



**Agreement on the Conservation of
Albatrosses and Petrels**

**Report of the Second Meeting
of the Advisory Committee**

BRASILIA, BRAZIL

5 - 8 JUNE 2006

AC2 FINAL REPORT

CONTENTS OF FINAL REPORT

Contents of Final Report	
List of Acronyms	
Agenda Item	
1. Opening Remarks	1
2. Adoption of the Agenda	2
3. Report from Interim Secretariat	
3.1 Activities undertaken in 2005	2
3.2 Financial Report	2
4. Report of Depository	2
5. Reports from ACAP Observers At Other International Meetings	
5.1 Reports from ACAP Observers	2
5.2 Attendance at Future Meetings of RFMOs	5
6. Parties' Reports on Implementation of the Action Plan	6
7. ACAP Secretariat	
7.1 Development of a Headquarters Agreement	6
7.2 Performance Indicators	7
8. Review of the Status and Trends of Albatrosses and Petrels	
8.1 Report of Working Group Meeting	7
8.2 Future Work Programme	8
9. Taxonomy of Albatrosses and Petrels	
9.1 Report of Working Group Meeting	9
9.2 Future Work Programme	10
10. Breeding Sites	
10.1 Report of Working Group	11
10.2 Future Work Programme	12
11. Incidental Mortality in Fisheries	
11.1 Foraging Ranges and Overlap with Fisheries	13
11.2 Standards for Bycatch Data Collection	13
11.3 Estimation of Bycatch	14
11.4 Bycatch Mitigation	14
11.5 Establishment of Seabird Bycatch Working Group	15
12. Advisory Committee Work Programme	
12.1 Review Work Programme 2006	16
12.2 Development of 2007-2009 Work Programme	16
12.3 Development of Conservation Guidelines	16
13. Agreement Budget 2007 - 2009	
13.1 Development of Agreement Budget 2007—2009	16
14. Advisory Committee Reporting to MOP2:	
14.1 Implementation of the Agreement	17
15. Developing Indicators to Measure the Success of ACAP	17
16. Listing of New Species	18
17. Future Meetings of the Advisory Committee	

AC2 FINAL REPORT

17.1 Timing and Location for AC3	19
17.2 Adoption of draft agenda for AC3	19
17.3 Future Meetings of the Advisory Committee	19
18. Second Session of the Meeting of the Parties to ACAP	
18.1 Second Meeting of Parties (MoP2)	19
18.2 Identification of Resolutions to be addressed at MoP2	19
18.3 Timeline for preparation of papers	20
19. Other Business	
19.1 Amendments to Rules of Procedure	20
19.2 Future Engagement with other International Organisations - Marine Protected Areas (MPAs)	20
19.3 Action Arising from AC2	20
20. Closing Remarks	21
21. Adoption of Report	21
Annexes	
1. List of Participants	22
2. Agenda	29
3. Future Meetings of Other International Organisations and ACAP Observers	31
4. Report of Working Group on Status and Trends Meeting	33
5. Taxonomy Working Group Report to the Second Advisory Committee Meeting	49
6. Report of the Breeding Sites Working Group Meeting	69
7. Seabird Bycatch Working Group Terms of Reference and Indicative Work Programme	77
8. Advisory Committee Work Programme	79
9. Report from the Advisory Committee to the Second Meeting of the Parties on the Implementation of the Agreement	88
10. Format for Reports on Implementation of the Agreement	105
11. Draft Agenda Third Meeting of the Advisory Committee	111
12. Fisheries Bycatch Resolution	113
13. Resolution on Adoption of the Red List Index as an Interim Headline Indicator	114
14. Rules of Procedure for the Advisory Committee	115
15. List of Documents	123
16. List of Information Papers	125
Attachments	
1. Argentine Statement	127
2. United Kingdom Statement	128

AC2 FINAL REPORT

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AC	Advisory Committee
ACAP	Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels
BSWG	Breeding Sites Working Group
CBD	Convention on Biodiversity
CCAMLR	Convention on the Conservation of Marine Living Resources
CCSBT	Convention on the Conservation on Southern Bluefin Tuna
CMS	Convention on Migratory Species
COFI	Committee on Fisheries, Food and Agriculture Organisation
EEZ	Exclusive Economic Zone
ERS	Ecologically Related Species
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations
GAM	Generalised Additive Model
GEB	SCAR Group of Experts on Birds
GLC	General Lineage Concept
GLOBAL	Global Bycatch Assessment of Long-Lived Species
GLM	Generalised Linear Modelling
HQA	Headquarters Agreement
IATTC	Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission
IBAMA	Brazilian Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources
ICCAT	International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tuna
IMAF	Incidental Mortality Associated with Fishing
IOTC	Indian Ocean Tuna Commission
IPOA-S	International Plan of Action-Seabirds
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources
IUU	Illegal, Unregulated, and Unreported
MARPOL	International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships
MoP	Meeting of the Parties
MPA	Marine Protected Area
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
NPOA	National Plan of Action
RADARSAT	A Canadian Earth observation satellite used to monitor environmental change and the planet's natural resources
RFMO	Regional Fisheries Management Organisation
ScM1	Scientific Meeting that preceded ACAP's first Meeting of Parties
SCAR	Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research
SEAFO	South East Atlantic Fisheries Organisation
SPRFMO	Southwest Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation
STWG	Status and Trends Working Group
TOR	Terms of Reference
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
USA	United States of America
WCPFC	Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission
WG	Working Group
WHOI	Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution
WWF	World Wildlife Fund

AC2 FINAL REPORT

1. OPENING REMARKS

- 1.1 The second meeting of the Advisory Committee to the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP) was held in Brasilia, Brazil, from 5 to 8 June 2006, with Mark Tasker (United Kingdom) as Chair and John Cooper (South Africa) as Vice-chair.
- 1.2 Six Parties were represented: Australia, Chile, France, New Zealand, South Africa and the United Kingdom (UK). In addition two Signatory States: Argentina and Brazil; and one Range State: the United States of America (USA); were represented.
- 1.3 BirdLife International attended the meeting as an Observer. Apologies were received from the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR).
- 1.4 The list of participants is provided at Annex 1. The lists of meeting documents and information papers are provided at Annexes 15 and 16, respectively.
- 1.5 The Chair invited Mr Bernado Paranhos (Brazilian Director of Environment Division, Ministry of External Relations), Mr Walmir Ortega (Substitute President of IBAMA) and Mr Claudio Roberto Langone (Executive Secretary for the Brazilian Ministry of Environment) to introduce the meeting.
- 1.6 Mr Paranhos welcomed delegates to meeting. He noted Brazil's commitment to seabird conservation and its active participation in ACAP. He also informed the meeting that Brazil was working towards ratification of ACAP.
- 1.7 Mr Ortega presented to the meeting Brazil's National Plan of Action for the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels. He noted that the Plan was produced in collaboration with local stakeholders including BirdLife International and Projeto Albatroz.
- 1.8 Mr Langone highlighted the significance of Brazil hosting ACAP on World Environment Day during which Brazil's President would be announcing the development of environmental policies, including new policies on seabird conservation.
- 1.9 The Chair thanked Mr Paranhos, Mr Ortega and Mr Langone for opening the meeting and thanked Brazil for hosting the meeting. Brazilian delegate, Onildo Marini Filho, was also introduced and thanked for his efforts in assisting the coordination of the meeting.
- 1.10 Projeto Albatroz and BirdLife International advised the meeting of the adoption of the Save the Albatross Campaign by the Volvo Ocean Race 2005-2006 and unfurled a large flag bearing the signatures of the captain and crew of the racing vessel Brasil 1 that participated in the race. The Committee Chair, Vice Chair and the Head of the ACAP Interim Secretariat were invited to sign the flag.
- 1.11 Both Argentina and the UK made statements on nomenclature in respect of certain disputed territories (Attachments 1 and 2). The Committee noted the statements and agreed to refer this issue to the next session of the Meeting of Parties (MoP). Argentina and the UK requested further opportunities to discuss nomenclature and

AC2 FINAL REPORT

sovereignty issues, but the Chair decided that he would not accept further discussion of this issue pending advice from MoP.

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

- 2.1 The provisional agenda was adopted by the meeting without amendment (AC2 Doc.1 Rev.2).

3. REPORT OF THE INTERIM SECRETARIAT

3.1 Activities Undertaken in 2005

- 3.1.1 Significant progress had been made on the Secretariat's work programme since the first meeting of the Advisory Committee. Key activities undertaken have included the development of a draft Headquarters Agreement in consultation with the Australian Government; undertaking preparations for the second Advisory Committee Meeting (AC2) and the Second Session of the Meeting of Parties (MoP2); representing the Agreement at the Ecologically Related Species (ERS) Working Group of the Commission for the Conservation of Southern Blue Fin Tuna (CCSBT) and at the 24th meeting of the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR); assisting Working Groups with the implementation of the action plan; and maintaining the operation of the Secretariat's office. The meeting thanked the Interim Secretariat for its report (AC2 Doc.6) and noted its contents.

3.2 Financial Report

- 3.2.1 The Executive Secretary presented the 2005 financial report (AC2 Doc.9) for the Agreement Budget which included an estimate of income and expenditure for the 2006 financial year. It was noted that the level of expenditure in 2005 was well below the budget allocated. This was primarily due to operating costs of the Secretariat being substantially underwritten by Australia, New Zealand and the UK. Expenditure in 2006 is expected to be over-budget due to the carry-over of commitments from 2005. However, over the two-year period there is expected to be a significant surplus, due in part to the under-expenditure in 2005, but also due to the effect of new Parties joining the Agreement since the budget was originally adopted at MoP1. The Committee approved of the format used for the financial report and endorsed the adoption of this format for the annual financial statement provided to Parties in accordance with Financial Regulation 10.2.

4. REPORT OF THE DEPOSITORY

- 4.1 Australia, as Depository for the Agreement, advised the meeting that Chile had notified it of its ratification of the Agreement, which came into effect on 1 December 2005. The Depository also received notification from the UK of the extension of the ratification of the Agreement to its Overseas Territory of Tristan da Cunha on 13 April 2006.

5. REPORTS FROM ACAP OBSERVERS AT OTHER INTERNATIONAL MEETINGS

5.1 Reports from ACAP Observers

AC2 FINAL REPORT

- 5.1.1 New Zealand presented a report on the First International Meeting on the establishment of the South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation (SPRFMO) (AC2 Inf.6), which was co-sponsored by Australia, New Zealand and Chile for the purposes of assisting in the management of High Seas areas in the South Pacific Ocean. Twenty-six states and 15 inter and non-governmental organizations attended, including seven Parties to ACAP and BirdLife International. The RFMO would have jurisdiction over trawl and longline fisheries, both of which impact seabird populations. Given the overlap with a large number of ACAP species and the possible area of coverage of the proposed South Pacific RFMO, this arrangement is likely to be important for the conservation of albatrosses and petrels. Therefore, although there are no current action items for the Committee to consider, it was agreed that it was important for an ACAP representative to attend future consultations on the establishment of this RFMO. New Zealand also noted that the Food and Agricultural Organization of the UN (FAO) International Plan of Action on Seabirds (IPOA-Seabirds) does not address the impact of trawl fisheries on seabirds and that the Committee and, subsequently the Parties, could have an influence over possibly broadening the IPOA-Seabirds to include trawling. It was decided that the Committee would consider this matter further when discussing ACAP's interactions with regional fisheries management organisations (RFMOs) under agenda items 5.2 and 11 (AC2 Inf. 6). The Committee noted that ACAP could assist the negotiating parties with the development of interim measures for the mitigation of seabird bycatch.
- 5.1.3 The USA attended the 2005 meeting of CCAMLR and its associated committees and reported on meeting outcomes as they pertained to ACAP (AC2 Inf. 12). The USA noted that the CCAMLR ad-hoc Working Group on Incidental Mortality Associated with Fishing (IMAF) considered a report on seabird bycatch mitigation tests and reiterated the importance of developing seabird bycatch mitigation techniques for fisheries operating in the foraging ranges of the CCAMLR Convention Area seabirds. The relevance of ACAP's work to CCAMLR, particularly in regard to the work of ACAP's Status and Trends Working Group, was also noted. CCAMLR concluded that ACAP was the most appropriate depository for status and trends data on seabirds listed under the Agreement and requested ACAP to provide an annual summary of such data to CCAMLR-IMAF. CCAMLR received a request from CCSBT to establish an agreement concerning fishing for southern bluefin tuna *Thunnus maccoyii* in the CCAMLR Convention Area. CCAMLR agreed that discussions should be initiated and that in the interim, recommended that CCSBT adopt CCAMLR seabird avoidance measures. CCSBT will meet in special session in July 2006 to consider this recommendation.
- 5.1.4 BirdLife International provided a report (AC2 Inf 13) on the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC) Stock Assessment Working Group which it and the USA attended. Four papers were considered addressing IATTC seabird resolution (C-05-01) which considered the overlaps of foraging ranges of seabird species and the IATTC area, including the vulnerability of particular seabird species to bycatch in fisheries. A need was identified for coordination with the adjacent Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) in addressing seabird bycatch issues. Several of the IATTC meeting participants requested standard protocols for recording seabird bycatch data and for the identification of seabirds at sea. The IATTC Working Group recommended to the IATTC that it coordinate with the WCPFC and other tuna RFMOs, as appropriate, to implement seabird resolutions, including bycatch mitigation and to develop scientific information to support the implementation of such resolutions.

AC2 FINAL REPORT

The Committee decided that the IATTC documents referred to should be linked to the ACAP website. The Committee also recommended that seabird bycatch issues be addressed at the joint tuna RFMO meeting in January 2007.

- 5.1.5 The Interim Secretariat reported on the 6th Meeting of the Ecologically Related Species Working Group (ERSWG) to the Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna (CCSBT) in Taiwan in February 2006. This group was established to provide advice on, amongst other things, the bycatch of seabirds in the fishery. Relevant to the work of this meeting was a directive from the Commission to provide recommendations on the management of ecologically related species (ERS), as no recommendations had been produced regarding mitigation of threats to seabirds or other ERS since the establishment of the ERSWG in 1994. ERSWG considered three recommendations tabled on data provision, sharks and seabird bycatch mitigation but was unable to finalise these at the meeting. Given the lack of progress and other substantial procedural obstacles, the ERSWG is now scheduled to convene a special meeting in 2007 to finalise the recommendations and advance the mitigation of bycatch in the southern bluefin tuna fishery.
- 5.1.6 Brazil reported on the recent SCAR Biology Symposium held in Curitiba, Paraná State, Brazil, from 25–29 June 2005. Although the Brazilian observer could not attend the meeting he was able to provide information to participants on ACAP and its objectives. The Committee noted that SCAR has an important role to play in data exchange with ACAP as noted in the report of the Status and Trends Working Group.
- 5.1.7 BirdLife International provided a report (AC2 Inf 17) of recent meetings of RFMOs it had attended, including CCAMLR, CCSBT, IATTC, the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT), the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC), WCPFC and the Preparatory Meeting for the Southwest Pacific RFMO (AC2 Inf. 18).
- 5.1.8 The USA reported on the proceedings of the Third International Fishers Forum, noting that seabird presentations were made by a number of nations, including several parties to ACAP. The “Yokohama Declaration” was signed at this meeting, raising the importance of the IPOA-Seabirds, associated RFMO mitigation measures, the upcoming joint tuna RFMO meeting, cooperation among RFMOs to reduce seabird bycatch, and the development of practical measures to reduce seabird bycatch.
- 5.1.9 Australia reported on the Meeting of the 8th Conference of Parties to the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS), held in Nairobi, Kenya, in November 2005. Of particular interest to ACAP was the successful nomination and listing of two seabird species to Appendix 1 of CMS – Henderson's petrel *Pterodroma atrata* and Balearic shearwater *Puffinus mauretanicus*. The conference of parties also adopted a resolution on bycatch that included several provisions related to seabird conservation. The resolution agreed to the appointment of a Scientific Councillor with expertise in bycatch to coordinate all of the work of the CMS Scientific Council on the topic. The resolution recognized the need to apply adequate funding to address the threat that bycatch poses to most of the marine species listed on the CMS appendices, including albatrosses and petrels. The CMS Secretariat was requested to source funds for a study to assist developing countries determine relative levels of bycatch in their fisheries as required, and to conduct a

AC2 FINAL REPORT

series of specialist bycatch mitigation workshops in those countries in coordination with interested Parties. The Scientific Council was also asked to identify emerging and best-practice techniques of bycatch mitigation as a priority, and to make this information readily available to key range states of migratory species threatened by bycatch.

