination of Species Assessments (\$36,800) | Completed. Dr. Wieslawa Misiak contracted by Secretariat (August 2007 – August 2008) |
| 2.6 | Seek information from the Secretariat on the progression of the ACAP database | STWG Convenor | December 2007 | Liaise with Secretariat | Completed. |

| | | | | | |
|------|--|---|---------------------------|--|--|
| 2.7 | Progress translations of Species Assessments | Secretariat, STWG Convenor, Assessment Contractor and Parties | Dec 2008 and ongoing | Progress voluntary translations (where possible) of Species Assessments, priority given to English to Spanish translations | In progress. Five assessments translated into Spanish as a result of assistance provided by Argentina and Chile. Three more assessments are currently being translated. One French assessment completed and another in progress. France has been approached for support with translating one assessment (Amsterdam albatross). |
| 2.8 | Complete draft Species Assessments – publication on CD ROM and as pdf files on ACAP web site | STWG / Parties / Assessment Contractor | AC4 August 2008 | Endeavour to complete Species Assessments of currently listed ACAP species (\$AUD 5000) | In progress. Anticipate DRAFT assessments completed by August 2008 |
| 2.9 | Provide and consider annual reports to AC on STWG activities | STWG | AC4, AC5 | Undertake STWG meetings and report to AC | STWG meeting August 2008 to report to AC4 |
| 2.10 | Maintenance of database and updating Species Assessments | STWG, Secretariat and AC | December 2008 and ongoing | Populate database with newly collected information and update Species Assessments as required. | Ongoing |

ANNEX 2: MEMBERSHIP OF SPECIES ASSESSMENT COORDINATING GROUP

| | |
|---|--------------------|
| Executive Secretary | Warren Papworth |
| Convenor Status and Trends WG | Rosemary Gales |
| Convenor Breeding Sites WG | Richard Phillips |
| Convenor Taxonomy WG | Mike Double |
| Convenor Seabird Bycatch WG | Barry Baker |
| National rep with endemic - New Zealand | Johanna Pierre |
| National rep with endemic - Australia | (Rosemary Gales) |
| National rep with endemic - UK | (Richard Phillips) |
| National rep with endemic - Ecuador | Gabriela Montoya |
| National rep with endemic - France | Henri Weimerskirch |
| Spanish speaking representative | Carlos Moreno |

**ANNEX 3: RULES FOR ACCESS AND USE OF DATA ON ALBATROSSES
AND PETRELS PROVIDED TO THE ACAP SECRETARIAT**

The following Rules for Access and Use of ACAP Data pertaining to the status and trends of albatrosses and petrels listed by the Agreement were adopted by the first Advisory Committee Meeting in July 2005. Guidance in the development of these rules was sourced from BirdLife International and CCAMLR.

It is recognised that:

1. All data submitted to the ACAP Secretariat, and maintained by the Secretariat, shall be available to Members of the Status and Trends Working Group for analysis and preparation of documents for the Agreement.
2. Inclusion of data, analyses or results from data by the Secretariat into Working Papers, Information Papers, and any other documents tabled at meetings does not constitute publication. Papers containing disaggregated data which are presented at meetings may contain a caveat to indicate that the data may not be used without consent of the provider(s).

By using any data in the Status and Trends database, users agree to the following terms and conditions:

1. Not to use data in any publication, product, or commercial application without prior written **consent** from the original data provider(s).
2. Once consent has been obtained, users shall adhere to the following conditions:
 - _The original data provider(s) must be offered **co-authorship** of any product including data that are unpublished and not in the public domain. Ultimately, inclusion as an author is decided by the data provider(s).
 - _Data providers have the right to approve the level of detail revealed in documents using their data and stipulate terms and/or levels of data security if necessary.
3. No data user shall hold ACAP or the original data provider(s) **liable** for errors in the data. While every effort has been made to ensure the integrity and quality of the database, ACAP (or whomever maintains the database) cannot guarantee the accuracy of the datasets contained herein.

ANNEX 4: RULES FOR ACCESS AND USE OF STATUS AND TRENDS, AND BREEDING SITES DATA SUBMITTED TO, AND MAINTAINED BY, ACAP

The following revised Rules for Access and Use of data submitted to, and maintained by, ACAP pertaining to population status and trends, and breeding sites management and threats, were adopted by the fourth meeting of the Advisory Committee in August 2008.

