



SUMMARY

This summary report has been compiled by the Advisory Committee and the Secretariat to provide MoP4 with a succinct overview of progress that has been made with implementation of the Agreement since MoP3 and to recommend a set of actions that should be undertaken in the next triennium to further the Agreement's objective. The full report, containing a detailed summary of information provided by Parties, is provided in MoP4 Info 04, 'Report on Progress with the Implementation of the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels 2008-2011'.

The framework of **Section 1** of this report follows that of the Action Plan within Annex 2 of the Agreement and has been prepared on the basis of information provided by Parties, Range States and BirdLife International. **Section 2** provides a review of changes in the status and trends of the albatrosses and petrels listed under Annex 1 of the Agreement. **Section 3** identifies difficulties encountered in the implementation of the Agreement.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In consideration of the difficulties identified in implementing the Agreement the Advisory Committee makes the following recommendations to the Meeting of the Parties:

That Parties:

- (a) Endorse the continued allocation of funds for a science support position in the Secretariat,
- (b) approve a budget for the operation of the Advisory Committee to enable its effective operation, taking into account the growth in the complexity and number of matters it now addresses;
- (c) and Range States provide relevant data on seabird bycatch to the Secretariat, and support the collection and provision of this data by RFMOs that they are members of;
- (d) establish, where necessary, bycatch observer programmes to collect this data;
- (e) establish effective domestic consultation processes to facilitate implementation of the Agreement;
- (f) review the efficacy of seabird bycatch mitigation measures used in the fisheries that they manage on the basis of the information provided by the SBWG;
- (g) provide the necessary resources for the conduct of the research programme identified by the Advisory Committee's Working Groups (see MoP4 Doc19);

'This paper is presented for consideration by ACAP and may contain unpublished data, analyses, and/or conclusions subject to change.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 Meeting of the Parties, ACAP Advisory Committee or their subsidiary Working Groups without the permission of the original data holders.'

- (h) continue their current long-term population monitoring programmes (see p. 10-14 [AC6 Doc 11 Rev 4](#));
 - (i) implement the priority population monitoring programmes (Annex 9 AC 6 Report) in order to increase current knowledge of population size, trends and demography;
 - (j) adopt best practice monitoring practices that include censuses of breeding sites conducted at a minimum of 10 year intervals;Pmonitor annually population trend and demographic parameters at a minimum for one representative site for each island group;
 - (k) conduct priority tracking programmes to enable a better understanding of at-sea distribution (see p. 4 [AC6 Doc 11 Rev 4](#));
 - (l) address High Priority at-sea threats in accordance with the conservation priorities;
 - (m) address High Priority land-based threats in accordance with the conservation priorities;
 - (n) update the ACAP database on an ongoing basis to maintain the currency of analyses.
-

1. SECTION 1 – REPORTS ON PROGRESS MADE WITH IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AGREEMENT

Eleven Parties (Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Chile, France, New Zealand, Peru, South Africa, Spain, the United Kingdom and Uruguay) and one Range State (the United States) submitted progress reports that were used in compiling this document. Information was also provided by BirdLife International detailing its significant achievements in seabird conservation actions.

Information provided in these reports shows that a substantial amount of work is being done to implement the Agreement. Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Chile, France, New Zealand, Spain, South Africa, the United Kingdom and the United States reported the adoption and/or implementation of National Plans of Action (NPOAs), recovery plans, action plans, strategy documents, Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) and feral pest eradication programmes, BirdLife International reported on the significant work it has undertaken through the Albatross Task Force (ATF) and other affiliates in: capacity building; developing management plans, Important Bird Areas (IBAs) and Marine Protected Areas (MPAs); education programmes; and in conducting research on the development and effectiveness of bycatch mitigation measures.

Of particular significance is the large body of research that has been undertaken in recent years on seabird bycatch mitigation by researchers in Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, South Africa, Spain, the United States, United Kingdom, Uruguay and BirdLife's ATF teams. As a consequence, effective mitigation measures have been identified for pelagic longline fishing operations, which are known to kill large numbers of albatrosses and petrels; as well as for a number of other fishing methods known to have seabird incidental mortalities. The individuals, organisations and countries that have been responsible for this important progress deserve to be commended as it is a vital step towards achievement of the Agreement's objective. Further research is still required in developing effective and reliable mitigation measures.