- 5.1.10 The UK indicated that it will provide UK£15,000 to assist the CMS with bycatch mitigation, some of which will be of relevance to ACAP.
- 5.1.11 BirdLife International reported that it met with the FAO to discuss plans for a revised FAO Circular 937, to include bycatch mitigation measures for both longline and trawl fisheries. BirdLife International asked the FAO if the International Plan of Action (IPOA)-Seabirds was to be revised to include trawl fisheries. The FAO had responded that the IPOA-Seabirds would not be revised, but that Circular 937 which provides technical information on mitigation measures would be revised as an accompanying document to the IPOA Seabirds. Discussions were also held regarding more robust and uniform development of NPOA-Seabirds, which could potentially include the development of FAO 'best-practice guidelines'. BirdLife International will continue to work with FAO on this issue and keep ACAP informed of progress and opportunities (see Section 11.1).
- 5.1.12 Brazil advised that Projeto Albatroz together with other organisations will be hosting the *1st South American Fishers Forum to Reduce the Incidental Capture of Seabirds* in Brazil in December 2006 and invited ACAP to attend in an observer capacity. Information brochures regarding this event were provided to meeting participants.
- 5.1.13 The Chair thanked participants for their reports and asked the Interim Secretariat to develop a simple standard process for reporting back from international meetings. The Chair asked the Interim Secretariat to compile a summary document containing action items derived from international meetings of particular relevance to ACAP. The Interim Secretariat advised that it has a briefing paper available for observers representing ACAP to use when attending international meetings and participating in discussions relating to seabird bycatch.

5.2 Attendance at Future Meetings of RFMOs

- 5.2.1 The Chair introduced AC2 Inf.17, noting it should be considered an iterative document. The Committee updated the document (Annex 3) and discussed attendance at the meetings. It was agreed that individual Parties and Range States would consider taking the lead on individual RFMOs, and the following provisional allocations were suggested:

CCSBT – Australia
IATTC – USA
IOTC – UK (with other European Union Party members)
ICCAT – UK (with other European Union Party members)
CCAMLR – USA
SEAFO – South Africa
WCPFC – New Zealand
SPRFMO – Australia

AC2 FINAL REPORT

- 5.2.2 With regard to the joint meeting of the five tuna RFMOs, Australia will endeavour to acquire observer status for ACAP at the meeting. The USA suggested that observers may need to contact specific RFMOs for which they are already observers to attain observer status at this joint meeting of RFMOs. ACAP has been invited to participate as an observer at a number of RFMOs already and could attend the meeting on behalf of the Parties. Parties to the RFMOs can also attend. It was also noted that the biennial COFI meetings provided a good opportunity to meet with the RFMOs. BirdLife International noted that there will also be a meeting of the heads of regional fisheries bodies prior to the 26th Session of COFI. The Chair requested the Secretariat to investigate opportunities for ACAP involvement in this meeting.

6. REPORT FROM ACAP PARTIES ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AGREEMENT

- 6.1 The Chair introduced the 'Draft Report from the Advisory Committee to the Second Session of the Meeting of the Parties on the Implementation of the Agreement'. This had been compiled by the Interim Secretariat based on the reports submitted by Parties and Range States (AC2 Docs. 18, 19, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 33 and 34). A reporting format had been decided upon at AC1, but the Interim Secretariat had found during drafting that it seemed more logical for the report to follow the format of the Action Plan within Annex 2 of the Agreement. The report was discussed under agenda item 14.
- 6.2 The Chair suggested that the reporting templates developed at AC1 were not adequate to outline fully the report of implementation of the Agreement. For example, capacity building is not included in either template although it is considered a priority of the Agreement. Following discussion by the Committee the Secretariat developed a new template that could be used for future reporting (Annex 10). It was agreed this should be reviewed prior to the next round of reporting in advance of MoP3.
- 6.3 It was noted that Range States, Observers and others contribute to the implementation of ACAP. It was decided that BirdLife International, as for Range States, could submit a separate report to be appended to the Draft Report to the MoP. If Parties and Range States wish to include national activities of BirdLife International and its national partners within their report, then that would be considered appropriate as well, with a cross-reference as needed. BirdLife International was invited to work with the Interim Secretariat to submit any additional information that it wished to have included in the current draft report. The Vice Chair noted that other observers such as SCAR should be invited to submit information in the future.

7. ACAP SECRETARIAT

7.1 Development of a Headquarters Agreement

- 7.1.1 The Interim Secretariat reported on progress made with the development of a Headquarters Agreement to provide the Secretariat with a legal personality and to establish privileges and immunities for the Secretariat's staff. Parties and Signatories

AC2 FINAL REPORT

that provided comments on the draft document have advised that they believe work on the Headquarters Agreement can be progressed through email exchanges. The Committee supported this approach.

7.1.2 It was proposed that a revised draft be circulated for comment in approximately a month's time to provide an opportunity for further comment, prior to a final draft being prepared for the consideration of MoP2. The Chair urged Parties to resolve any outstanding issues through this process so that an agreed text could be forwarded to MoP2.

7.1.3 The Interim Secretariat noted that staff regulations would also be required to establish the terms and conditions for employment of the Secretariat's staff. The Committee accepted the Secretariat's offer to draft staff regulations for consideration at MoP2.

7.2 Performance Indicators

7.2.1 The Interim Secretariat noted that it is required to develop performance indicators to measure its efficiency and effectiveness and advised that it would be preparing a paper on this issue for consideration at MoP2. Input from the Advisory Committee into the development of this paper was invited.

8. REVIEW OF THE STATUS AND TRENDS OF ALBATROSSES AND PETRELS

8.1 Report of the Status and Trends Working Group Meeting

8.1.1 The Chair of the Status and Trends Working Group (STWG), Rosemary Gales, introduced the Group's report (AC2 Doc.10) and thanked other members of the WG for their contributions. The Report documented the discussions of the first meeting of STWG that was held in Brasilia, Brazil on 3 June 2006. The information compiled by the STWG to date provided extremely useful and comprehensive population-specific data for 20 species of albatrosses and seven species of petrels breeding within the jurisdictions of Argentina, Australia, France, New Zealand, South Africa and the UK. The waved albatross *Phoebastria irrorata* is the only species for which no data had been submitted.

8.1.2 Summarised assessments of the population status and trends of the ACAP-listed species were provided to the meeting from which it was evident that for the populations for which data are available:

- i Population size estimates of high-medium quality are available for 68% of all populations, 32% of populations having either low or no estimates of population size;
- ii Population trend information is only available for 40% of all populations of ACAP listed species. For the populations for which trend data are available, 27% are increasing, 30% are stable and 43% are decreasing;
- iii The availability of vital demographic parameters for these populations remains limited, with estimates of adult survival available for 18% of populations, and immature recruitment/survival estimates available for 11% of populations;

AC2 FINAL REPORT

iv Of the ACAP-listed taxa, the level of information on population status and trends is most limited for the *Procellaria* petrel group.

- 8.1.3 The Committee congratulated the STWG on the excellent progress the WG had made and thanked the Chair and the WG members for continuing the progress reported at AC1. The Advisory Committee reiterated that this review is essential to assist the MoP in prioritising its actions and measuring progress in meeting the objective of the Agreement.
- 8.1.4 The Committee noted that data had not yet been submitted by Chile, Ecuador and the SCAR Group of Experts on Birds (SCAR-GEB), but welcomed the commitment by Chile to provide the relevant information and also the offer of John Cooper, a member of SCAR-GEB, to provide the information for southern giant-petrels *Macronectes giganteus* breeding within the Antarctic Treaty area.
- 8.1.5 Following the recommendation from AC1 (para 9.8) the STWG explored appropriate statistical approaches for estimating population trends and trajectories. The Committee noted paper AC2 Doc.32 and supported the conclusion of the STWG that it was not necessary to decide on a single statistical approach at this meeting as long as a robust and defensible approach is adopted. The Committee agreed that the data are only effective if they are both analysed and summarised appropriately and made widely available.
- 8.1.6 The Committee considered a proposal from the STWG for ACAP to facilitate the creation of an ACAP Species Conservation Assessment for all ACAP-listed species. These assessments would include a basic description of each species including such information as taxonomy, breeding locations, foraging distribution and overlap with fisheries but also, importantly, would facilitate the presentation of synthesised analyses of the data collated by both the Breeding Sites WG and STWG. These data would include summaries of known threats at each breeding site, current population sizes and population trend data. It was proposed that these Species Assessments would be web-based and housed on the ACAP web site, and also published electronically as Portable Document Format (pdf) files and in hard copy.
- 8.1.7 The proposal was viewed as an important progression in the work of ACAP and would address the need identified at AC1 for a comprehensive reporting mechanism to be identified and implemented. Equally importantly, this initiative would facilitate the harmonisation of information resulting from the work of the three current Working Groups (Status and Trends, Taxonomy and Breeding Sites). It was agreed that the initiative will be invaluable to other international and national fora, including encouraging other groups to engage and participate in the work of the Agreement.
- 8.1.8 The proposal included indicative costings that the Committee agreed should be provided to MoP2 for consideration for funding.

8.2 Future Work Programme

- 8.2.1 It was agreed by the Committee that the ACAP Species Conservation Assessments should be developed.

AC2 FINAL REPORT

8.2.2 The Committee endorsed the STWG's report (Annex 4) and agreed to the revised future work plan (see below) and that no changes were required to the STWG's terms of reference.

8.2.3 Revised Future Work Plan for the Status and Trends Working Group (STWG):

Action	To be completed by	Responsibility
2.8 Continue population data collection	2006/2007 and ongoing	Parties and Range States with breeding populations
2.10 Progress further development of electronic database	Jan-June 2007	WG
2.10 Establish agreed process for analyses of trends	Jan-Feb 2007	WG
2.11 Develop proforma for ACAP species assessments.	Jan-March 2007	WG
2.12 Coordinate synthesis based on species conservation assessments	July 2007	WG
2.13 Develop strategy of publication of species assessments in public domain – web, print, electronic.	July-Nov 2007	WG
2.14 Consider amalgamation of Status and Trends WG with Breeding Sites WG	AC 3	WG and AC

8.2.4 The USA introduced reports of the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution (WHOI) Working Group on Albatross Demography. The work of this group was introduced at AC1 (AC1 Report paragraphs 9.11 to 9.14) and the final report of the second WHOI Workshop on Albatross Demography was submitted as AC2 Inf.22. A preliminary report of the third WHOI workshop held on 15-19 May 2005 was submitted as AC2 Inf.23. The primary focus of this third workshop was a comparative analysis of the adult life cycle for a representative selection of albatross species and populations. The WHOI meeting agreed that a follow-up workshop, to continue to focus on demographic analysis, is a priority. The STWG encouraged the WHOI Group to submit a final report of its third workshop to AC 3.

9. TAXONOMY OF ALBATROSSES AND PETRELS

9.1 Report of the Taxonomy Working Group

9.1.1 The Chair of the Taxonomy Working Group (TWG), Michael Double, introduced the WG report (AC2 Doc.11). The report recalled that, the Scientific Meeting (MOP1; ScM1; Section 4.6) recommended that as a first step, the Taxonomy Working Group should aim to reach consensus about the three main contentious albatross species

AC2 FINAL REPORT

splits; namely Gibson's and Antipodean albatrosses (*Diomedea antipodensis/gibsoni*), shy and white-capped albatrosses (*Thalassarche cauta/steady*) and Buller's and Pacific albatrosses (*T. bulleri/platei*).

9.1.2 The TWG report summarises and assesses scientific data relevant to these three main contentious species splits.

9.1.3 The TWG unanimously agreed on the following:

- that available data do not warrant the recognition of Gibson's and Antipodean albatrosses or Buller's and Pacific albatrosses at the specific level;
- to adopt a subspecific nomenclature for these taxa; and
- that data suggest shy and white-capped albatrosses are divergent and diagnosable and therefore, following the taxonomic guidelines, warrant recognition at the specific level.

9.1.14 For the purpose of summarising available data and highlighting gaps in current biological knowledge, the TWG suggested a review of the evidence supporting the specific and sub-specific status of the following pairs of taxa be completed before the next Advisory Committee meeting:

1. Northern royal albatross and southern royal albatross
2. Indian yellow-nosed albatross and Atlantic yellow-nosed albatross
3. Chatham albatross and Salvin's albatross
4. Northern giant-petrels and southern giant-petrels
5. Black petrels and Westland petrels
6. White-chinned petrels and spectacled petrel (reassessment)
7. Buller's and Pacific albatross (the group is aware of information that will be published shortly)

9.1.15 The Committee thanked the TWG for its excellent work. It was noted that these findings may lead to an amendment to the Agreement, which under Article 12 would require a Party to submit a proposal to the Secretariat 150 days prior to a Meeting of Parties.

9.1.16 With support from several Parties, New Zealand agreed to submit such a proposal to the Secretariat .

9.1.17 The Chair referred the Committee to the TWG's revised work plan which refers to the production of guidelines for the recognition of subspecific status and further assessment of these taxa. BirdLife International informed the Chair that it would need to consider these findings internally to assess their implications for the taxonomy used by BirdLife International.

9.2 Future Work Programme

9.2.1 The Committee endorsed the TWG's revised terms of reference and the work plan (shown below).

Timetable of progress

AC2 FINAL REPORT

Action	Completed by	Responsibility
Review the evidence supporting the specific status of the following taxa (noting that new information may be published shortly): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buller's and Pacific albatross • Northern royal albatross and southern royal albatross • Indian yellow-nosed albatross & Atlantic yellow-nosed albatross • Chatham albatross & Salvin's albatross • Northern giant-petrel & southern giant-petrel • Black petrel & Westland petrel • White-chinned petrel & spectacled petrel 	2006/2007	WG Chair
Move the WG's web site to the ACAP Secretariat	2006/2007	WG Chair
Assess the utility of the subspecies rank for ACAP purposes and if appropriate develop guidelines for the recognition of subspecific status	2006/2007	WG Chair
Construct a morphological and plumage database, then canvass for, collate, archive and summarise available data	Ongoing	WG Chair
Maintain the WG's bibliographic database of published scientific papers relevant to the taxonomic status of ACAP-listed taxa	Ongoing	WG Chair
Develop and provide advice to AC on the construction and maintenance of species lists as appropriate	Ongoing	WG
Provide annual reports to AC on WG activities	Ongoing	WG Chair
Draft resolutions (when necessary) for amendments to the species list in Annex 1 of the Agreement	Ongoing	AC

10. BREEDING SITES

10.1 Report of the Breeding Sites Working Group

10.1.1 The Chair of the Breeding Sites Working Group (BSWG), Susan Waugh, introduced the Working Group's report (AC2 Doc 12 Rev. 1). The report outlined the development and adoption of the BSWG Terms of Reference (ToR) since its establishment at AC1.

10.1.2 In accordance with the BSWG 2005/06 work programme (AC1 Final Report Annex 7), New Zealand led the development of a database for the collection and collation of data on breeding sites of ACAP species, management activities and threats present at the sites.

10.1.3 BSWG members contributed comments to the design of the database and the extent and level of detail of data to be submitted. Approximately 300 breeding sites for ACAP species were identified and data from about one half of those sites were used to test the database and determine the kinds of analyses it could perform.

AC2 FINAL REPORT

- 10.1.4 During the testing phase, structural and functional modifications were made to the database to address relatively minor issues. The BSWG also refined some of the definitions set out in the database to guide data submission, such as the definition of a site and the way that existing and potential threats are recorded in the database.
- 10.1.5 The Committee thanked the BSWG for its work, congratulated its Chair for making such great progress in the past year and thanked New Zealand for its contribution to the development of the database.
- 10.1.6 The Committee endorsed the Report of the BSWG (Annex 2) and agreed to its recommendations that:
- i) ongoing data management and maintenance of the database be passed over to the ACAP Secretariat in the medium term; and
 - ii) the analyses proposed in Sections 6 and 11 of the BSWG report be undertaken in order to contribute to the reporting format of the Status and Trends Working Group (see Item 8).

10.2 Future Work Programme

- 10.2.1 The Committee endorsed the proposed work programme of the BSWG and noted that data submission deadlines would be brought forward to December 2006 (below).

Action	To be completed (*already complete)	Responsibility
Data submission from Parties 1 st tranche (1/2 of available data) 2 nd tranche (remaining data) 3 rd tranche (newly collected data)	May 2006* December 2006 Annually	Parties and Range States with breeding populations
Request a list of breeding sites from Parties and Range States	July 2006	Chair
Revise the database lists and structures following the recommendations of the BSWG in June 2006	September 2006	Chair
Develop a list of alien species	July 2006	Chair
Develop analyses as set out in the report of the BSWG of June 2006	March 2007	Chair and WG
Review analyses of data and gaps, recommend priority sites / threat management actions. Recommend data-gathering priorities	June 2007 and ongoing	Chair and WG
Work with other ACAP WGs to report on analyses of threats to ACAP species	June 2007 and ongoing	Chair and WG

AC2 FINAL REPORT

- 10.2.2 Australia referred to the proposed data submission deadline and noted that this might prove difficult for some Parties to meet. Chile informed the meeting that its data were ready and would be submitted to the BSWG as soon as possible.
- 10.2.3 The Chair suggested that the BSWG's Terms of Reference be revisited and reviewed at AC 3.