It is recognised that:

1. All status and trends, and breeding sites data submitted to, and maintained by, the ACAP Secretariat, shall be available to ACAP officials (Secretariat, Advisory Committee Chair, Advisory Committee Vice-chair, Working Group convenors and vice-convenors) for analysis and preparation of documents for the Agreement.
2. Inclusion of data, analyses or results from data held by the ACAP Secretariat into working papers, information papers, reports and any other documents tabled at meetings of the Advisory Committee or Working Groups, or circulated inter-sessionally to members of the Secretariat, ACAP officials, Working Group members or invited experts does not constitute publication.
3. Data included in any published reports or scientific papers outside ACAP will be considered to be in the public domain and so may be included in databases maintained by the ACAP Secretariat, and may be released by the ACAP Secretariat to other parties on request without the need to obtain permission from the data holders (owners/originators). Release to other parties will include making the data available through the ACAP web portal.
4. Unless indicated otherwise by the relevant member of the Breeding Sites Working Group, all data, analyses or results concerning breeding site threats and management may be released by the ACAP Secretariat to other parties on request without the need to obtain permission from the data holders. Release to other parties will include making the data available through the ACAP web portal. Other parties will be advised of the source of the original data and will be asked to consult the original data holder (including on assignation of authorship) before proceeding with publication of documents describing analyses and interpretation of these data.
5. Unless indicated otherwise by the relevant member of the Status and Trends Working Group, the most recent count from each breeding site, summary statistics (mean, statistical errors, range) of population trend, productivity, survival rates and breeding frequency, and trend graphs generated for ACAP Species Assessments may be released by the ACAP Secretariat to other parties on request without the need to obtain permission from the data holders. Release to other parties will include making the data available through the ACAP web portal. Other parties will be advised of the source of the original data and will be asked to cite the data contributor and, if required, to consult the original data contributor for further information before proceeding with publication of documents describing analyses and interpretation of these data.
6. No data user shall hold ACAP or the original data provider(s) liable for errors in the data. While every effort has been made to ensure the integrity and quality of the database, ACAP (or whomever maintains the database) cannot guarantee the accuracy of the datasets contained herein.
7. The following statement shall be placed on the cover page of working papers, information

papers, reports and any other documents tabled at meetings of the Advisory Committee or Working Groups, or circulated inter-sessionally to members of the Secretariat, ACAP officials, Working Group members or invited experts:

‘This paper is presented for consideration by ACAP and may contain unpublished data, analyses, and/or conclusions subject to change. Data in this paper shall not be cited or used for purposes other than the work of the ACAP Secretariat, ACAP Advisory Committee or their subsidiary Working Groups without the permission of the original data holders.’

ANNEX 5: CURRENT TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE STWG

Resolution 1.5 of the First Session of the Meeting of the Parties (MOP1) to ACAP provides for the establishment by the Advisory Committee of a Working Group on the Status and Trends of albatross and petrel species covered by the Agreement.

The aim of this group is to collect and collate the most up to date information on breeding numbers of each species of albatross and petrel listed on Annex 1 of the ACAP Agreement and to produce an assessment of the status and trends of each species.

The data for this review will be sought from Parties and Signatories to ACAP who are Breeding Range States for (ie are home to breeding populations of) the ACAP listed species.

These terms of reference include the work programme for the review, details of the membership of the working group, a timetable for actions and details of the conditions for use of albatross and petrel data submitted for the purposes of this review.

Work Programme for Status and Trends Review Group

The remit of the group is set out below (taken from section two of the work programme for the Advisory Committee; Annex 2 of Resolution 1.5 adopted at the first session of the Meeting of the Parties to ACAP).

- 2.1 Establish Working Group
- 2.2 Develop terms of reference
- 2.3 Develop data proforma and database template
- 2.4 Identify national coordinators to compile and submit data
- 2.5 Collate and submit data
- 2.6 Populate database
- 2.7 Conduct initial gap analysis to identify requirements for additional data for species/ populations
- 2.8 Collect additional data to fill gaps and complete review

Membership of Working Group

The group will be chaired by Rosemary Gales of Australia with a membership comprised of representatives from Breeding Range States for ACAP albatrosses and petrels which are Parties and Signatories to ACAP; and invited experts from ACAP observer organisations.

| Party / Signatory/ Observer | Member | Organisation / position |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Australia | Rosemary Gales, CHAIR | Department of Primary Industries, Water and Environment |
| Ecuador | <i>To be advised</i> | |
| New Zealand | Susan Waugh | Ministry of Fisheries |
| South Africa | John Cooper Rob Crawford | University of Cape Town Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism |
| United Kingdom | Richard Phillips | British Antarctic Survey |
| Argentina | Adrian Schiavini Maria Tombesi | Southern Scientific Research Centre Environmental and Sustainable Development |
| Chile | <i>To be advised</i> | |
| Ecuador | <i>To be advised</i> | |
| France | <i>To be advised</i> | |

| | | |
|---|-----------------|--------------------------------|
| Party / Signatory/ Observer | Member | Organisation / position |
| BirdLife International | Stuart Butchart | Birdlife International |
| Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research | Eric Woehler | SCAR Group of Experts on Birds |

Timetable for progress

The following timetable has been updated from the Advisory Committee (AC) work programme (Annex 2 of Resolution 1.5) to provide for a progress report to the first meeting of the ACAP Advisory Committee (AC1), 20-22 July 2005.