A key challenge now is to ensure that the knowledge we have gained is applied and that the mitigation measures are implemented widely and effectively in the fisheries where incidental mortality is occurring. Parties' reports indicate that progress has already been made in this

regard in a number of domestic fisheries, however there are others where this knowledge is yet to be implemented. ACAP's Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (RFMO) Engagement Strategy, supported with voluntary contributions from France, has been developed to assist with the implementation of these measures in high seas fisheries. Some progress has already been achieved here as well. In November 2011, the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT) adopted a seabird Recommendation that substantially reflects ACAP's best practice advice for pelagic longline fishing operations. The Indian Ocean Tuna Commission's (IOTC) Scientific Committee has also recommended the adoption of a similar Resolution by its Commission, which meets in April, 2012. Adoption of appropriate Recommendations is only the first step however, as incidental mortalities will continue to occur until these measures are implemented effectively. The implementation of adequate observer and data collection programmes will be necessary to gauge the effectiveness of mitigation measures and to further refine their application. The development of uniform seabird identification guides by the ACAP Secretariat is one example of how the Agreement is assisting RFMOs to do this.

Another significant achievement has been the development of a framework for identifying conservation priorities. This framework, which has been developed under the leadership of New Zealand, is a tool that can be used to assist in setting, monitoring and reporting on progress against priority conservation actions. The adoption and application of this framework by ACAP Parties and others involved with implementation of the Agreement's Action Plan, will be critical to making the most effective use of the limited resources available.

Underpinning the above initiatives has been the development of the online ACAP web portal and database. These tools have provided the means to efficiently maintain current, accurate and comprehensive information on ACAP populations' trends and threats, both at-sea and on land, which is essential for developing strategy, setting priorities and assessing the success of the Agreement. They will also provide for the continued refinement and collation of data from many sources, including from the national reports of Parties.

2. SECTION 2

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 (see [AC6 Doc 11 Rev 4](#) and [AC6 Doc 17 Rev 2](#)), and will allow any progress in this area to be readily assessed at future MoPs.

ANNEX 1 summarises IUCN status, population size and trend information currently held in the database for all ACAP species. The following Critically Endangered or Endangered species show a decline in the number of breeding pairs over the past decade (2001-2011):

- Critically Endangered **Tristan Albatross**, breeding only on Gough Island, has declined at 3.7 % a year due to incidental mortality associated with longline fisheries and predation of chicks by the introduced House Mouse (see Annex 9.3 in [AC6 Doc 11 Rev 4](#)).

- Endangered **Black-browed Albatross** has declined between 2.8-4.2% per year at **Bird Island, South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)**¹, in the absence of land based threats or evidence of disease (see Annex 9.2 in [AC6 Doc 11 Rev 4](#)).
- Endangered **Sooty Albatross** has declined by 2.8 % per year at **Ile de la Possession, Crozet archipelago** (see Annex 9.4 in [AC6 Doc 11 Rev 4](#)).

In addition to the above assessment, it is significant that the population trend over the last decade is currently unknown for 100% of the global population of the Critically Endangered **Waved Albatross** (endemic to Ecuador) and the Endangered **Atlantic Yellow-nosed Albatross** (endemic to UK), **Indian Yellow-nosed Albatross** (Amsterdam Island, Crozet archipelago, Kerguelen archipelago and Prince Edward Island), and **Northern Royal Albatross** (endemic to NZ).

In contrast to these trends, at least 50% of the global population of seven ACAP species are increasing in numbers. These include the three North Pacific albatrosses, the Amsterdam albatross, Shy albatross and Southern giant petrel, most of which are now recovering from major historical reductions in population size.

The suite of gaps in population and demographic monitoring data required from Parties for estimating population trends and monitoring the effectiveness of management actions are summarised by breeding site jurisdiction in ANNEX 2.

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

All 29 Species Assessments have been completed and are available in the three languages of the Agreement on the ACAP website. This invaluable, and widely consulted resource provides comprehensive and current information on the conservation status, biology and threats facing all ACAP species.