11. INCIDENTAL MORTALITY IN FISHERIES

11.1 Foraging Ranges and Overlap with Fisheries

- 11.1.1 Matters relating to bycatch of seabirds caused by fishing activities were comprehensively discussed in drafting groups and in plenary. These discussions were supported by a number of papers as discussed below.
- 11.1.2 ACAP had contracted BirdLife International to produce analyses of remote tracking data of albatrosses and petrels in relation to the areas of high albatross distribution overlap within the jurisdiction of five regional fisheries management organisations (CCAMLR, CCSBT, ICCAT, IOTC and WCPFC). Analyses will examine the distribution of breeding and non-breeding birds and temporal distribution divided by year-quarters (AC2 Doc 31). Discussion focused on the level of technical detail best suited for these reports. It was agreed that the reports should be in a format suited for a policy as well as a scientific audience. The remaining papers will be produced in 2006/7 and reviewed intersessionally by the Advisory Committee.
- 11.1.3 AC2 Doc 13 presents a summary of recent developments in the key RFMOs, and suggests actions by which ACAP could encourage RFMOs to address proactively and effectively the issue of seabird bycatch in fisheries within their competence. Key actions for consideration include: the inclusion of seabird bycatch experts within delegations to RFMO scientific meetings; the presentation of data on seabird bycatch, seabird distribution and overlap with fishing effort to these meetings; the development and funding of the seabird assessments planned by ICCAT, IATTC and IOTC; the strengthening of observer programmes to include mandatory collection of bycatch data and data on mitigation measures; the improved use of mitigation measures; and the development of RFMO indicators and targets for bycatch reduction.
- 11.1.4 The Committee took note of the proposed actions and thanked BirdLife International for producing the paper. The Committee noted that there is little seabird bycatch data collected by most RFMOs, which hinders understanding of the scope of the bycatch problem. The recommendations of this paper were not discussed in detail but were subsequently referred to the Seabird Bycatch Working Group for its assessment.

11.2 Standards for Bycatch Data Collection

- 11.2.1 New Zealand presented AC2 Doc 15 which provided suggestions for the collection of data to characterise the incidental capture of seabirds in fisheries. New Zealand put forward this paper for consideration by other ACAP Parties for use within their fisheries.

AC2 FINAL REPORT

11.2.2 The USA stated that an executive summary of a paper on standards for bycatch collection was presented at the International Fisheries Observer Conference held in Sydney, Australia. The paper will be completed by the time of MoP2.

11.2.3 The recommendations of these papers were not discussed in detail but were subsequently referred to the Seabird Bycatch Working Group for its assessment.

11.3 Estimates of Bycatch

11.3.1 New Zealand presented AC2 Inf. 2 which presents methods for estimating bycatch in New Zealand trawl and longline fisheries. It was noted that incidental catch of seabirds could only be estimated at a generic (seabird) level for most fisheries and that estimates of albatross (all taxa combined) captures had been produced for trawl fisheries.

11.3.2 Birdlife International noted that this report focused on bycatch within EEZ (Exclusive Economic Zone) fisheries. Given that most RFMOs currently collect very low levels of bycatch data this method may not be easily applied to RFMO fisheries at present.

11.4 Bycatch Mitigation

11.4.1 New Zealand presented (AC2 Inf. 1) which reviewed seabird bycatch mitigation measures in global fisheries and provided conclusions and recommendations in relation to these measures. The review captured information from a variety of local, national and international sources. Factors influencing the appropriateness and effectiveness of mitigation measures include the type of fishery, vessel, location, seabird assemblage present and time of year. As such, implementing combinations of mitigation measures is recommended. Retention or strategic management of fish waste is extremely important in reducing seabird bycatch in longline and trawl fisheries. Recommended mitigation methods for both demersal and pelagic longlining include paired bird-scaring lines, line-weighting and night-setting. Along with offal and discard management, paired bird-scaring lines and minimising the time the net is on (or near) the surface are likely to reduce significantly seabird interactions with both the warp cables and net. Urgent investigation is needed into more effective measures to reduce seabird interactions with trawl nets and cables. The Committee noted that more clearly defined partitioning of pelagic and demersal longlining data was necessary.

11.4.2 Current New Zealand work on mitigation includes trials to determine the efficacy of mitigation measures in its southern squid fishery (AC2 Inf. 5). Overseen by an advisory group of government, NGO and industry representatives, these trials will test paired bird-scaring lines, the `Carey` warp scarer and bird bafflers with data collected by government observers. Efficacy will be assessed by seabird contacts with warp cables.

11.4.3 The USA tabled AC2 Inf. 8, 9 & 10 summarising research on the design and use of bird avoidance measures on small vessels within the Alaskan demersal longline fishery. It was concluded that these measures were not necessary for these vessels as they fish close to shore and do not overlap with the distribution of procellariiform seabirds. The USA also reported on side-setting in the Hawaiian pelagic longline fishery, and a programme to assist with converting vessels to side-setting. Australia

AC2 FINAL REPORT

reported that from limited data of side-setting on a single vessel, line-sink rates were similar to those for stern-setting.

- 11.4.4 Discussion centred on how the Committee could complement existing efforts to record, analyse and reduce the incidental mortality of albatrosses and petrels in fisheries.
- 11.4.5 Drafting groups were formed to discuss how ACAP could advance work to address issues of seabird bycatch.
- 11.4.6 It was noted that a number of RFMOs had recently passed resolutions dealing with seabird bycatch matters. The Committee could thus act as an expert body advising on or reviewing available information, recommending what information should be gathered (e.g. by designing observer programmes) and producing best-practice guidelines for mitigation for these RFMOs.
- 11.4.7 It was agreed that Parties and Range States should be proactive in engaging with RFMOs and in promoting information exchange and strengthening their input into RFMO meetings by including seabird experts on member-state delegations. It was also agreed that a critical role of Parties and Range States was to become involved in the development and implementation of seabird resolutions and other measures to reduce bycatch of albatrosses and petrels within RFMO jurisdictions. Further, there was agreement that Parties and Range States should take steps beyond the current scope of the IPOA-Seabirds and that NPOA-Seabirds or similar plans should be developed for fisheries with a known seabird bycatch problem, and assessments conducted of all other fisheries operating within their EEZs.
- 11.4.8 The Committee recognised the benefits of developing a strategy for ACAP Parties and Range States to engage with RFMOs and other relevant international and national bodies to reduce seabird bycatch. It was suggested that such a strategy could be guided by a conceptual approach to addressing seabird bycatch issues. In addition, it was recognised that ACAP had an important role both in supporting and proposing measures to reduce seabird bycatch.

11.5 Establishment of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group

- 11.5.1 The extensive discussions on fisheries interactions identified the potential benefit to the Committee of addressing at-sea threats in a co-ordinated manner. It was therefore agreed to establish a Seabird Bycatch Working Group (SBWG). Terms of Reference and the following indicative work programme were developed for this Working Group and were subsequently adopted by the meeting (Annex 7).

Action	To be actioned by	Responsibility
Collate available information on the foraging distribution of ACAP species and the degree of spatial and temporal overlap with fisheries		
Review and utilise available information on foraging distribution and seabird bycatch to assess the risk of fishing operations on ACAP species in fishing regions		

AC2 FINAL REPORT

(e.g. RFMO areas of competence, national EEZs)		
Review information on mitigation measures for fishing methods known to impact albatrosses and petrels. Initial work shall focus on pelagic longline methods		
Develop products to assist RFMOs and other relevant international and national bodies in reducing seabird bycatch		
Assist in the preparation, adoption and implementation of FAO NPOA-Seabirds, including the development of best-practice guidelines		
Develop materials and guidelines to assist ACAP representatives attending RFMO and other relevant meetings to maximise effective participation and consideration of issues relevant to ACAP		

- 11.5.2 It was noted that the first step in the work programme of the SBWG would be the development of the strategy referred to above.
- 11.5.3 Barry Baker (Australia) accepted an invitation to chair the SBWG. The Advisory Committee offered its thanks and endorsed the SBWG Chair's suggestion that he canvass for members among Parties and Range States attending the meeting.
- 11.5.4 A drafting group chaired by Tatiana Neves (Brazil) drafted Resolution 16 to reflect the views of the Committee on the key elements of the above discussion for endorsement by the Second Session of the Meeting of Parties.

12. ADVISORY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME

12.1 Review Work Programme 2006

- 12.1.1 The Committee reviewed in both break-out and plenary sessions the work programme for the period 2005-2007 that had been produced by MoP1 (MoP1 Res. 1.5, Annex 2). This resolution provides for the revision of the work programme at each Committee meeting. The reviewed work programme is provided at Annex 8.

12.2 Development of 2007-2009 Work Programme

- 12.2.1 The Committee developed a work programme for the period 2007/2009 (Annex 8) taking into consideration the outcomes of this meeting and the preceding workshops. It was noted that tasks relating to seabird bycatch issues would need to be reviewed by the newly formed Seabird Bycatch Working Group and amended, if necessary.

12.3 Development of Conservation Guidelines

- 12.3.1 This item was not discussed and will be carried forward to AC 3.

13. AGREEMENT BUDGET 2007-2009

13.1 Development of Agreement Budget 2007-2009

AC2 FINAL REPORT

13.1.1 A closed session discussed the development of the Agreement budget for the period 2007-2009. It was noted that the frequency of meetings of the Advisory Committee and sessions of the Meeting of Parties, and the location where these are held, have significant budgetary implications and that, where possible, decisions on these issues should be made as far in advance as practicable. It was also noted that decisions on pay scales and the number of staff to be employed in the Secretariat would similarly have significant budgetary implications. It was agreed that the Secretariat would provide the Parties with quarterly reports on budgetary and other issues.

14. ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORTING TO MoP2

14.1 Implementation of the Agreement

14.1.1 The Interim Secretariat presented a draft 'Report from the Advisory Committee to the Second Meeting of the Parties on the Implementation of the Agreement' (AC2 Doc 18), for consideration by the meeting. The meeting agreed to make the following amendments to the report:

- to only include items within the reporting period;
- to include relevant activities that have already been reported under the Antarctic Treaty System in order that the report to MoP is not incomplete;
- that all information included in the report should pertain directly to ACAP-listed species, unless substantial indirect impacts are clearly explained; and
- to include an Executive Summary at the beginning of the report.

14.1.2 A revised version of the report incorporating the above amendments was considered by the Committee. Chile requested that it be provided with additional time to compile information for the report as it had not received the original request for data submission. The Committee agreed to this request and decided to adopt the completed report via correspondence following submission of the Chilean information.

14.1.3 The Committee considered and adopted a revised 'Reporting Format for the Advisory Committee Report to the Meeting of the Parties' (Annex 10).

15. DEVELOPING INDICATORS TO MEASURE THE SUCCESS OF ACAP

15.1 New Zealand presented paper AC2 Doc 20 entitled "ACAP Indicators". This paper had been prepared by New Zealand, South Africa and BirdLife International and contained recommendations for progressing the development of indicators to measure the success in achieving and maintaining a favourable conservation status for albatrosses and petrels.

15.2 Parties were requested to note the proposed approach and potential indicators contained in the paper and were asked to consider how the outputs of the Breeding Sites and Status and Trends Working Groups could be used in the future development and refinement of a suite of indicators.

15.3 It was noted that the outputs from these groups were not yet sufficiently advanced to inform the development of a suite of indicators at the present time. It was therefore agreed that New Zealand, South Africa and BirdLife International would develop a

AC2 FINAL REPORT

small number of prototype indicators for discussion at MoP2 and for use as potential interim indicators until the outputs from the Breeding Sites and Status and Trends Working Groups became more advanced. The authors advised that they would welcome involvement in this work from other meeting participants.

16. LISTING OF NEW SPECIES

- 16.1 The Vice-Chair introduced paper (AC2 Doc 21), proposing an objective procedure for selecting candidate species for inclusion in Annex 1 of the Agreement. It was noted that the First Meeting of Parties requested that a discussion paper on this subject be prepared by the Advisory Committee and that South Africa had offered to take the lead in preparing the paper.
- 16.2 The procedure proposed would utilise a scoring system using the following seven criteria: global conservation status, listing within the Convention on Migratory Species, rarity, level of endemism, migratory nature, land-based threats, and at-sea conservation threats. On conservation status, the paper used IUCN Red List rating, a CMS listing, degree of endemism and rarity as criteria.
- 16.3 The approach taken was to assess all 128 extant species of procellariiform seabirds against the above seven criteria, using a semi-quantified scale (e.g. IUCN status Critically Endangered = 4, Endangered = 3; Vulnerable = 2, Near-threatened = 1; and Not Threatened/Least Concern = 0).
- 16.4 Using the proposed methodology two groups of birds appeared as strong candidates: the three North Pacific albatrosses *Phoebastria* spp. and three Mediterranean shearwaters of the genera *Calonectris* and *Puffinus*. Four southern hemisphere-breeding shearwaters *Puffinus* spp. scored relatively highly, and so might also be considered as candidate species for listing in the future. All ACAP species scored highly, giving credence to the scoring system.
- 16.5 The Committee recognised that the criteria used were not fully independent, particularly as rarity and endemism were already taken into account by the IUCN Red List. There were also some concerns expressed about taking account of CMS listing, but it was pointed out that such a listing did identify species for which international co-operation was seen as bringing a benefit. Weighting could be given to at-sea risks against land-based ones, since fishing-related bycatch was already recognized as a key threat to ACAP species.
- 16.6 The Committee took the view that the paper was a useful start in developing a transparent approach to assessing candidate species for listing on Annex 1 of the Agreement and endorsed the need to use independent criteria. New Zealand offered assistance in developing this approach, given its previous work in this area.
- 16.7. It was agreed that South Africa through the Vice-Chair, Australia and New Zealand would co-author a new version of the document for submission to AC 3 in 2007.

17. FUTURE MEETINGS OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

AC2 FINAL REPORT

17.1 Timing and Location for AC 3

17.1.1 Chile made an initial offer to host AC 3 in 2007. This offer was dependent on consultations to be undertaken within the Chilean Government.

17.2 Adoption of Draft Agenda for AC 3

17.2.1 The Committee agreed that a draft agenda for the next meeting should be developed at the conclusion of each meeting. The Chair noted that illegal, unregulated and unreported (IUU) fishing has serious ramifications for ACAP-listed species. It was agreed to include an agenda item to consider this issue in greater depth at AC 3. A draft agenda for AC 3 is provided at Annex 11.

17.3 Future Meetings of the Advisory Committee

17.3.1 South Africa made an initial offer to host AC 4 in 2008. This offer was dependent on consultations to be undertaken within the South African Government.

17.3.2 It was agreed that in order to maintain the momentum of the work of the Committee it would continue to meet annually. Recognising that the cost of holding meetings has significant cost implications it was agreed to recommend to MoP 2 that MoP meetings be held at three-yearly intervals, except when there were issues to be addressed that required more frequent meetings.

18. SECOND SESSION OF THE MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO ACAP

18.1 Second Meeting of Parties (MoP2)

18.1.1 New Zealand informed the Committee that preparations for hosting the Second Session of the Meeting of Parties were well advanced. The meeting will be held in Christchurch, New Zealand, during 13 -17 November 2006. Further details, including confirmation of the venue and meeting schedule, will be communicated to Parties and other ACAP participants in the near future.

18.1.2 The UK advised that it will make available a voluntary contribution of UK£10,000 for sponsorship of delegates to attend MoP2. The Committee expressed its gratitude for this welcome offer.

18.2 Identification of Resolutions to be addressed at MoP 2.

18.2.1 The Committee agreed to draft resolutions on the following issues for consideration at the next Meeting of Parties:

1. Headquarters Agreement between the Agreement Secretariat and the Government of Australia
2. Staff Regulations
3. Agreement Budget 2007-2009
4. Amendments to the Financial Regulations
5. Revision of Annex 1 (Taxonomic changes)
6. Advisory Committee Work Programme

AC2 FINAL REPORT

- 7. Party actions on fisheries
- 8. Indicators

18.2.2 Draft resolutions on items 6, 7 and 8 are attached as Annexes 8, 12 and 13. The remainder will be prepared intersessionally.

18.3 Timeline for preparation of papers

18.3.1 Members were reminded that documents for MoP2 must be submitted 60 days prior to the meeting if translation is required.

19. OTHER BUSINESS

19.1 Amendments to the Rules of Procedure

19.1.1 The Committee agreed to adopt three new rules of procedure. Rule 15:4 requires Parties to advise at least one month prior to a meeting if they require interpretation services in one of the three working languages. Rule 17:4 relates to the preparation of draft agendas for future meetings. Rule 18:2 concerns amendments to the Records of the Meeting. The revised Rules of Procedure for the ACAP Advisory Committee are appended at Annex 15.

19.2 Future Engagement with Other International Organisations - Marine Protected Areas (MPAs)

19.2.1 The Committee noted the findings of AC2 Doc 14 and discussed the utility of using at-sea data to identify high seas MPAs in the Southern Ocean. Although the value of the paper was recognised, the Committee agreed that additional data sets (e.g. remote tracking data and targeted multi-species surveys) would be required to identify high seas MPAs.