| Action | To be completed by | Responsibility |
|---|--|--|
| 2.1 Establish Working Group: identify Working Group Chair and membership | End February 2005 | Interim Secretariat / AC |
| 2.2 Develop terms of reference | End February 2005 | Rosemary Gales / AC |
| 2.3 (i) Circulate draft proforma and database format (for data on breeding albatrosses and petrels) to Working Group (WG) Members (ii) Provide comments on draft data proforma | End February 2005 End March 2005 | Rosemary Gales WG Members |
| 2.4 Notify Interim Secretariat of national coordinators to compile and submit data | End March 2005 | Parties and Signatories (Breeding Range States) |
| 2.5 (i) Circulate final data proforma to Breeding Range States (ii) Provide data in completed proforma | Beginning April 2005 End May 2005 | Rosemary Gales National Co-ordinators for Breeding Range States (Parties and Signatories) |
| 2.6 Populate database | Mid June 2005 | Rosemary Gales |
| 2.7 (i) Conduct initial gap analysis (ii) Compile progress report for AC1 | End June 2005 | Rosemary Gales, WG Members |
| 2.8 Population data collection | Timeframe 2006/2007 | Breeding Range States (Parties and Signatories) |

Data Submitted to the ACAP Working Group on Status and Trends

- (i) Data supplied to the Working Group will be used only for the purposes of reviewing the status and trends of albatross and petrel species listed on Annex 1 of the Agreement.
- (ii) Ownership of data provided for the review will be clearly set out in any report(s) of the Working Group.

ANNEX 6: REVISED TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE STATUS AND TRENDS WORKING GROUP

Resolution 1.5 of the First Session of the Meeting of the Parties (MOP1) to ACAP provides for the establishment by the Advisory Committee of a Working Group on the Status and Trends of albatross and petrel species covered by the Agreement.

The aims of the Status and Trends Working Group are:

- to oversee the collation of the most up to date information on population numbers and demography of each species of albatross and petrel listed on Annex 1 of the ACAP Agreement. The information will be sought from Parties and Signatories to ACAP who are Breeding Range States for (ie are home to breeding populations of) the ACAP listed species.
- to contribute towards production and review of comprehensive assessments of the status and trends of each species;
- to identify key gaps in the knowledge of the conservation status of each species;
- to work with other working groups in identifying specific albatross and petrel populations that may require priority conservation actions.

ANNEX 7: Suggested standardised SGP methodology in SCAR Report

The aim of this protocol is to obtain the best count of the number of Southern giant petrels that are breeding at a particular site. These data can be used to obtain trend estimates.

Requirements for censuses

Breeding sites should be censused in the following way

- (1) The census should be conducted as soon as possible after all pairs at a site have laid eggs (see (4) below) or as close as possible to that date (keeping as close as possible to the same date each year) by counting active nests.
- (2) Active nests are either: (i) nests on which the adult appears to be incubating an egg or brooding a chick, or (ii) nests which contain a single chick.
- (3) Do not disturb any adult that is sitting on a nest to attempt to determine whether it is on an egg or small chick.
- (4) The required information for such a census is:
 - i. Locality name and position to the nearest decimal minute, or second.
 - ii. Date (day, month, year) of census.
 - iii. Name and employing institution of observer(s).
 - iv. Weather conditions with wind speed, snow cover and visibility given as a minimum.
 - v. A description of the census methodology and observation procedure used, including the approach distance to the breeding birds.
 - vi. As accurate a description as possible of the area covered by the census and where the breeding birds are located; photographs and maps are highly desirable.
 - vii. The number of active nests.

Important considerations for all censuses

1. Giant petrels are extremely susceptible to human disturbance. No personnel should approach so closely that birds are disturbed or move from the nest.
2. Inexperienced personnel should obtain instruction and training on census methods, and behaviour around seabird colonies from experts before undertaking a census. Following the census, data should be submitted to an expert for consideration and the results discussed.
3. Ideally, censuses should be undertaken every year. Data on a less frequent basis may not enable assessment of inter-annual variability and could make trend assessments more difficult.
4. For guidance, it is known that almost all pairs have laid by *c.* November 25th in the Antarctic Peninsula area. However, it is possible that the ideal time for censusing will differ at other sites.
5. Thorough documentation of the censuses is essential and will greatly assist in interpretation of results as well as help personnel undertaking future counts to consistently repeat the count. Scaled maps (with co-ordinates and other units identified, preferably by using a GPS) and photographs and descriptive text (state the spatial units used) should be recorded wherever possible.
6. Additional data on breeding success, can assist a better understanding of population trends. To estimate breeding success on an annual basis the following approach should be adopted only by observers experienced with this species:
 1. Undertake a census of active nests as above.
 2. Undertake a chick count when chicks are approaching adult size, are unattended, but have not yet fledged, *c.* mid-February at the earliest, and preferably later (between mid-March and early April).
 3. Do not attempt to census the numbers of small chicks because of the high risks of nest desertion.
7. Even if nests are not counted it is useful to record whether birds are breeding at a particular site. Similarly, stating that no Southern Giant Petrels are breeding is important. Modern distribution and abundance modelling techniques are improved considerably if real absence (rather than presumed absence) data are available.
8. Data holders are requested to send census data to the Secretariat of the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (www.acap.aq).