2.1.1. Current Conservation Status

With the addition of the three North Pacific albatross species, there are currently 29 seabird species listed in Annex 1 of the Agreement. Of these, 21 (73%) are classified at risk of extinction. Of the 22 species of albatrosses listed by ACAP, three are listed as *Critically Endangered* (CR), six as *Endangered* (EN), eight as *Vulnerable* (VU) and five as *Near Threatened* (NT). Of the seven petrel species, four are currently listed as VU, one as NT and two species as *Least Concern* (LC) (see [AC6 Doc 30](#)).

2.1.2. Changes in Status and Trends since MoP3

Since MoP3 (2009), there have been changes in the status of four ACAP species reflecting reviews by BirdLife International, the listing authority for the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN). These species are **Laysan Albatross** (downlisted from VU to NT in 2010), **Chatham Albatross** (downlisted from CR to VU in 2010), and both giant petrels (downlisted from NT to LC in 2009).

2.1.3. Status of knowledge relating to population size and trends

¹ "A dispute exists between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland concerning sovereignty of 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".

Recent trend, defined as at least three census data points, with at least one census between 2001-2005 and another between 2006-2010, is completely unknown (unknown for >99% of the global population) for 15 species (ANNEX 1). For eight species, trend is unknown for more than 50% of the population, while for the remaining six species trend is unknown for only less than 20% of the population.

Although the size of most populations is known (some numbers not available disaggregated per site however), often the trend and current demographic statistics are not, due to difficulties accessing remote sites at appropriate intervals. The populations of the burrowing petrels (**White-chinned** and **Grey petrels**) are particularly difficult to estimate on islands where they breed in large numbers.

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

The ACAP database now holds virtually all available census data, and can be interrogated to produce updatable lists of breeding sites with 1%, 2%, 5% and 10% of the global population of each ACAP species (ANNEX 2 [AC6 Doc 11 Rev 4](#)). New Zealand and France have jurisdiction over more internationally important sites than any other Party (Table 1). Most species breed at relatively few sites (ANNEX 3 [AC6 Doc 11 Rev 4](#)). Note that (i) census data are unavailable for approximately a third of breeding sites, particularly those of *Procellaria* petrels, and (ii) some counts are of low reliability or were collected ≥ 10 years ago. Filling these gaps and obtaining updated population estimates is considered a priority.

Table 1. 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

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

Development of BirdLife International's *Global Procellariiform tracking Database* continues, including the addition of 13 new datasets, completion of five RFMO papers on bird-fisheries overlap, development of a web access portal, and production of case studies for Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in relation to establishment of marine protected areas. ACAP Parties are encouraged to fill key gaps in availability of tracking data, including for Salvin's and other New Zealand albatrosses, *Procellaria* petrels and giant petrels, as well as non breeding adults, immature and juveniles birds from many populations. The ACAP Species Assessments include maps of overall distribution and tracking data. ACAP and BirdLife International exchange information on availability of tracking data.

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 a standardised system for listing of threats to breeding sites adapted from criteria produced by the 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 threat magnitude. (A breakdown of the proportion of sites, and of the global population subjected to threats meeting these criteria are listed in Table 3 [AC6 Doc 17 Rev 2](#)). The vast majority relates to introduced mammals or disease (see section 2.8, item 5.1h).

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](#) and [Biosecurity Guidelines](#).

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, usually by reindeer *Rangifer tarandus*, and predation by introduced mammals, particularly feral cat *Felis catus*, black rat *Rattus rattus* and brown rat *R. norvegicus* are the most common threats at breeding sites (Table 4 [AC6 Doc 17 Rev 2](#)). Other threats affected few sites, although were severe in some cases, including the effects of avian cholera at Amsterdam Island (Table 2). 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.

Table 2. *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 [AC6 Doc 17 Rev 2](#)), 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 [AC6 Doc 17 Rev 2](#)).

3. NEXT STEPS FOR THE AGREEMENT

3.1. Amendments to the Action Plan

No amendments have been proposed to the Action Plan (Annex 2 to the Agreement).