19.2.2 As reported at AC1, BirdLife International is currently involved in an initiative with WWF, Wildlife Conservation Society, Conservation International and Nature Conservancy to develop a strategic plan for delivering the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD) goal of developing a representative network of MPAs by 2012. Recent progress on this initiative has been slow, but currently the group is in the process of hiring a consultant to develop a costed plan for delivering a “ten-year, ten projects in ten regions”, approach.

19.2.3 BirdLife International have been working to ensure that fisheries-related issues are at the core of the initiative and that its focus is not solely on tropical EEZs, and more specifically it includes high seas regions in the Southern Ocean, to arrive at a representative MPA network. Currently the 10 regions are tropical, or sub-tropical, with the Patagonian Shelf and Galapagos being the two areas of relevance to ACAP. BirdLife International agreed to continue to report on this initiative to ACAP as it develops.

19.3 Action Arising from AC2

AC2 FINAL REPORT

- 19.3.1 The Chair noted that a number of actions arising from the first meeting of the Advisory Committee had not been undertaken and requested the Secretariat to prepare a list of all actions arising from this meeting to assist delegates in identifying actions requiring their attention. The Secretariat was requested to forward this list to delegates on a quarterly basis and to update it to reflect action taken.

20. CLOSING REMARKS

- 20.1 The Chair concluded by noting that the Committee had successfully addressed a complex and difficult agenda and extended his thanks to the Vice-Chair and the Secretariat for assisting in keeping the meeting focused. It highlighted the need to schedule carefully these meetings to ensure adequate time was available to address all issues.
- 20.2 The meeting was very successful and achieved a number of milestones. Serious discussion was commenced on engagement with fisheries RFMOs and promising ways forward identified. In particular the creation of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group will provide a clear focus for the Agreement to address this issue. It was the first ACAP meeting to be held in South America with a large number of Parties and Range States participating in the meeting. Advice was also received of Chile's ratification of the Agreement and of the imminent ratification by Argentina and Brazil, meaning that all breeding Range States will shortly be Parties to ACAP.
- 20.3 The Chair will report to the MoP on the many significant issues addressed by this Committee and expressed appreciation to all participants in the achievement of these outcomes.
- 20.4 Thanks were extended to the Government of Brazil for hosting the meeting and to the other organizations in Brazil who contributed to its success. The interpreters, technical staff and hotel staff were thanked for their great support. The Secretariat was thanked for working efficiently over long hours to help achieve a successful outcome.

21. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

- 21.1 The meeting adopted the final report of AC2.

AC2 FINAL REPORT

ANNEX 1

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

**ADVISORY
COMMITTEE CHAIR:**

Mark TASKER
Head of Marine Advice
Joint Nature Conservation Committee
Dunnet House, 7 Thistle Place
Aberdeen, AB10 1UZ, Scotland
United Kingdom
Phone: +44 1224 655701
Fax: +44 1224 621488
Email: mark.tasker@jncc.gov.uk

VICE-CHAIR:

John COOPER
Chief Research Officer
Avian Demography Unit
Department of Statistical Sciences
University of Cape Town
Rondebosch 7701
South Africa
Phone: +27 21 650 3426
Fax: +27 21 650 3434
Email: jcooper@adu.uct.ac.za

PARTIES

AUSTRALIA

Representative:

Barry BAKER
Australian Antarctic Division
203 Channel Hwy, Kingston
Tasmania, 7050
Australia
Phone: +61 3 6232 3407
Fax: +61 6232 3215
Email: barry.baker@aad.gov.au

Alternate
representative:

Rosemary GALES
Section Head
Wildlife and Marine Conservation
DPIW, PO Box 44
Hobart, Tasmania 7001
Australia
Tel: +61 3 6233 3865
Fax: +61 3 6233 3477
Email: Rosemary.Gales@dpiw.tas.gov.au

Advisors:

Michael DOUBLE
School of Botany and Zoology
Australian National University
ACT 0200
Australia
Phone: +61 2 61258483
Fax: +61 2 61255573

AC2 FINAL REPORT

Email: Mike.Double@anu.edu.au

CHILE

Representative: Marcelo GARCIA
Subsecretaria de Pesca
Bellavista 168; Piso 16; Valparaiso
Chile
Phone: +56 32 502 700
Fax: +56 32 502 586
Email: mgarcia@subpesca.cl

FRANCE

Jean Philippe DELORME
Embassy Technical Cooperation
Ses, Av. Dasnações, Lote 9
Quadra So1, 70909,900
Brasilia DF
Brazil
Phone: +55 61 33 12 92 01
Fax: +55 61 33 12 92 03
Email: delorme@terra.com.br

NEW ZEALAND

Representative: Simon BANKS
Manager, Marine Species and Sites
Department of Conservation, Marine Conservation Unit
P.O. Box 10-420
Level 5, 53
Boulcott Street
Wellington
New Zealand
Phone: +64 4 4713192
Fax: +64 4 471 3014
Email: sbanks@doc.govt.nz

Advisors: Susan WAUGH
Science Manager (Acting)
Aquatic Environment
Ministry of Fisheries
101 The Terrace
PO Box 1020
Wellington
New Zealand
Phone: +64 4 494 8252
Fax: +64 4 494 8261
Email: susan.waugh@fish.govt.nz

Spencer CLUBB
Policy Analyst
Ministry of Fisheries
101-103 The Terrace
P.O. Box 1020
Wellington
New Zealand
Phone: 64 4 4702694
Fax: 64 4 470 2664

AC2 FINAL REPORT

Email: clubbs@fish.govt.nz

Johanna PIERRE
Scientific Officer
Department of Conservation, Marine Conservation Unit
P. O. Box 10-420
Wellington
New Zealand
Phone: +64 4 471 3204
Fax: +64 4 471 3041
Email: jpierre@doc.govt.nz

REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

Representative: Robert CRAWFORD
Chief Specialist Scientist
Marine and Coastal Management
Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism
Private Bag X2
Rogge Bay 8012
South Africa
Phone: +27 21 4023140
Fax: +27 21 4217406
Email: crawford@deat.gov.za

UNITED KINGDOM

Representative: Hilary THOMPSON
Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
Wildlife Species Conservation Division
Zone 1/10, Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol BS1 6EB
United Kingdom
Phone: +44 117 372 8233
Fax: +44 117 372 8688
Email: hilary.thompson@defra.gsi.gov.uk

Alternative Representative: Andrew WILLIAMS
Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
Zone 1/11, Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol BS1 6EB
United Kingdom
Phone: +44 117 372 8110
Fax: +44 117 372 8393
Email: andy.williams@defra.gsi.gov.uk

Advisor: Dominique GIUDICELLI
c/o DEFRA
Wildlife Species Conservation
Zone 1/10, Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol BS1 GEB
United Kingdom

AC2 FINAL REPORT

Phone: +44 372 8110

Advisor:

Richard PHILLIPS
Senior Scientific Officer
British Antarctic Survey
High Cross, Madingley Road
Cambridge CB3 0ET
United Kingdom
Phone: +44 1223 221 610
Fax: +44 1223 221 259
Email: r.phillips@bas.ac.uk

Richard BARLOW
British Embassy Brasilia
SE 5801 Conj K Lote 8
Brasilia DF 70408-900 Brazil
Phone: +55 61 33 29 2309
Fax: +55 61 33 29 2325
Email: Richard.barlow@fco.gov.uk

SIGNATORIES

ARGENTINA

Representative

Eduardo LEONE
Argentine Embassy Brasilia
SHIS QL2, Conj. 1, Casa 19
Lago Sul, Brasilia
Brazil
Phone: +55 61 3364-7600
Fax: +55 61 3364-7666
Email: edle2006@gmail.com

BRAZIL

Representative

Onildo MARINI-FILHO
Brazilian Institute of the Environment and Natural Renewable
Resources
SCEN Av. L4 Norte Ed. Sede do IBAMA – Bl. B – Subsolo
Brasília-DF CEP: 70818-900
Brazil
Phone: +55 61 3316 1216
Fax: +55 61 3316 1215
Email: onildo.marini-filho@ibama.gov.br

Leonardo MOHR
Brazilian Institute of the Environment
SCEN Av. L4 Norte Ed. Sede do IBAMA – Bl. B – Subsolo
Brasília-DF CEP: 70818-900
Brazil
Phone: +55 61 3316 1235
Fax: +55 61 3316 1215
Email: Leonard.mohr@ibama.gov.br

Claudia CAMPOS
IBAMA-Brazilian Institute of the Environment and Natural Resources

AC2 FINAL REPORT

SCEN Av. L4 Norte Ed. Sede do IBAMA – Bl. B – Subsolo
Brasília-DF CEP: 70818-900
Brazil
Phone: +55 61 3316 1270
Fax: +55 61 3316 1215
Email: Claudia.campos@ibama.gov.br

Tatiana NEVES
Projeto Albatroz/IBAMA
Av. Rei Alberto I, 450 - sala 05 – Ponta da Praia
Brazil - Santos/SP CEP: 11030-380
Phone: +55 13 9126 1100
Fax: +55 13 3261 4039
Email: tatiana.neves@iron.com.br; tneves@projetoalbatroz.org.br

Eduardo OLIVIERA
Ministry of the Environment
Esplanada dos Ministerios, Bloco “B”, 7º Andar
Brasilia
Brazil
Phone: +55 61 4009-1151
Email: eduardo.oliviera@mma.gov.br

Julio Cesar ROMA
Ministry of the Environment (Brazil)
SCEN Av. L4 Norte Ed. Sede do IBAMA – Bl. B – Subsolo
Brasília-DF CEP: 70818-900
Brazil
Phone: +55 61 4009-9573
Fax: +55 61 4009-9593
Email: julio.roma.mma.gov.br

Andre MISI
Esplanada dos Ministérios – Bloco H
Brasília – DF - Anexo I – Sala 439
Brazil
CEP: 70170-900
Phone: +55 61 3411-8447
Fax: +55 61 3411-8446
Email: misi@mre.gov.br

Ricardo SOAVINSKI
SCEN Av. L4 Norte
Ed. Sede do IBAMA – Bl. B – Subsolo
Brasília-DF CEP: 70818-900
Brazil
Phone: +55 61 3316-1165
Fax: +55 61 3316-1067
Email: ricardo.sovinski@ibama.gov.br

Polyana PEDROSA
SCEN Av. L4 Norte Ed. Sede do IBAMA – Bl. B – Subsolo
Brasil-Brasília-DF CEP: 70818-900
Phone: +55 61 3316-1297
Fax: +55 61 3316-1067
Email: polyana.pedrosa@ibama.gov.br

AC2 FINAL REPORT

RANGE STATES

UNITED STATES

Head of Delegation: Kim RIVERA
National Seabird Coordinator
National Marine Fisheries Service
Protected Resources Division
PO Box 21668
Juneau, Alaska 99802
United States of America
Phone: +907 586 7424
Fax: +907 586 7012
Email: kim.rivera@noaa.gov

Observer: James STORY
U.S. Embassy Brasilia
Regional Environment Program Officer
HUB Office South America
Av. das Nações Sul
Quadra 801 Lote 3
CEP 70403-900
Brasilia, DF
Brazil
Phone: +55 61 3312 7447
Fax: +55 61 3312 7668
Email: storyj@state.gov

Gislaine DISCONZI
U.S. Embassy Brasilia
Regional Environment Program Specialist
HUB Office South America
Av. das Nações Sul
Quadra 801 Lote 3
CEP 70403-900
Brasilia, DF
Brazil
Phone: +55 61 3312 7447
Fax: +55 61 3312 7668
Email: disconzigm@state.gov

OBSERVERS – NON-GOVERNMENT ORGANISATIONS

BIRDLIFE INTERNATIONAL

Ben SULLIVAN
BirdLife Global Seabird Programme Coordinator
BirdLife International
RSPB The Lodge
Sandy, Bedfordshire SG19 2DL
United Kingdom
Phone: +44 1767 680551
Fax: +44 1767 691178
Email: ben.sullivan@rspb.org.uk

AC2 FINAL REPORT

Cleo SMALL
BirdLife Global Seabird Programme
RSPB, The Lodge
Sandy, Bedfordshire, SG19 2DL
United Kingdom
Phone: +44 1767 680551
Email: cleo.small@rspb.org.uk

Esteban FRERE
BirdLife International Global Seabird Program
Aves Argentinas, 25 de Mayo 749 2° Piso
Buenos Aires
Argentina
Phone: +54 11 4312 1015
Fax: +54 11 4312 1015
Email: avesmarinas.sudamerica@avesargentinas.org.ar

SECRETARIAT

Head of Secretariat	Warren PAPWORTH Executive Secretary ACAP Interim Secretariat Suite 25 - 26 Salamanca Square GPO Box 824 Hobart, Tasmania 7001 Australia Phone: +61 3 6233 3719 Fax: +61 3 6233 5497 Email: warren.papworth@acap.aq
Staff	Nicole LE BOEUF ACAP Interim Secretariat Suite 25 - 26 Salamanca Square GPO Box 824 Hobart, Tasmania 7001 Australia Phone: +61 3 6233 5695 Fax: +61 3 6233 5497 Email: nicole.leboeuf@noaa.gov
Staff	Diane ERCEG 3 Edwards Crescent Redcliffe WA 6104 Australia Phone: +61 8 9277 7129 Email: di_erceg@hotmail.com

AC2 FINAL REPORT

ANNEX 2

AGENDA

SECOND MEETING OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (AC2)

5 – 8 JUNE 2006

Agenda item	Paper No.
1. Opening Remarks	
2. Adoption of the Agenda	Doc 1, 2 & 3
3. Report from Interim Secretariat 3.1 Activities undertaken in 2005 3.2 Financial Report	Doc 6 Doc 9
4. Report of Depository	Doc 7
5. Reports from ACAP Observers At Other International Meetings 5.1 Attendance at Future Meetings of RFMOs	Inf 6, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19
6. Parties' Reports on Implementation of the Action Plan	
7. ACAP Secretariat 7.1 Development of a Headquarters Agreement 7.2 Performance Indicators	Doc 8 Inf 15 Inf 16
8. Review of the Status and Trends of Albatrosses and Petrels 8.1 Report of Working Group Meeting 8.2 Future Work Programme	Doc 10 Doc 32
9. Taxonomy of Albatrosses and Petrels 9.1 Report of Working Group Meeting 9.2 Future Work Programme	Doc 11
10. Breeding Sites 10.1 Report of Working Group 10.2 Future Work Programme 10.3 Application of Criteria for Identifying Internationally Important Breeding Sites	Doc 12 Inf 3 Inf 4
11. Incidental Mortality in Fisheries 11.1 Foraging Ranges and Overlap with Fisheries 11.2 Standards for Bycatch Data Collection 11.3 Estimation of Bycatch 11.4 Bycatch Mitigation 11.5 Marine Protected Areas	Doc 13 Doc 14 Doc 15 Doc 31 Inf 1, 2, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11

AC2 FINAL REPORT

<p>12. Advisory Committee Work Programme 12.1 Review Work Programme 2006 12.2 Develop Work Programme 2007-2009 12.3 Development of Conservation Guidelines</p>	<p>Doc 16</p>
<p>13. Agreement Budget 2007 - 2009 13.1 Develop a budget for 2007—2009</p>	<p>Doc 17</p>
<p>14. Advisory Committee Reporting to MOP2: 14.1 Implementation of the Agreement 14.2 Activities of the Advisory Committee.</p>	<p>Doc 18 Doc 19, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 33, 34</p>
<p>15. Developing Indicators to Measure the Success of ACAP</p>	<p>Doc 20</p>
<p>16. Listing of New Species</p>	<p>Doc 21</p>
<p>17. Future Meetings of the Advisory Committee 17.1 Timing and Location for AC3 17.2 Adoption of draft agenda for AC3 17.3 Future Meetings of the Advisory Committee</p>	<p>Doc 22</p>
<p>18. Second Session of the Meeting of the Parties to ACAP 18.1 Identification of Resolutions to be addressed at MOP2 18.2 Timeline for preparation of papers</p>	<p>Doc 23</p>
<p>19. Other Business 19.1 Amendments to Rules of Procedure 19.2 Future Engagement with other International Organisations - Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) 19.3 Action Arising from AC2</p>	<p>Doc 35</p>
<p>20. Closing Remarks</p>	
<p>21. Adoption of Report</p>	

**FUTURE MEETINGS OF OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS AND ACAP
OBSERVERS**

(Brackets indicate tentative offers to provide an Observer; italics indicate meetings that might have relevant content for which reports would be welcome)