3.2. Difficulties with implementation of the Agreement

It is pleasing to report that of the seven impediments to implementation of the Agreement identified in the last report to MoP3, all of them have been substantially addressed, or mechanisms developed to address them. These include the development of:

- a framework to identify conservation priorities;
- a RFMO engagement strategy;
- systems for the collection of data on seabird bycatch;
- a more effective system for National reporting by Parties;
- an approved budget for the Advisory Committee Work Programme;
- a medium to long term strategy for capacity building; and
- the appointment of a Science Officer position within the Secretariat.

All of the above activities are considered essential to the on-going effective implementation of the Agreement and require continued support from MoP over the next triennium.

3.3. Key outcomes for the next triennium

Key challenges for the Agreement in the next triennium are:

- Collection of data on seabird bycatch. Although the Agreement has been successful in developing a system to obtain 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 by some Parties 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 information on the distribution of fishing effort, levels of seabird attendance and bycatch for high seas fisheries. This will require the development of observer programmes and/or other automated mechanisms for the collection of bycatch and relevant fisheries data.
- Implementation of best practice mitigation measures in both domestic and high seas fisheries. As mentioned earlier in this report, effective mitigation measures are now known for many of the fishing operations that result in seabird incidental mortality. The challenge is to ensure that these mitigation measures are implemented in areas where they are needed.
- Filling the significant gaps in data relating to population status and trends, especially for the species which are currently in decline. These data are critical for ultimately measuring the success of the Agreement.

ANNEX 1: 2011 SUMMARY OF STATUS OF ACAP ALBATROSS AND PETREL SPECIES.

Species shaded in grey are those downlisted by IUCN since MoP3.

? = proportion of population with this trend is unknown.

IUCN Status MoP3	IUCN Status 2011	Common name	N sites	Single Country Endemic	Breeding Frequency	Annual breeding pairs	Trend 2001-2010 ↑ (% annual breeding pairs)	Trend 2001-2010 ↓ (% annual breeding pairs)	Trend 2001-2010 ↔ (% annual breeding pairs)	Trend 2001-2010 unknown (% annual breeding pairs)
CR	CR	Amsterdam albatross	1	France	B	30	100	0	0	0
CR	CR	Tristan albatross	1	UK	B	1,698	0	100	0	0
CR	CR	Waved albatross	3	Ecuador	A	9,615	?	?	?	100
EN	EN	Atlantic Yellow-nosed Albatross	6	UK	A	33,650	?	?	?	100
EN	EN	Black-browed albatross	65		A	672,412	1.98	27.43	?	70.59
EN	EN	Black-footed albatross	13		A	68,961	48.12	?	32.3	19.58
EN	EN	Indian yellow-nosed albatross	6		A	39,319	?	?	?	100
EN	EN	Northern royal albatross	5	NZ	B	5,832	?	?	?	100
EN	EN	Sooty Albatross	15		B	13,674	12.44	0.67	?	86.89
VU	VU	Antipodean albatross	6	NZ	B	8,272	?	94.8	?	5.2
VU	VU	Black petrel	2	NZ	A	1,000	?	?	?	100
VU	VU	Campbell albatross	2	NZ	A	22,093	?	?	?	100
CR	VU	Chatham albatross	1	NZ	A	5,407	?	?	?	100
VU	VU	Grey-headed albatross	29		B	94,603	7.81	?	?	92.19
VU	VU	Salvin's albatross	12	NZ	A	31,874	?	?	?	100
VU	VU	Short-tailed albatross	2		A	470	88.94	?	?	11.06
VU	VU	Southern royal albatross	4	NZ	B	7,886	?	?	0.87	99.13
VU	VU	Spectacled petrel	1	UK	A	14,400	?	?	?	100
VU	VU	Wandering albatross	28		B	8,276	24.84	18.72	1.63	54.81
VU	VU	Westland petrel	1	NZ	A	4,000	?	?	?	100
VU	VU	White-chinned Petrel	73		A	1,057,930	?	?	?	100
NT	NT	Buller's Albatross	10	NZ	A	29,948	?	?	?	100
NT	NT	Grey petrel	17		A	79,570	?	0.04	?	99.96
VU	NT	Laysan albatross	17		A	650,561	92.39	?	?	7.61
NT	NT	Light-mantled Albatross	71		B	9,955	18.44	?	22.25	59.31
NT	NT	Shy albatross	3	Australia	A	12,842	40.75	?	?	59.25
NT	NT	White-capped albatross	5	NZ	?	74,885	?	?	?	100
NT	LC	Northern Giant Petrel	50		A	10,862	8.27	?	?	91.73
NT	LC	Southern Giant Petrel	119		A	47,156	8.76	?	7.21	84.03

ANNEX 2: ACAP SPECIES MONITORING SUMMARY BY JURISDICTION.

Grey text indicates breeding sites outside the jurisdiction of Parties to ACAP.

Cells in red indicate lack of census data at any site within last 10 years, or for more than 50% of breeding sites, or global population unknown.

Jurisdiction	Common name	N island groups	N sites	% sites pop unknown	Annual breeding pairs	most recent year of pop estimate	% global population	% sites monitored annually 2001-2010%	% island groups counted in their entirety 2001-2010	% of sites (ongoing population monitoring)	% of sites (ongoing demographic monitoring)
Antarctic	Southern Giant Petrel	12	46	20	8,570	2010	18	0	58	0	0
Argentina	Southern Giant Petrel	2	4	0	2,669	2009	6	0	100	?	?
Australia	Black-browed albatross	2	4	25	787	2010	0.1	25	100	25	25
Australia	Grey petrel	1	1	0	32	2009	?	100	100	?	?
Australia	Grey-headed albatross	1	1	0	97	2010	0.1	100	100	100	100
Australia	Light-mantled Albatross	2	3	33	1,600	2009	?	33	50	33	33
Australia	Northern Giant Petrel	1	1	0	1,793	2009	17	0	100	?	?
Australia	Shy albatross	1	3	0	12,842	2010	100	33	0	33	?
Australia	Southern Giant Petrel	2	3	33	5,666	2009	12	0	100	?	?
Australia	Wandering albatross	1	1	0	4	2010	0.1	100	100	100	100
Chile	Black-browed albatross	6	20	5	118,465	2007	18	0	100	?	?
Chile	Grey-headed albatross	2	9	0	17,195	2003	18	0	100	?	?
Chile	Southern Giant Petrel	2	2	50	1,000	2005	2	0	50	?	?
Disputed - South Atlantic ¹	Black-browed albatross	2	33	0	548,679	2011	82	0	100	?	?
Disputed - South Atlantic ¹	Grey-headed albatross	1	10	0	48,065	2010	51	0	100	?	?
Disputed - South Atlantic ¹	Light-mantled Albatross	1	41	98	88	2011	?	0	0	?	?
Disputed - South Atlantic ¹	Northern Giant Petrel	1	23	0	3,733	2011	34	0	100	?	?
Disputed - South Atlantic ¹	Southern Giant Petrel	3	55	9	25,373	2011	54	0	67	?	?
Disputed - South Atlantic ¹	Wandering albatross	1	13	0	1,404	2011	17	23	100	8	?
Disputed - South Atlantic ¹	White-chinned Petrel	2	48	81	669,443	2007	?	0	0	?	?
Disputed - North Pacific	Black-footed albatross	1	1	0	56	2002	0.1	0	100	?	?
Disputed - North Pacific	Short-tailed albatross	1	1	0	52	2002	11	0	100	?	?
Ecuador	Waved albatross	2	3	0	9,615	2010	100	0	50	?	?
France	Amsterdam albatross	1	1	0	30	2009	100	0	100	?	?
France	Black-browed albatross	2	6	0	4,335	2011	1	0	50	?	?
France	Grey petrel	3	7	57	8,908	2006	?	0	67	?	?
France	Grey-headed albatross	2	6	0	13,845	1985	15	0	0	?	?

¹ "A dispute exists between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland concerning sovereignty of 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".