Date	Organisation	Meeting	Location	Observer
24 June 2006	IATTC	Bycatch working group	Busan, Korea	USA
26-30 June 2006	IATTC	74 th meeting of the IATTC	Busan, Korea	USA
18-19 July 2006	CCSBT	Special meeting of the Commission	Canberra, Australia	[Australia]
31 July –1 Aug 2006	IOTC	2 nd meeting of the Bycatch working group	Seychelles	UK [and other EU Parties]
7-18 August 2006	WCPFC	Scientific Committee and Ecosystem and Bycatch Working Group	Manilla, Philippines	[New Zealand]
4-11 September 2006	CCSBT	Stock Assessment Group	Tokyo, Japan	Australia
12-15 September 2006	CCSBT	Scientific Committee	Tokyo, Japan	Australia
25-29 September 2006	ICCAT	Working groups, including bycatch group	Madrid	[UK and other EU Parties]
27-29 September 2006	SEAFO	Scientific Committee meeting	Windhoek, Namibia	[South Africa]
28 Sept – 3 Oct 2006	WCPFC	Technical and Compliance Committee	Brisbane, Australia	New Zealand
2-6 October 2006	ICCAT	SCRS	Madrid	[UK and other EU Parties]
2-6 October 2006	SEAFO	Commission meeting	Windhoek, Namibia	[South Africa]
<i>3-7 October 2006</i>	NORTH AMERICAN ORNITHOLOGICAL CONFERENCE		<i>Mexico</i>	
<i>7-12 October 2006</i>	UK OVERSEAS TERRITORIES MEETING		<i>Jersey, UK</i>	<i>Vice Chair</i>
8-9 October	CCSBT	First meeting of the	Miyazaki,	Australia

AC2 FINAL REPORT

2006		Compliance Committee	Japan	
10-13 October 2006	CCSBT	Commission meeting	Miyazaki, Japan	Australia
9-20 October 2006	CCAMLR	Working Group on Fish Stock Assessment, including IMAF	Hobart, Australia	USA
23 Oct – 3 Nov 2006	CCAMLR	Scientific Committee and Commission meeting	Hobart, Australia	USA
November 2006	<i>BIRDLIFE</i>	Japan workshop	Japan	BirdLife
6-10 November 2006	South Pacific RFMO	2nd preparatory meeting	Australia	
20-26 November 2006	ICCAT	Special meeting of the Commission	Dubrovnik, Croatia	[UK and other EU Parties]
11-15 December 2006	WCPFC	Third Commission meeting	Apia, Samoa	New Zealand
12-14 December 2006	1 st South American Fishers Forum to Reduce the Incidental Capture of Seabirds		Guarujá, Brazil	Brazil
22-26 January 2007	Tuna RFMOs	Meeting of the 5 tuna RFMOs	Japan	
February/March 2007	FAO	Committee on Fisheries	Rome	
March 2007	RFMOs	Joint meeting	Rome	
26-30 March 2007		Conference on Rats, Humans, and Islands	Hawaii	
Late July 2007 (2days)	IOTC	3rd meeting of the Bycatch working group		[UK and other EU Parties]

REPORT OF WORKING GROUP ON STATUS AND TRENDS MEETING

3 JUNE 2006

Background

1. The first Session of the Meeting of the Parties (MOP1) of the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels agreed to recommend to the Advisory Committee (AC) a proposal to review the population status, trends and demography of albatrosses (21 species) and petrels (seven species) listed on Annex 1 of the Agreement (MOP1 Final Report, Paragraph 7.2).
2. To progress this review, Resolution 1.5 provided for the establishment by the Advisory Committee of a Working Group whose aim is to collect and collate information on breeding numbers and critical population and demographic parameters on each species. It was anticipated that this synthesis would then enable gaps in information to be identified and facilitate the prioritisation of actions to collect information to fill these gaps.
3. The data for this review would be sought from Parties and Signatories to ACAP that are Breeding Range States for the ACAP-listed species. It was agreed that Rosemary Gales (Australia) would chair the Working Group. Working Group members were sought from both breeding-range Parties and non-Party Signatory states. The current membership of the Status and Trends Working Group (STWG) is provided in Attachment 1.

Progress to date

4. At the first meeting of the AC (AC1) in Hobart in 2005, the Status and Trends Working Group (STWG) had received data for a range of species breeding within the jurisdictions of Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and the United Kingdom. Data from Argentina were presented at the AC1 meeting.
5. Tasks that were identified by AC1 as being relevant to the STWG included:
 - a) Initial analyses should prioritise determination of population trends and trajectories from existing time-series count data (Para 9.3 in AC1 Report)
 - b) Obtain statistical advice to assist in estimating population trends and trajectories from population counts (Para 9.8 in AC1 report).
 - c) SCAR would make compiled data available on ACAP species, especially for Southern Giant Petrels breeding on the Antarctic Treaty Area (see Para 9.9 in AC1 Report).
6. Action 5a) above has been partially achieved through the commitment by France to provide data for populations in their jurisdiction before AC2 (June 2006). This was achieved with

AC2 FINAL REPORT

France submitting valuable summary data. Raw data as requested were not submitted. Communication is ongoing with the few remaining nations who have not yet provided data.

7. For Action 5b) above at AC1 the UK undertook to provide a paper on estimation of population trends from counts for the forthcoming AC2 meeting. Consequently, UK suggested the possible application of TRIM Software that may achieve the goals of the STWG in seeking to establish trends. This software and the manual are freely available at: <http://firmy.publikuj.cz/EBCC/index.php?ID=13>. It was therefore suggested that members peruse this software prior to the meeting. To further assist in achieving this Action, Australia commissioned a paper for the STWG to consider that will provide some guidance on the types of statistical analyses that may be most appropriate (AC2 Doc. 32).
8. For Action 5c) above SCAR (through its Group of Experts on Birds convened by Eric Woehler) committed to providing the relevant population data to the WG before AC2. Unfortunately this information remains outstanding.

First Meeting of the Status and Trends Working Group, 3 June 2006

9. A working group meeting was convened on 3 June 2006 in Brasilia, Brazil, to progress the following work items:
 - a. Completion of database to ensure comprehensive coverage of populations for which data exist;
 - b. Determination of appropriate statistical tools to quantify trends;
 - c. Method of appropriate reporting and delivery of synthesised analyses; and
 - d. Identification of gaps in information, and prioritisation of actions to collect information to fill these gaps (as identified in the Terms of Reference of the STWG).
10. The meeting was attended by Members of the STWG from Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and the UK. Observers from Australia, Brazil, New Zealand and UK and USA also attended the meeting. The STWG accepted the proposed agenda and reviewed the membership and provision of data to date (see Attachment 1).
11. South Africa and the UK jointly reported ongoing efforts to collate population and trends data for ACAP species breeding within the UK Overseas Territory of Tristan da Cunha. It is their intention to submit these data to the STWG by the end of 2006.
12. The STWG noted that no data had been submitted by Chile and Ecuador and it was noted that these data are critical for a global assessment of trends. The STWG also noted that the SCAR Group of Experts on Birds (GEB) had not as yet submitted data to the STWG. John Cooper, a member of the SCAR GEB, undertook to organise the submission of data to both the Breeding Sites and Status & Trends databases by the end of 2006. The STWG welcomed and accepted this offer.

AC2 FINAL REPORT

13. The STWG also welcomed the provision of data from Argentina and France and noted that these additions significantly enhance the comprehensiveness of the status and trends database. Raw data pertaining to population numbers remain outstanding from France and it was agreed that the WG Chair should request this information from the French STWG member.
14. The STWG considered the frequency of data submission by data holders and agreed that an annual delivery of data is highly desirable. The STWG agreed that a reporting request will be issued each June with a delivery deadline two months after the request is issued. If annual delivery of data is not always possible then the STWG emphasised that outstanding data should be submitted in sufficient time to be analysed before each Meeting of Parties. Annual delivery of information will enable timely to other forums (e.g. CCAMLR) that have an interest in the focus of the WG. If appropriate, timely requests for data submission could be conveyed in ACAP correspondence facilitated by the Secretariat.

Summary of trends in populations

15. The population status and trends summary spreadsheets were updated. For completeness, published information for Chile and Ecuador populations were included in the absence of data submissions. The Revised and Updated Population Tables was reviewed by the STWG and all members acknowledged the high value of this extremely useful and comprehensive information resource. The information provided was considered in the context of species groups.
16. For the great albatrosses, most populations appear to be stable or increasing. Notable exceptions are the decreasing populations of wandering albatross in the South Atlantic, and the Tristan albatross at Gough Island. Amongst the great albatrosses, the only large populations for which recent data are lacking are Wandering albatrosses at three of the four islands in the Crozet Island group and several peninsulas at the Kerguelen Islands.
17. Grey-headed albatross populations are decreasing at some South Atlantic colonies and Campbell Island, but are considered to be stable at Marion and Macquarie Islands. There are no trend data for Chilean and French islands; for the latter, no recent census data are available.
18. Sooty albatross populations on Marion Island, Crozet and Tristan da Cunha are all reported to be decreasing. Census data do not allow for confident statements on trends for other locations. There are very few population data for Light-mantled sooty albatrosses, with the exception of Marion and Macquarie Islands where the populations are stable and at Ile de la Possession where they are increasing.
19. For black-browed albatrosses, where information is available, all populations over 5000 pairs are declining (South Atlantic colonies). There are no status and trend data for the large Chilean populations.
20. The Campbell albatross population was increasing but data have only been submitted up until 1996. For the Buller's albatross, the Snares and Solander Island populations are increasing, but no recent count data exist for the Chatham Island population.
21. The shy albatross is increasing in numbers on Albatross Island, trend data are not available for the other two breeding localities. No recent population data exist for the White-capped albatross. The

AC2 FINAL REPORT

Salvin's albatross population is decreasing at the Bounty Islands and stable on the Snare Islands. The Chatham albatross population appears to be stable.

22. Atlantic yellow-nosed albatrosses are decreasing in numbers at Tristan and Gough Islands, whereas for other sites in the Tristan Group data are lacking. For the Indian Yellow-nosed albatrosses overall, data are poor, but the large population at Amsterdam Island is decreasing in size.
23. No data were submitted for the Waved albatross.
24. Where data exist, Southern giant petrel populations are generally stable or increasing with the exceptions of those on Marion Island, Isla Nelson (Argentina) and the Antarctic Peninsula. A recent survey of islands on the Patagonian shelf has revealed a much larger population than was hitherto known.
25. Northern giant petrel populations are increasing at some South Atlantic colonies, where the largest populations exist, are stable at Marion and Macquarie Islands, but are decreasing at Ile de la Possession (Crozet). There are few recent data for other sites.
26. Few population and demographic data are available for the *Procellaria* species. Where information is available, White-chinned petrel populations are reported to be decreasing. The Spectacled petrel population is increasing. Black petrel numbers are stable or increasing. The Westland petrel has no population size or trend data. Data on population size and trends of grey petrels are insufficient for a summary statement, with the exception of the very small populations on Campbell and Macquarie islands where the populations are reported to be recovering. Both these sites have recently undergone successful removal of introduced predators.

Statistical tools to assess population trends

27. The STWG then considered methods that may be appropriate for assessing trend data and reviewed several alternatives.
28. A report (Woehler et al. 2001) produced by SCAR, on population trends of seabirds within Antarctic Treaty areas, used a Generalised Additive Model (GAM) approach to assess changes in population size with time (trends). This method does not assume the relationship between the population size and time is linear. Only data sets with five or more years of data were analysed using this approach.
29. The TRIM Software implements a log-linear Poisson regression method (a form of Generalised Linear Modelling or GLM) and, given its wide use, could be considered to be an 'industry standard' for assessing trends in wild bird populations from time-series data. The software facilitates the assessment of data from multiple census sites simultaneously. The STWG was advised that the TRIM software is well regarded and based on established statistical theory.
30. The paper "Review of Trends Monitoring Methods as applied to Seabird Populations" (AC2 Doc 32) was presented to the STWG. This paper recognises the utility of using GAM or GLM techniques (also known as 'phenomenological modelling') but recommended an alternative 'population modelling' approach. Essentially, this approach either attempts to estimate the underlying parameters that affect a population's growth rate or, in its most sophisticated form, parameters such as survival, growth and fecundity rates can be integrated into the model which is then used to infer the population's growth rate (trend in population size). Spreadsheets and code can be made freely available to data contributors to implement this approach if necessary.

AC2 FINAL REPORT

31. Members of the STWG concluded and agreed that as long as a robust and defensible process is adopted then it was not necessary to decide at this stage which approach was most appropriate. Indeed, more than one approach could be used if this would improve the veracity of the results.
32. To facilitate data analysis, the STWG considered the following options:
 - a. A workshop with data holders and statisticians;
 - b. A analysis by each data holder individually; and
 - c. To employ an appropriate person to complete the analyses while liaising closely with those that have submitted the data.
33. The STWG agreed that this third option was the most desirable approach.

Data synthesis and reporting

34. The STWG discussed options for data synthesis and reporting and agreed that the data are only effective if then they are both analysed and summarised appropriately and made widely available.
35. The Chair tabled a proposal for ACAP to facilitate the creation of an ACAP Species Conservation Assessment for all the ACAP listed species (Attachment 2). These assessments would include a basic description of each species including such information as taxonomy, breeding locations, foraging distribution and overlap with fisheries but also, importantly, would also facilitate the presentation of synthesised analyses of the data collated by both the Breeding Sites and the Status and Trends WGs. These data would include summaries of known threats at each breeding site, current population sizes and population trend data. It was proposed that these Species Assessments would be web-based and housed on the ACAP web site, and also published electronically as Portable Document Format (pdf) files and in hard copy.
36. This proposal was endorsed by all members of the STWG present at the meeting. The proposal was viewed as an important progression in the work of ACAP and would fulfill the consensus reached at AC1 that a comprehensive reporting mechanism should be identified and implemented. Equally importantly, this initiative would facilitate the harmonisation of information resulting from the work of the three current Advisory Committee Working Groups (Status and Trends, Taxonomy and Breeding Sites). The STWG agreed that a proposal including indicative costing be tabled at AC 2 for consideration (Attachment 2).

Future workplan and actions identified

37. The STWG agreed that the current workplan required revision to reflect the decisions made by the STWG within the meeting. This new workplan that builds upon the progress made to date is presented consideration by the Advisory Committee (Attachment 3).

Actions by the Advisory Committee

38. The STWG agreed that substantial progress has been made with most major data holders now having submitted data. To progress adequately the work of the STWG, the WG recommends ACAP Species Conservation Assessments be developed and produced. This initiative will also enhance the synergy between the three current Advisory Committee WGs. Consequently the Advisory Committee is asked to:

AC2 FINAL REPORT

- a. Consider the Proposal for ACAP Species Conservation Assessments (Attachment 2);
- b. Consider and agree to the revised work program for the STWG (Attachment 3);
- c. Consider whether any changes are required to the Terms of Reference reflecting the progress of the STWG.

AC2 FINAL REPORT

Attachment 1 - STWG members and data provision – June 2006

(* indicates 2006 Workshop attendee)

Party/Signatory/ Member	Organisation	Status of Data Provision
Observer		
Australia	Rosemary Gales* CHAIR	Dept of Primary Industries & Water, Tasmania Data provided up to 2005 season
Ecuador	Gabriela Montoya	No data provided
France	Martine Bigan Henri Weimerskirch	Ministere de l'ecologie et du Developpment Durable CNRS Summary data provided in May 2006. Raw count data not provided To be requested.
New Zealand	Susan Waugh*	Ministry of Fisheries Data provided up to 2005 season. Some updates for some species provided in 2006
South Africa	John Cooper* Rob Crawford	University of Cape Town Department of Environmental Affairs & Tourism Data provided up to 2005 season
United Kingdom	Richard Phillips*	British Antarctic Survey Data provided up to 2005 season
Argentina	Adrian Schiavini Maria Laura Tombesi	Southern Scientific Research Centre Secretary of Environment and Sustainable Development Data provided up to 2005 season
Chile	Marcelo Garcia Alvarado	Under secretariat for Fishery No data provided

AC2 FINAL REPORT

BirdLife International	Stuart Butchart	BirdLife International	N/A
SCAR	Eric Woehler John Cooper*	SCAR Group of Experts on Birds	No data provided

Attachment 2 – Conservation Assessment Proposal

Development of ACAP Species Conservation Assessments

A proposal to develop comprehensive and contemporary species profiles of albatross and petrel species listed in Annex 1 of the Agreement

The Status and Trends Working Group has progressed in working with data holders to compile time series information on the population status and trends of ACAP-listed species. Most of the existing information has been contributed to the group, to the point that analyses of population trends and assessment of required conservation actions are warranted. Similarly, the Breeding Sites Working Group has made substantial progress in achieving their aims. To progress adequately this important focus, the Status and Trends Working Group recommends the development of ACAP Species Conservation Assessments. This series of assessments will summarise all information relevant to the conservation status of each ACAP species. The information to be compiled will include data on size and trends of all populations for which information is available. The analyses of trends shall be consistent and comparable through the application of consistent decision rules and analytical techniques. Other information in the assessments shall include relevant demographic parameters (e.g. adult survival and recruitment), breeding and foraging distribution, and links to relevant national and international conservation initiatives. Importantly, the assessments shall also include the most up-to-date information on the taxonomic status, and threats impacting on each species. This

AC2 FINAL REPORT

harmonisation of information will enhance the synergy between the three current AC Working Groups (Status and Trends, Breeding Sites, and Taxonomy).

A critical element of this initiative is to export the products of the current working groups, currently largely housed within the institutions of the Chairs of the Working Groups, to the ACAP Secretariat. This “ACAP Branding” is deemed imperative at this stage to ensure the appropriate management and application of the information and analyses, and to showcase the work of ACAP to date. The initiative will provide a means to access, analyse and deliver the most up-to-date and comprehensive information on the conservation status of ACAP species. This information is not only critical for advancing the work of the Agreement, but will also prove invaluable to other international and national fora. The initiative will also be instrumental in encouraging other groups who have yet to engage with data delivery, or indeed ACAP, to participate in the work of the Agreement.

For this initiative to succeed, ACAP resources will be required. To date, the Working Groups have operated largely independently of ACAP resources. However, to collate and synthesise the information, to conduct trend analyses and to highlight and communicate the results, funding will be required to support the development of the conservation assessments and the production of results. It is anticipated that the ACAP Species Conservation Assessments will be produced in high-quality print copies (consideration to be given to appropriate languages), on CD and also on a web-based system via the ACAP website. The web-based system should be designed so that the information can be updated at least annually to provide the most comprehensive and current information available for all the ACAP-listed species.

An indicative work program and budget estimates are provided below:

	PHASE I (December 2006 – May 2007)	
1	Information compilation and drafting of Species Assessments:	
2	Development of population trends relational database:	
3	Statistical analyses of population trends:	
4	Drafting of synthesis of conservation assessments from species groups and regional perspectives to enable prioritisation of identified actions :	
	INDICATIVE COST	AUD\$ 29 000
	PHASE II (July 2007 – November 2007)	
6	Review of the Species Assessments and the priorities by Advisory Committee and Meeting of Parties	
7	Finalisation of the assessments and priorities	
8	Production of the ACAP Species Conservation	

AC2 FINAL REPORT

	Assessments in :	
	I. High-quality print reports (colour)	
	II. CD	
	III. Web-based via the ACAP Website	
	INDICATIVE COST	AUD \$20 000
	Indicative total costs for PHASE I and II	AUD \$ 49 000
	PHASE III - Ongoing	
	Maintenance of data quality assurance, review and input	AUD \$ 5 000 annually

ACAP Species Conservation Assessments



1. Species Overview

SUMMARY OF STATUS, TRENDS AND THREATS

2. Taxonomy

Order

Family

Genus and Species

Scientific Synonyms

Common names (English, French and Spanish)

3. Listing Details

Date of listing on Appendix 1

IUCN Listing Category (Listing Year)

4. Distribution and Range

4.1 BREEDING

Range States with Breeding Populations

Map showing breeding locations

Table of population jurisdiction, size, trend

AC2 FINAL REPORT

Jurisdiction	Location	Pairs (year)	Estimate reliability	Population Trend
Country	A	Xxxxx	High	Decreasing
	B	Yy	Low	Unknown
	C	Zzzzz	Low	Unknown

4.2 *Foraging Distribution*

Range States that overlap with Foraging Distributions

Description based on published information and (possibly) maps from Tracking Ocean Wanderers

5. *Population Status and Trends*

5.1 *Breeding Frequency and Season*

Brief description of breeding frequency and months of presence at colonies, egg laying, hatching and fledging.

5.2 *Population Size and Trends*

Information on population size, reliability of the estimates and the statistical analyses of the trends.

Graph of trends over time with associated statistical parameters.

5.3 *Population Demographic Parameters*

Summary information on productivity, adult survival and recruitment including the years in which these data were collected

Location	Productivity	Adult survival	Juvenile survival

6. *Threats*

6.1 *Marine Threats*

AC2 FINAL REPORT

Summary information of known interactions with fishing operations, e.g. known to interact with longline and trawl fisheries in waters adjacent to breeding colonies (reference). Also recorded as interacting with longline vessels in distant waters outside the breeding season (reference). Foraging range of adults overlaps with RFMO X and Y during the breeding season. The foraging range of juveniles remains unknown.

6.2 *Breeding Site Threats*

Information on threats that impact at breeding Sites

Site	Human Disturbance	Human take	Natural disaster	Disease	AIS Habitat alteration	Human habitat alteration	AIS Predation	Changes in native species	Contamination
a	low						high		
b	high					low			
c	medium				high				

7. *National and International conservation initiatives*

Provide links to conservation initiatives that are relevant to this species ie National action plans and recovery plans.

8. *Priorities to improve conservation status*

Assessment of the key gaps in knowledge for population information profile (taxonomy, population size, trend, demographic parameters, threats, distribution)

9. *Information Sources*

This section would likely be aggregated to cover all species assessments to minimise duplication.

9.1 *References*

9.2 *Contributors*

Information compiled by John Smith, reviewed by Status and Trends Working Group.

AC2 FINAL REPORT

Attachment 3 – Revised Work Plan

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	WG Chair / 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	WG Chair WG Members
2.4 Notify Interim Secretariat of national coordinators to compile and submit data. Review coordinators as required	End March 2005 and ongoing	Parties and Signatories (Breeding Range States)
2.5 (i) Circulate final data proforma to Breeding Range States	Beginning April 2005	WG Chair
(ii) Provide data in completed proforma	End May 2005	National Co-ordinators for Breeding Range States (Parties and Signatories)
2.6 Initial Population of database	Mid June 2005	WG Chair
2.7 (i) Conduct initial gap analysis (ii) Compile progress report for AC1	End June 2005	WG Chair and Members
2.8 Continued population data collection	2006/2007 and ongoing	Breeding Range States (Parties and Signatories)
2.9 Determine frequency for data submission	June 2006	WG and AC2
2.10 Progress further development of electronic database	Jan-June 2007	WG, Chair (pending outcome of AC2)
2.10 Establish agreed process for analyses of trends	Jan-Feb 2007	WG, Chair (pending outcome of AC2)
2.11 Develop proforma for ACAP species assessments.	Jan-March 2007	WG, Chair (pending outcome of AC2)
2.12 Coordinate synthesis based on species conservation	July 2007	WG, Chair (pending outcome of AC2)

AC2 FINAL REPORT

Action	To be completed by	Responsibility
assessments		
2.13 Develop strategy of publication of species assessments in public domain – web, print, electronic.	July-Nov 2007	WG, Chair (pending outcome of AC2)
2.14 Consider amalgamation of Status and Trends WG with Breeding Sites WG	AC3	WG and AC

TAXONOMY WORKING GROUP REPORT TO THE SECOND ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

JUNE 2006

Summary

This report describes the decision-making guidelines (Attachment One) adopted by the Taxonomy Working Group and the application of these guidelines to three pairs of taxa:

1. Gibson's and Antipodean albatrosses (*Diomedea antipodensis/gibsoni*)
2. Buller's and Pacific albatrosses (*Thalassarche bulleri/platei*)
3. Shy and white-capped albatrosses (*Thalassarche cauta/steady*)

We conclude that available data do not warrant the recognition of Gibson's and Antipodean albatrosses or Buller's and Pacific albatrosses at the specific level. We recommend the adoption of a subspecific nomenclature for these taxa (*cf.* Table One). In contrast, data suggest shy and white-capped albatrosses are divergent and diagnosable and therefore, following the taxonomic guidelines, warrant recognition at the specific level (*cf.* Table One).

We also outline future work for the Taxonomic Working Group and propose that ACAP establish a database to store primary morphometric and plumage data to facilitate the characterisation of biological diversity, the identification of bycatch specimens, the taxonomic process, and the long-term storage of valuable data.

Background

Article IX 6 (b) of the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP) requires the Advisory Committee to "endorse a standard reference text listing the taxonomy and maintain a listing of taxonomic synonyms for all species covered by the Agreement". This reflects the current state of flux in the taxonomy of Procellariiformes and, in particular, of albatrosses.

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 taxonomy of albatross and petrel species covered by the Agreement.

The objective of the Working Group was to establish a transparent, defensible and highly consultative taxonomic listing process. The Scientific Meeting that preceded the first meeting of Parties (MOP1; ScM1; Section 4.3) stated that "...given the importance that species lists have upon conservation policy and scientific communication, taxonomic decisions must be based on robust and defensible criteria. It is important to resolve differences in a scientific and transparent manner with appropriate use of peer-reviewed publications."

It was agreed at the Scientific Meeting (MOP1) that Dr. Michael Double (Australia) would chair the Working Group (WG).

The Scientific Meeting (MOP1; ScM1; Section 4.6) recommended, "...as a first step, this [Taxonomic] Working Group...should aim to reach consensus about the three main contentious albatross species splits; namely *Diomedea antipodensis/gibsoni*, *Thalassarche cauta/steady* and *T. bulleri/platei*."

Introduction

Conservation policy and scientific communication depend heavily on species lists because such lists are considered accurate representations of contemporary biodiversity (Isaac *et al.* 2004). Species lists influence conservation policy and must therefore reflect robust, thoughtful and defensible taxonomic decisions that were based on a thorough assessment of all relevant data. Currently, species lists for albatrosses and petrels lack consensus and this highlights the need for the Parties to the Agreement for the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP) to address this issue.

The taxonomy of albatrosses and petrels has always been problematic. Over 80 albatross taxa have been formally described since the mid 1700s (Robertson & Nunn 1998) often based on specimens collected at sea that could not be assigned to breeding locations. As knowledge of breeding locations and plumage maturation improved many of these 'new taxa' were recognised to be previously described species. This in turn led to prolonged debates over the number of species and the precedence of scientific and common names (e.g. Medway 1993; Robertson & Nunn 1998; Robertson & Gales 1998; Robertson 2002).

The identification of species boundaries among albatrosses and petrels is further confounded by three other factors. First, Procellariiformes spend most of their time at sea and often breed in remote locations. Thus studies of these species are few and data on the breeding behaviour, at-sea distribution and foraging ecology of most species are lacking (Brooke 2004). Second, strong natal philopatry is thought to be characteristic of most petrels (Warham 1990). This precludes the recognition of genuine physiological or behavioural barriers to gene flow because contact between individuals from disparate populations is rare. Third, petrels (and albatrosses in particular) show unusually low levels of genetic divergence even between what appear to be very different species (Nunn *et al.* 1996; Nunn & Stanley 1998). This inevitably reduces the power of genetic studies to delineate species boundaries among more closely-related taxa (Burg & Croxall 2001; Abbott & Double 2003b; Burg & Croxall 2004). But our understanding of albatross and petrel species is constantly improving. New data from long-term demographic studies (e.g. Weimerskirch *et al.* 1997; Croxall *et al.* 1998; Cuthbert *et al.* 2003a; Nel *et al.* 2003), from studies of foraging ecology through the application of satellite tracking technology (e.g. Weimerskirch *et al.* 2000; Hedd *et al.* 2001; González-Solís *et al.* 2002; Birdlife International 2004; Xavier *et al.* 2004), molecular genetic analyses (e.g. Burg & Croxall 2001; Abbott & Double 2003b; Abbott & Double 2003a; Burg & Croxall 2004) and morphometric analyses (e.g. Cuthbert *et al.* 2003b; Double *et al.* 2003) are all likely to influence the taxonomic decision-making process and potentially the content of species lists.

Much of the present taxonomic confusion surrounding albatrosses followed the publication of a phylogenetic study by Nunn *et al.* (1996). Prior to this study the number of albatross species was considered to be 14. However, using data from Nunn *et al.* (1996) and other behavioural and morphometric data, Robertson & Nunn (1998) proposed a new 'interim' taxonomy which recognised 24 albatross species. Unfortunately the taxonomic decisions presented in their book chapter were not always supported by published, peer-reviewed scientific data and thus much controversy has surrounded the decisions therein. Following

AC2 FINAL REPORT

Robertson & Nunn's publication there has been no consensus over the number of albatross species among scientists, governments or conservation organisations. For example, of the two most recent books that discuss albatross taxonomy, one described 24 species (Shirihai 2002) whereas the other recognised only 21 (Brooke 2004). Similarly, Birdlife International lists 21 albatross species (www.birdlife.net) whereas the preliminary ACAP species lists are based on two taxonomies of 14 and 24 species (www.acap.aq). Only recently Penhallurick and Wink (2004) reviewed the genetic data published by Nunn *et al.* (1996) and argued the data supported the recognition of only 13 albatross species. The scientific logic adopted by Penhallurick & Wink (2004) was criticised by Rheindt & Austin (2005) who argued that later genetic studies (e.g. Burg & Croxall 2001; Abbott & Double 2003a; Burg & Croxall 2004) not considered by Penhallurick & Wink (2004) support the recognition of at least some of the 'new species' proposed by Robertson & Nunn (1998).

Taxonomic consensus is probably an unachievable goal. However, we believe that the current taxonomic confusion primarily exists due to a combination of three factors. First, as explained earlier, the identification of species boundaries among albatrosses and petrels is very difficult. Second, the veracity of the peer review process is variable and the process itself is fallible. Thus, unfortunately, less-than-robust taxonomic recommendations have been published in the scientific literature and been replicated in derivative secondary sources such as handbooks and field guides. Third, scientists, government departments and conservation bodies have adopted particular and often very different taxonomies without adequate justification.

This apparent lack of scientific rigour and taxonomic inconsistency was recognised at the latest International Albatross and Petrels Conference held in Montevideo, Uruguay in 2004. Delegates to this conference endorsed a submission encouraging ACAP to address these problems 'through the establishment of a transparent, scientifically defensible and highly consultative listing process. The process must promote taxonomic stability but allow revision when robust peer-reviewed studies suggest that amendment is necessary.' Acting on recommendations in this submission, Resolution 1.5 of the First Session of the Meeting of the Parties (MOP1) to ACAP provided for the establishment of a Working Group (WG) to review the taxonomy of all current species listed by the Agreement (Annex 1). The current membership of this WG is presented in Attachment Three.

The first action for this WG was to agree on a set of guidelines for taxonomic decision-making (Attachment One). These guidelines are based on those described by Helbig *et al.* (2002) of the taxonomic sub-committee of the British Ornithologists' Union and justify the adoption of a particular species concept and make the decision-making process transparent. They facilitate the assessment and assimilation of potentially influential studies while guarding against poor science. The guidelines also consider the inevitable limitations of species lists and the benefits of taxonomic stability.

The Scientific Meeting (MOP1; ScM1; Section 4.6) recommended, "...as a first step, [the Taxonomic] Working Group...should aim to reach consensus about the three main contentious albatross species splits; namely *Diomedea antipodensis/gibsoni*, *Thalassarche cauta/steadii* and *T. bulleri/platei*." In this report we summarise and assess the scientific data relevant to these three taxa groups and suggest that data does not currently support the recognition of Gibson's and Antipodean albatrosses (*Diomedea antipodensis/gibsoni*) or Buller's and Pacific albatrosses (*Thalassarche bulleri/platei*) at the specific level. We do however recognise that data suggest shy and white-capped albatrosses are divergent and

AC2 FINAL REPORT

diagnosable and therefore, following the taxonomic guidelines, warrant recognition at the specific level. The justification for these decisions is presented below. The updated list of taxa recognised by the ACAP Taxonomy Working Group is presented in Table One.

Justification of taxonomic decisions:

Antipodean and Gibson's Albatrosses

For convenience Antipodean and gibbon's albatrosses are sometimes referred to simply as *antipodensis* and *gibsoni* respectively.

Recent taxonomic history

Taxonomic debate has long surrounded the wandering albatross (exulans-type) group. In 1983 Roux et al. (1983) proposed that the exulans-type albatross breeding on Amsterdam Island in the Indian Ocean was a separate species (*Diomedea amsterdamensis*). Later Warham (1990), in his seminal work on petrels, relegated *amsterdamensis* to a subspecies and recognised four others: *Diomedea exulans exulans*, *D. e. chionoptera*, plus two others later described as *D. e. antipodensis* and *D. e. gibsoni* by Robertson & Warham (1992). Following rules of taxonomic precedence Medway (1993) argued that the large, high latitude forms should be named *D. e. exulans* (replacing *chionoptera*) while the smaller birds of the Tristan-Gough group be called *D. e. dabbenena* (replacing *exulans*). Robertson & Nunn (1998) did not adopt this nomenclature when they recognised five species of wandering albatross (*Diomedea exulans*; *D. chionoptera*; *D. amsterdamensis*; *D. antipodensis* and *D. gibsoni*) but in the same book (Robertson & Gales 1998), Gales (1998) and Croxall & Gales (1998) follow Medway's (1993) nomenclature but also recognised five species (*Diomedea exulans*; *D. dabbenena*; *D. amsterdamensis*; *D. antipodensis* and *D. gibsoni*). Most relevant organisations and recent publications now recognise *Diomedea exulans*, *D. dabbenena* and *D. amsterdamensis* as full species (e.g. Shirihai 2002; Birdlife International 2004; Brooke 2004; but see Penhallurick & Wink 2004), however, the treatment of *D. antipodensis* and *D. gibsoni* currently varies between conspecifics, subspecies, allospecies and species (e.g. Holdaway et al. 2001; Shirihai 2002; Brooke 2004; Elliott & Walker 2005) .