Jurisdiction	Common name	N island groups	N sites	% sites pop unknown	Annual breeding pairs	most recent year of pop estimate	% global population	% sites monitored annually 2001-2010%	% island groups counted in their entirety 2001-2010	% of sites (ongoing population monitoring)	% of sites (ongoing demographic monitoring)
France	Indian yellow-nosed albatross	3	5	0	34,085	2006	87	0	33	?	?
France	Light-mantled Albatross	2	8	38 ¹	5,949	2011	?	0	50	?	?
France	Northern Giant Petrel	2	12	8	2,864	2011	26	0	50	?	?
France	Salvin's albatross	1	1	0	4	1986	0.00	0	0	?	?
France	Sooty Albatross	3	8	0	2,607	2011	19	0	67	?	?
France	Southern Giant Petrel	2	6	0	1,177	2011	3	0	50	?	?
France	Wandering albatross	2	12	8	3,012	2011	36	8	100	?	?
France	White-chinned Petrel	2	15	73 ²	285,928	2005	?	0	50	?	?
Japan	Black-footed albatross	2	3	0	2,538	2006	4	0	100	?	?
Japan	Laysan albatross	1	1	0	20	2006	0	0	100	?	?
Japan	Short-tailed albatross	1	1	0	418	2009	89	0	100	?	?
Mexico	Laysan albatross	3	4	0	418	2008	0.1	0	100	?	?
New Zealand	Antipodean albatross	4	6	17	8,272	2010	100	0	75	?	?
New Zealand	Black petrel	1	2	0	1,000	2010	69	50	100	?	?
New Zealand	Black-browed albatross	2	2	0	146	1995	0.02	0	0	?	?
New Zealand	Buller's Albatross	4	10	0	29,948	2010	100	0	75	?	?
New Zealand	Campbell albatross	1	2	50	22,093	1998	100	0	0	?	?
New Zealand	Chatham albatross	1	1	0	5,407	2009	100	0	100	?	?
New Zealand	Grey petrel	2	5	60	53,080	2003	?	0	100	?	?
New Zealand	Grey-headed albatross	1	1	0	6,600	1997	7	0	0	?	?
New Zealand	Light-mantled Albatross	3	17	71	1,911	1996	?	0	0	?	?
New Zealand	Northern Giant Petrel	5	12	50	1,858	2005	17	0	50	?	?
New Zealand	Northern Royal albatross	3	5	0	5,832	2011	100	0	67	?	?
New Zealand	Salvin's albatross	3	11	64 ³	31,874	2010	100	0	100	?	?
New Zealand	Southern Royal albatross	2	4	0	7,886	2008	100	0	100	?	?
New Zealand	Westland petrel	1	1	0	4,000	2008	100	0	100	?	?
New Zealand	White-capped albatross	3	5	0	74,885	2010	100	0	67	?	?
New Zealand	White-chinned Petrel	3	8	75	110,000	1988	?	0	0	?	?
South Africa	Grey petrel	1	2	100	?	1979	?	0	0	?	?
South Africa	Grey-headed albatross	1	2	0	8,801	2010	9	50	100	?	?
South Africa	Indian yellow-nosed albatross	1	1	0	5,234	2009	13	0	100	?	?
South Africa	Light-mantled Albatross	1	2	0	439	2010	?	50	100	?	?
South Africa	Northern Giant Petrel	1	2	0	614	2010	6	50	100	?	?
South Africa	Sooty Albatross	1	2	0	2,911	2010	21	50	100	?	?
South Africa	Southern Giant Petrel	1	2	0	2,466	2010	5	50	100	?	?
South Africa	Wandering albatross	1	2	0	3,856	2010	47	50	100	?	?
South Africa	White-chinned Petrel	1	2	100	?	2002 ⁴	?	0	0	?	?
United Kingdom	Atlantic Yellow-nosed Albatross	2	6	0	33,650	2010	100	0	100	?	?
United Kingdom	Grey petrel	2	2	0	17,550	2007	?	0	100	?	?
United Kingdom	Sooty Albatross	2	5	0	8,156	2010	60	0	100	?	?
United Kingdom	Southern Giant Petrel	1	1	0	235	2010	1	0	100	?	?
United Kingdom	Spectacled petrel	1	1	0	14,400	2009	100	0	100	?	?
United Kingdom	Tristan albatross	1	1	0	1,698	2010	100	0	100	?	?
USA	Black-footed albatross	4	9	0	66,367	2011	96	22	100	?	?
USA	Laysan albatross	3	12	0	650,123	2011	100	8	100	?	?

² but total numbers estimated for Kerguelen archipelago

³ but total Bounties population estimated

⁴ noted as breeding but numbers not estimated