Primary publications or reviews of data relevant to the taxonomy of Gibson's and Antipodean albatrosses

1. **Robertson & Warham (1992)** first proposed *Diomedea exulans gibsoni* (Auckland Islands) and *D. e. antipodensis* (Antipodes and Campbell Islands) as subspecies and provided descriptions of type specimens. They also presented a summary of Gibson Plumage Scores (Gibson 1967) for *antipodensis* (male: mean = 8.7 ± 1.6 (5.5 – 11.5), N = 43; female: mean = 4.4 ± 0.5 (4 – 6), N = 45) and *gibsoni* (male: mean = 14.2 ± 2.4 (10.5 – 19), N=12; female: mean = $10.2, \pm 1.5$ (7.5 – 12), N = 9) taken from birds on their breeding islands.
2. **Robertson & Warham (1994)** presented morphometric data from *antipodensis* and *gibsoni* sampled at their breeding locations. No formal statistical analysis was provided but measures from each taxon overlapped considerably within sexes for each body part.
3. **Nunn et al. (1996)** did not include DNA sequence data from either *antipodensis* or *gibsoni* in their analyses but provided convincing justification for splitting the genus *Diomedea* into *Diomedea*, *Thalassarche* and *Phoebastria*.
4. **Robertson & Nunn (1998)**, the highly influential book chapter proposing 24 albatross species, stated “the New Zealand Wandering albatrosses are diagnosable morphologically and ecologically as two distinct taxa (*gibsoni* and *antipodensis*)...”. No evidence was provided to justify this statement or why these taxa should be recognised as species rather than subspecies.

AC2 FINAL REPORT

5. **Nunn & Stanley (1998)** found a single base difference in 1143 base pairs of mitochondrial cytochrome b gene DNA sequence. Only one *gibsoni* and one *antipodensis* sequences were examined. Given the level of divergence and the number of samples examined, this study provides little taxonomic information.
6. **Walker & Elliott (1999)** presented detailed morphometric data for *gibsoni* sampled at the breeding sites but no comparison was made to data from other *Diomedea*. They also summarised the laying period of *gibsoni* (29th Dec – 5th Feb; median 4th – 7th Jan) which they stated is “three weeks later than its near neighbour *D. e. antipodensis*”. Data for *antipodensis* were not provided but this appears to be a mistake. Walker & Elliott (2005) report the median laying date of *gibsoni* to be three weeks earlier than *antipodensis* (see below).
7. **Cuthbert et al. (2003b)** primarily considered morphometric data from Tristan albatross (*Diomedea dabbenena*) and show they are distinct from high latitude *Diomedea exulans*. They also provided a simple summary of morphometric data for these taxa plus those for *gibsoni* and *antipodensis* from Onley & Bartle (1999) and Walker & Elliott (1999). Measurements for *gibsoni* and *antipodensis* were similar but difficult to assess without formal statistical analyses.
8. **Burg & Croxall (2004)**, in a study of mitochondrial control region DNA sequences, detected three distinct lineages within the Wandering albatross group. These lineages were concordant with *Diomedea exulans*, *D. dabbenena* and the New Zealand *Diomedea (gibsoni and antipodensis)*. The Amsterdam albatross (*D. amsterdamensis*) was not included in this study. No fixed differences in the mtDNA sequences between *gibsoni* and *antipodensis* were found, but significant differentiation was discovered in population genetic analyses using microsatellite-based analyses. No structure was found among the disparate populations of *D. exulans* although not all island populations were included in this study. Based on these data, Burg and Croxall suggested *gibsoni* and *antipodensis* should be considered conspecifics.
9. **Walker & Elliott (2005)** reported the median lay date for *antipodensis* was between the 23rd and 26th Jan (range: 7th Jan – 17th Feb), three weeks later than *gibsoni* (Walker & Elliott 1999).

Assessment of diagnosability (cf. Attachment One; Section3)

Based on data provided in the studies described above:

- A. Same age/sex individuals of *gibsoni* and *antipodensis* **cannot** be distinguished by one or more qualitative differences.
- B. Same age/sex individuals of *gibsoni* and *antipodensis* **cannot** be distinguished by a complete discontinuity in one or more continuously varying characters.
- C. Same age/sex individuals of *gibsoni* and *antipodensis* **cannot** be distinguished by a combination of two or three functionally independent characters.

Decision

These taxa fail to meet any of the diagnosability criteria described in Attachment One. We therefore recommend that these taxa do not warrant specific status. We do, however, recognise that: 1) little or no gene flow occurs between *gibsoni* and *antipodensis* (Burg & Croxall 2004), 2) that *antipodensis* tend to be darker than *gibsoni* (Robertson & Warham 1992) and 3) that it is likely *antipodensis* forage more frequently in the eastern Pacific whereas *gibsoni* tend to forage in the Tasman Sea (Walker et al. 1995; Nicholls et al. 1996; Birdlife International 2004). To acknowledge these biological characteristics and provide ACAP with a practical list of taxa that can facilitate the presentation of taxon-

AC2 FINAL REPORT

specific information we recommend that these taxa are recognised as subspecies (cf. Table One):

Diomedea antipodensis antipodensis (Antipodean albatross)

Diomedea antipodensis gibsoni (Gibson's albatross)

This nomenclature is justified by Burg & Croxall (2004) and Brooke (2004).

Comments

We acknowledge that those scientists who have worked most closely with these taxa advocate that they are treated as either subspecies (Walker & Elliott 1999) or, most recently, as species (Elliott & Walker 2005; Walker & Elliott 2005). The ACAP Taxonomy Working Group will carefully consider all future publications that describe the biology of these taxa and will revisit this decision when appropriate. To facilitate taxonomic decisions and, importantly, the identification of bycatch specimens or albatrosses at-sea, a detailed quantitative comparative analysis of morphometric and plumage (adult and subadult) data for these taxa would be highly valuable as would a detailed presentation of their foraging distribution.

Buller's and Pacific Albatrosses

For convenience Buller's and Pacific albatrosses are sometimes referred to simply as *bulleri* and *platei* respectively.

Recent taxonomic history

Robertson & Nunn (1998) proposed that the subspecies *Thalassarche bulleri platei* (Murphy 1936) breeding on the Chatham and Three Kings Islands and those breeding on the Solander and Snares Islands (*T. bulleri bulleri*) should be treated as distinct species (*T. platei* and *T. bulleri* respectively). *T. platei* is also referred to as *T. sp. nov.* because Robertson & Nunn (1998) suggested the type specimen for *T. platei* is in fact a juvenile *T. bulleri*.

Primary publications or reviews of data relevant to the taxonomy of Buller's and Pacific Albatrosses

1. **Nunn et al. (1996)** only included DNA sequence data from *bulleri* but provided convincing justification for the placement of Buller's Albatrosses in the genus *Thalassarche*. Similarly, no molecular data for *platei* were presented in Nunn & Stanley (1998).
2. **Robertson & Nunn (1998)**, in justification for the recognition of two species, state "In the case of *T. bulleri* breeding is two months later at The Snares and Solander Islands than at the Chatham Islands (*T. platei*) and incubation stints are about three times the length." No primary data sources were cited to justify these assertions.
3. **Tickell (2000)** summarised data available for *bulleri* and *platei* (but no primary sources were cited) and showed that all measurements overlap considerably. To our knowledge no statistical analyses of morphometric data have been published for these taxa.

Assessment of diagnosability (cf. Attachment One; Section3)

Based on data provided in the studies described above:

AC2 FINAL REPORT

- A. Same age/sex individuals of *bulleri* and *platei* **cannot** be distinguished by one or more qualitative differences.
- B. Same age/sex individuals of *bulleri* and *platei* **cannot** be distinguished by a complete discontinuity in one or more continuously varying characters.
- C. Same age/sex individuals of *bulleri* and *platei* **cannot** be distinguished by a combination of two or three functionally independent characters.

Decision

These taxa fail to meet any of the diagnosability criteria described in Attachment One. We therefore recommend that these taxa do not warrant specific status. Very few data are available for *T. platei* and currently there is little justification for recognition even at the subspecific level, however, appear widely accepted in the scientific literature (e.g. Marchant & Higgins 1990; Holdaway *et al.* 2001; Brooke 2004). At this stage we recommend that these taxa are recognised as subspecies (*cf.* Table One). We concede that this decision is highly questionable. However, genetic research currently being conducted at Victoria University, Wellington, N.Z. may shed light on the taxonomic standing of these taxa. Once published, we will consider the implications of this research and review these taxa again prior to the next Meeting of Parties. In the meantime we recommend they are listed as follows:

Thalassarche bulleri bulleri (Buller's albatross)

Thalassarche bulleri platei (Pacific albatross)

This nomenclature follows Brooke (2004). The nomenclature for *T. b. platei* is likely to change when an appropriate type specimen is formally described.

Comments

Very few comparative data are available for these taxa and there is a misconception that molecular data exists that justifies the recognition of these taxa as species (Shirihai 2002). To our knowledge no comparative molecular data, morphometric data and quantitative plumage descriptions are currently available. To facilitate taxonomic decisions and, importantly, the identification of bycatch specimens or albatrosses at-sea, a detailed quantitative comparative analysis of genetic, morphometric and plumage (adult and subadult) data for these taxa would be highly valuable as would a detailed presentation of their foraging distribution.

Shy and White-capped Albatrosses

For convenience shy and white-capped albatrosses are sometimes referred to simply as *cauta* and *steadii* respectively.

Recent taxonomic history

Prior to Robertson & Nunn (1998) these taxa were classified as either separate subspecies (*T. c. cauta* and *T. c. steadii*) or pooled as single subspecies (*T. cauta cauta*) within the shy albatross (*Thalassarche cauta*) complex (e.g. Marchant & Higgins 1990). Chatham albatrosses (*Thalassarche cauta eremita*) and Salvin's albatrosses (*T. c. salvini*) were also included in this complex. Robertson & Nunn (1998) elevated all four subspecies to specific status.

AC2 FINAL REPORT

Primary publications or reviews of data relevant to the taxonomy of shy and white-capped albatrosses

1. **Nunn et al. (1996)** only included DNA sequence data from a *T. cauta* but provided convincing justification for the placement of shy albatrosses in the genus *Thalassarche*. Similarly, no molecular data for *steadi* were presented in Nunn & Stanley (1998).
2. **Brothers et al. (1997)** used band recoveries and sighting of colour marked birds to show subadult (< five years old) *cauta* can venture as far as South African waters but adults were always recovered in Australian waters.
3. **Brothers et al. (1998)** used satellite telemetry to show adult *cauta* remain in southern Australian waters close to their breeding islands both inside and outside the breeding season (see also Hedd et al. 2001).
4. **Robertson & Nunn (1998)** justified the recognition of shy and white-capped albatrosses as follows: “*T. cauta* and *T. steadi* can be differentiated by wing morphometrics which do not overlap, though other differences are less clear cut.” No primary data sources were cited to justify this statement and was later shown to be false by Double et al. (2003).
5. **Ryan et al. (2002)** reported that of an estimated 19 – 30,000 seabirds killed by longliners in South African waters, 69% were albatrosses. Of these, approximately 64% were shy-type albatrosses. Equal numbers of adult and subadult shy-type albatrosses were present among those birds returned to port for identification. Later genetic analyses suggested that *steadi* dominate the shy-type albatrosses killed by longline fisheries operating in South African waters (100% *steadi*, N= 24, Abbott et al. in press).
6. **Double et al. (2003)** presented within-sex comparisons of morphometric data from *T. cauta* and *T. steadi* bycatch specimens identified using a DNA-based test (Abbott & Double 2003b). Of 10 body measurements, 6 were significantly different between *cauta* and *steadi* for both sexes. All measurements overlapped but in combination could be used to correctly identify approximately 90% (N=70) of specimens. Also yellow colouration at the base of the culmen was found in 86% of adult *cauta* specimens but was never recorded among adult *steadi*.
7. **Abbott & Double (2003a)**, based on a study of microsatellite allele frequencies, report very strong population differentiation between *cauta* and *steadi* and suggest contemporary gene flow does not occur or is extremely rare.
8. **Abbott & Double (2003b)** used DNA sequencing of the mitochondrial control region to show *cauta* and *steadi* are very closely related. However, *cauta* and *steadi* did not share any of the 37 haplotypes (sequence types) recovered.
9. **Abbott et al. (in press)** used a DNA-based test to identify shy-type (*cauta* or *steadi*) bycatch specimens returned from Australian, South African and New Zealand fisheries. No *cauta* were detected outside Australian waters. Adult and subadult *T. steadi* were identified from Australian waters and all adult and subadults recovered from South African and New Zealand waters were *steadi*.

Assessment of diagnosability (cf. Attachment One; Section3)

Based on data provided in the studies described above:

- A. Same age/sex individuals of *T. cauta* and *T. steadi* **can** be distinguished by one or more qualitative differences.
- B. Same age/sex individuals of *T. cauta* and *T. steadi* **cannot** be distinguished by a complete discontinuity in one or more continuously varying characters.

AC2 FINAL REPORT

- C. Same age/sex individuals of *T. cauta* and *T. steadi* **can** be distinguished by a combination of two or three functionally independent characters.

Decision

These taxa satisfy two of the diagnosability criteria described in Attachment One: Section 3, Criterion A: taxa can be separated by a single qualitative trait (mitochondrial sequences); Section 3, Criterion C: using a combination of two independent traits (morphometric measurements and bill coloration) all adults can be accurately diagnosed. We also recognise that taxa have been shown to be genetically distinct and behave differently. Adult *steadi* disperse widely outside the breeding season and frequently reach South African waters. In contrast, adult *cauta* always remain close to their breeding islands. Also despite *steadi* being very common in the Australian waters close to the breeding colonies of *cauta*, no gene flow is detectable. We therefore recommend that these taxa warrant specific status. These taxa are recognised as follows (*cf.* Table One):

Thalassarche cauta (shy albatross)

Thalassarche steadi (white-capped albatross)

This nomenclature follows Robertson & Nunn (1998).

Comments

These studies clearly show that *T. cauta* and *T. steadi* have diverged recently in evolutionary terms but the fact that they are divergent is indisputable. This divergence, however, has not been manifested in a plumage difference immediately apparent to a human observer. This is, in our opinion, the primary reason why many are reluctant to recognise *cauta* and *steadi* either at the subspecific or specific level. In contrast, Chatham and Salvin's albatrosses (*T. eremita* and *T. salvini*) show a similar level of genetic divergence (Abbott & Double 2003b) to *cauta* and *steadi* but because plumage differences between adults are immediately apparent they are more commonly recognised as 'good species'. In our opinion this approach is inconsistent, anthropocentric, and will underestimate biological diversity. To facilitate later taxonomic assessments and, importantly, the identification of bycatch specimens or albatrosses at-sea, a detailed quantitative comparative analysis of subadult plumage for these taxa would be highly valuable as would a more detailed study of the foraging distribution of adult *steadi* and of subadults of both species.

Future work for the ACAP Taxonomy Group

No species list should necessarily be static and the ACAP Taxonomy Working Group will carefully consider all future publications that describe the biology of albatrosses and petrels and will revisit all decisions when appropriate.

This taxonomic process is not only useful for producing a practical, defensible and consistent list of species for ACAP but also to summarise available data and highlight gaps in our current biological knowledge. We therefore think that the WG should review the evidence supporting the specific status of all the following pairs of taxa before the next AC meeting (this list is not presented in any specific order):

1. Buller's and Pacific albatrosses
2. Northern royal albatrosses and southern royal albatrosses

AC2 FINAL REPORT

3. Indian yellow-nosed albatrosses and Atlantic yellow-nosed albatrosses
4. Chatham albatrosses and Salvin's albatrosses
5. Northern giant-petrels and southern giant-petrels
6. Black petrels and Westland petrels
7. White-chinned petrels and spectacled petrels

These taxa were chosen from those taxa listed by ACAP because they are thought to be the most closely related taxon pairs not yet reviewed by the Taxonomy WG. Inclusion on this list does not imply that the WG suspects their current taxonomic status should be amended. However, the taxonomic status of these taxa has been questioned by others (e.g. Penhallurick & Wink 2004) and therefore it is prudent for the WG to review the taxonomic literature pertinent to these taxa so that ACAP's current species list is justifiable.

The Working Group will also question whether the rank of subspecies reflects genetic diversity in procellariiform seabirds (see review by Phillipmore & Owens 2006) and, if so, develop taxonomic guidelines for the recognition of subspecific status.

This taxonomic process has also highlighted the benefits of access to primary data. In genetics, almost all published DNA sequences are submitted to a web-based, public, searchable database (e.g. www.ncbi.nih.gov). This approach allows data to be permanently available for review and re-analysis (e.g. Penhallurick & Wink 2004; Alderman *et al.* 2005), and no information is lost when researchers retire or data storage mechanisms become obsolete. A similar approach has been adopted by Birdlife International who now archives extremely valuable satellite tracking data of procellariiform seabirds collected by 18 research groups from nine countries. We believe a similar approach is necessary for morphometric and plumage data. Such data cannot be fully presented in scientific presentations and information is inevitably lost when data are summarised. The Taxonomy Working Group suggest that ACAP should consider the development an archival database for morphometric and plumage characteristics of listed species and approach researchers to submit their data to this database. Such a resource will facilitate the characterisation of biological diversity, the identification of bycatch specimens, the taxonomic process, and the long-term storage of valuable data.

Attachments Two and Three include a revised TOR and WG workplan to be considered by the AC should the AC endorse the future work outlined above.

AC2 FINAL REPORT

Table

TABLE ONE. PROPOSED STANDARD LIST OF TAXA TO BE RECOGNISED BY PARTIES TO THE AGREEMENT ON THE CONSERVATION OF ALBATROSSES AND PETRELS (ACAP)

FAMILY DIOMEDEIDAE ALBATROSSES		
1	<i>Diomedea exulans</i>	Wandering Albatross
2	<i>Diomedea dabbenena</i>	Tristan Albatross
3	<i>Diomedea antipodensis antipodensis</i>	Antipodean Albatross
4	<i>Diomedea antipodensis gibsoni</i>	Gibson's Albatross
5	<i>Diomedea amsterdamensis</i>	Amsterdam Albatross
6	<i>Diomedea epomophora</i>	Southern Royal Albatross
7	<i>Diomedea sanfordi</i>	Northern Royal Albatross
8	<i>Phoebastria irrorata</i>	Waved Albatross
9	<i>Thalassarche cauta</i>	Shy Albatross
10	<i>Thalassarche steadi</i>	White-capped Albatross
11	<i>Thalassarche salvini</i>	Salvin's Albatross
12	<i>Thalassarche eremita</i>	Chatham Albatross
13	<i>Thalassarche bulleri bulleri</i>	Buller's Albatross
14	<i>Thalassarche bulleri platei</i>	Pacific Albatross
15	<i>Thalassarche chrysostoma</i>	Grey-headed Albatross
16	<i>Thalassarche melanophrys</i>	Black-browed Albatross
17	<i>Thalassarche impavida</i>	Campbell Albatross
18	<i>Thalassarche carteri</i>	Indian Yellow-nosed Albatross
19	<i>Thalassarche chlororhynchos</i>	Atlantic Yellow-nosed Albatross
20	<i>Phoebetria fusca</i>	Sooty Albatross
21	<i>Phoebetria palpebrata</i>	Light-mantled Albatross
FAMILY PROCELLARIIDAE - PETRELS		
22	<i>Macronectes giganteus</i>	Southern Giant-petrel
23	<i>Macronectes halli</i>	Northern Giant-petrel
24	<i>Procellaria aequinoctialis</i>	White-chinned Petrel
25	<i>Procellaria conspicillata</i>	Spectacled Petrel
26	<i>Procellaria parkinsoni</i>	Black Petrel
27	<i>Procellaria westlandica</i>	Westland Petrel
28	<i>Procellaria cinerea</i>	Grey Petrel

Taxa considered in this report are shaded in grey.

AC2 FINAL REPORT

References

- Abbott, C. A., Double, M. C., Baker, G. B., Gales, R., Lashko, A., Robertson, C. J. R. & Ryan, P. G. (in press). Molecular provenance analysis for shy and white-capped albatrosses killed by fisheries interactions in Australia, New Zealand and South Africa. *Conservation Genetics*.
- Abbott, C. L. & Double, M. C. (2003a). Genetic structure, conservation genetics, and evidence of speciation by range expansion in shy and white-capped albatrosses. *Molecular Ecology* **12**:2953-2962.
- Abbott, C. L. & Double, M. C. (2003b). Phylogeography of shy and white-capped albatrosses inferred from mitochondrial DNA sequences: implications for population history and taxonomy. *Molecular Ecology* **12**:2747-2758.
- Alderman, R., Double, M. C., Valencia, J. & Gales, R. P. (2005). Genetic affinities of newly sampled populations of wandering and black-browed albatross. *EMU* **105**:169-179.
- Birdlife International (2004). 'Tracking Ocean Wanderers: the global distribution of albatrosses and petrels. Results from the Global Procellariiform Tracking Workshop, 1-5 September, 2003, Gordon's Bay, South Africa.' (Birdlife International: Cambridge UK).
- Brooke, M. (2004). 'Albatrosses and petrels across the world.' (Oxford University Press: Oxford).
- Brothers, N., Gales, R., Hedd, A. & Robertson, G. (1998). Foraging movements of the shy albatross *Diomedea cauta* breeding in Australia - implications for interactions with longline fisheries. *Ibis* **140**:446-457.
- Brothers, N. P., Reid, T. A. & Gales, R. P. (1997). At-sea distribution of shy albatrosses *Diomedea cauta cauta* derived from records of band recoveries and colour-marked birds. *Emu* **97**:231-239.
- Burg, T. M. & Croxall, J. P. (2001). Global relationships amongst black-browed and grey-headed albatrosses: analysis of population structure using mitochondrial DNA and microsatellites. *Molecular Ecology* **10**:2647-2660.
- Burg, T. M. & Croxall, J. P. (2004). Global population structure and taxonomy of the wandering albatross species complex. *Molecular Ecology* **13**:2345-2355.
- Croxall, J. P. & Gales, R. (1998). An assessment of the conservation status of albatrosses. In: 'Albatross Biology and Conservation' (Ed. G. Robertson & R. Gales.) pp. 46-65. Surrey Beatty & Sons: Chipping Norton.
- Croxall, J. P., Prince, P. A., Rothery, P. & Wood, A. G. (1998). Population changes in albatrosses at South Georgia. In: 'Albatross Biology and Conservation' (Ed. G. Robertson & R. Gales.) pp. 69-83. Surrey Beatty & Sons: Chipping Norton.
- Cuthbert, R., Ryan, P. G., Cooper, J. & Hilton, G. (2003a). Demography and population trends of the Atlantic yellow-nosed albatross. *Condor* **105**:439-452.
- Cuthbert, R. J., Phillips, R. A. & Ryan, P. G. (2003b). Separating the Tristan albatross and the wandering albatross using morphometric measurements. *Waterbirds* **26**:338-344.
- Double, M. C., Gales, R., Reid, T., Brothers, N. & Abbott, C. L. (2003). Morphometric comparison of Australian shy and New Zealand white-capped albatrosses. *Emu* **103**:287-294.
- Elliott, G. & Walker, K. (2005). Detecting population trends of Gibson's and antipodean albatrosses. *Notornis* **52**:215-222.
- Gales, R. (1998). Albatross populations: status and threats. In: 'Albatross Biology and Conservation' (Ed. G. Robertson & R. Gales.) pp. 20-45. Surrey Beatty & Sons: Chipping Norton.

AC2 FINAL REPORT

- Gibson, J. D. (1967). The wandering albatross (*Diomedea exulans*): Results of banding and observations in New South Wales coastal waters and the Tasman Sea. *Notornis* **14**:47-57.
- González-Solís, J., Croxall, J. P. & Briggs, D. R. (2002). Activity patterns of giant petrels, *Macronectes* spp., using different foraging strategies. *Marine Biology* **140**:197-204.
- Hedd, A., Gales, R. & Brothers, N. (2001). Foraging strategies of shy albatross *Thalassarche cauta* breeding at Albatross Island, Tasmania, Australia. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **224**:267-282.
- Helbig, A. J., Knox, A. K., Parkin, D. T., Sangster, G. & Collinson, M. (2002). Guidelines for assigning species rank. *Ibis* **144**:518-525.
- Holdaway, R. N., Worthy, T. H. & Tennyson, A. J. D. (2001). A working list of breeding bird species of the New Zealand region at first human contact [Review]. *New Zealand Journal of Zoology* **28**:119-187.
- Isaac, N. J. B., Mallet, J. & Mace, G. M. (2004). Taxonomic inflation: its influence on macroecology and conservation. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **19**:464-469.
- Marchant, S. & Higgins, P. J. (1990). 'Handbook of Australia, New Zealand and Antarctic birds.' (Oxford University Press: Melbourne).
- Medway, D. G. (1993). The identity of the Chocolate Albatross *Diomedea spadicea* of Gmelin, 1789 and of the Wandering Albatross *Diomedea exulans* of Linnaeus, 1758. *Notornis* **40**:145-162.
- Murphy, R. C. 1936. Oceanic birds of South America. American Museum of Natural History: New York.
- Nel, D. C., Taylor, F., Ryan, P. G. & Cooper, J. (2003). Population dynamics of the wandering albatross *Diomedea exulans* at Marion Island: Longline fishing and environmental influences. *African Journal of Marine Science* **25**:503-517.
- Nicholls, D. G., Murray, M. D., Elliott, G. P. & Walker, K. J. (1996). Satellite tracking of a wandering albatross from the Antipodes Islands, New Zealand to South America. *Corella* **20**:28.
- Nunn, G. B., Cooper, J., Jouventin, P., Robertson, C. J. R. & Robertson, G. G. (1996). Evolutionary relationships among extant albatrosses (Procellariiformes: Diomedidae) established from complete cytochrome-b gene sequences. *Auk* **113**:784-801.
- Nunn, G. B. & Stanley, S. E. (1998). Body size effects and rates of cytochrome b evolution in tube-nosed seabirds. *Molecular Biology & Evolution* **15**:1360-1371.
- Onley, D. & Bartle, S. (1999). 'Identification of seabirds of the Southern Ocean: a guide for scientific observers aboard fishing vessels.' (Te Papa Press: Wellington, New Zealand).
- Penhallurick, J. & Wink, M. (2004). Analysis of the taxonomy and nomenclature of the Procellariiformes based on complete nucleotide sequences of the mitochondrial cytochrome *b* gene. *Emu* **104**:125-147.
- Phillimore, A. B. & Owens, I. P. F. (2006). Are subspecies useful in evolutionary and conservation biology. *Proceedings of the Royal Society Biological Sciences Series B* **273**:1049-1053.
- Rheindt, F. E. & Austin, J. J. (2005). Major analytical and conceptual shortcomings in a recent taxonomic revision of the Procellariiformes - a reply to Penhallurick and Wink (2004). *Emu* **105**:181-186.
- Robertson, C. J. & Nunn, G. B. (1998). Towards a new taxonomy for albatrosses. In: 'Albatross biology and conservation' (Ed. G. Robertson & R. Gales.) pp. 13-19. Surrey Beatty & Sons: Chipping Norton.
- Robertson, C. J. R. (2002). The scientific name of the Indian yellow-nosed albatross *Thalassarche carteri*. *Marine Ornithology* **30**:48-49.

AC2 FINAL REPORT

- Robertson, C. J. R. & Warham, J. (1992). Nomenclature of the New Zealand Wandering Albatrosses *Diomedea exulans*. *Bulletin of the British Ornithologists' Club* **112**:74-81.
- Robertson, C. J. R. & Warham, J. (1994). Measurements of *Diomedea exulans antipodensis* and *D. e. gibsoni*. *Bulletin of the British Ornithologists' Club* **114**:132-134.
- Robertson, G. & Gales, R. (1998). 'Albatross biology and conservation.' (Surrey Beatty: Chipping Norton).
- Roux, J.-P., Jouventin, P., Mouglin, J.-L., Stahl, J.-C. & Weimerskirch, H. (1983). Un nouvelle albatros *Diomedea amsterdamensis* n. sp. decouvert sur l'île Amsterdam (37° 50'S, 77°35'E). *Oiseau Revue fr. Orn.* **53**:1-11.
- Ryan, P. G., Keith, D. G. & Kroese, M. (2002). Seabird bycatch by longline fisheries off southern Africa, 1998-2000. *South African Journal of Marine Science* **24**:103-110.
- Shirihai, H. (2002). 'A complete guide to Antarctic wildlife.' (Alula Press: Degerby, Finland).
- Tickell, W. L. N. (2000). 'Albatrosses.' (Pica Press: Sussex, UK).
- Walker, K. & Elliott, G. (1999). Population changes and biology of the Wandering Albatross *Diomedea exulans gibsoni* at the Auckland Islands. *Emu* **99**:239-247.
- Walker, K. & Elliott, G. (2005). Population changes and biology of the Antipodean wandering albatross (*Diomedea antipodensis*). *Notornis* **52**:206-214.
- Walker, K., Elliott, G., Nicholls, D., Murray, D. & Dilks, P. (1995). Satellite tracking of wandering albatross (*Diomedea exulans*) from the Auckland Islands: preliminary results. *Notornis* **42**:127-137.
- Warham, J. (1990). 'The petrels - their ecology and breeding systems.' (Academic Press: London).
- Weimerskirch, H., Brothers, N. & Jouventin, P. (1997). Population dynamics of wandering albatross *Diomedea exulans* and Amsterdam albatross *D. amsterdamensis* in the Indian Ocean and their relationships with long-line fisheries - conservation implications. *Biological Conservation* **79**:257-270.
- Weimerskirch, H., Guionnet, T., Martin, J., Shaffer, S. A. & Costa, D. P. (2000). Fast and fuel efficient? Optimal use of wind by flying albatrosses. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series B-Biological Sciences* **267**:1869-1874.
- Xavier, J. C., Trathan, P. N., Croxall, J. P., Wood, A. G., Podesta, G. & Rodhouse, P. G. (2004). Foraging ecology and interactions with fisheries of wandering albatrosses (*Diomedea exulans*) breeding at South Georgia. *Fisheries Oceanography* **13**:324-344.

AC2 FINAL REPORT

ATTACHMENT ONE

GUIDELINES FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF SPECIES BOUNDARIES AMONG TAXA LISTED BY THE AGREEMENT ON THE CONSERVATION OF ALBATROSSES AND PETRELS (ACAP)

TAXONOMIC WORKING GROUP OF ACAP

Introduction

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 taxonomy of albatross and petrel species covered by the Agreement.

The objective of this Working Group (WG) is to establish a transparent, defensible and highly consultative taxonomic listing process. The Scientific Meeting (MOP1; ScM1; Section 4.3) stated that "...given the importance that species lists have upon conservation policy and scientific communication, taxonomic decisions must be based on robust and defensible criteria. It is important to resolve differences in a scientific and transparent manner with appropriate use of peer-reviewed publications."

The guidelines to identify species boundaries among taxa listed by ACAP are listed below. These guidelines are largely based on those presented by Helbig *et al.* (2002). This document should not be considered an original piece of work but an adaptation of the guidelines presented by Helbig *et al.* (2002).

It is worth recalling the following paragraph written by Helbig *et al.* (2002) when reading these guidelines:

"No species concept so far proposed is completely objective or can be used without the application of judgement in borderline cases. This is an inevitable consequence of the artificial partitioning of the continuous processes of evolution and speciation into discrete steps. It would be a mistake to believe that the adoption of any particular species concept will eliminate subjectivity in reaching decisions."

Species concepts

Helbig *et al.* (2002) adopt the General Lineage Concept (GLC: de Queiroz 1998; de Queiroz 1999) a concept very similar to the Evolutionary Species Concept (ESC: Mayden 1997) but stresses that "differences between concepts are largely a matter of emphasis" and that the tenets of other common concepts such as the Biological Species Concept, the Phylogenetic Species Concept (PSC: Cracraft 1983) and the Recognition Species Concept are largely encompassed by the GLC.

The General Lineage Concept defines species as:

"...population lineages maintaining their integrity with respect to other lineages through time and space; this means the species are diagnosably different (otherwise we could not recognize them), reproductively isolated (otherwise they

AC2 FINAL REPORT

would not maintain their integrity on contact) and members of each (sexual) species share a common mate recognition and fertilization system (otherwise they would not be able to reproduce)." (Helbig *et al.* 2002)

Helbig *et al.* (2002) state that to produce a practical taxonomy for West Palaearctic birds the species definition must only include taxa "for which we are reasonably certain that they will retain their integrity no matter what other taxa they encounter in the future."

The WG considers this criterion difficult or impossible to apply to predominantly allopatric taxa such as procellariiform seabirds. The WG therefore restrict its considerations to only the first of the two questions posed by Helbig *et al.* (2002) in order to delimit species. They were:

1. Are the taxa diagnosable?
2. Are they likely to retain their genetic and phenotypic integrity in the future?

By adopting this strategy the WG applies the less stringent GLC (de Queiroz 1998; de Queiroz 1999) and ESC (Wiley 1978) which recognise species that are currently maintaining their integrity but "do not require species to maintain their integrity in the future" (Helbig *et al.* 2002).

Below we list a set of guidelines the WG will use to decide if taxa are diagnosable and if they therefore warrant specific status.

Guidelines to identify species (Diagnosibility)

Taxon diagnosis is based on characters or character states. Characters used in diagnosis must be considered, or preferably shown to have a strong genetic (heritable) component and not likely to be the product of environmental differences. Characters known to evolve rapidly in response to latitude must be considered less informative e.g. morphometrics, timing of breeding and moult patterns.

In the assessment of diagnostic characters the WG, whenever possible, will only consider primary data published in peer reviewed journals. Conclusions drawn by such studies must be supported by appropriate statistical analyses. Once established the Taxonomy WG will aim to maintain the stability of the ACAP List of Taxa. Modifications to the List will only be considered when a study published in a peer-reviewed journal suggests change.

As stated by Helbig *et al.* (2002), taxa are diagnosable if:

A) "Individuals of at least one age/sex can be distinguished from the same age/sex class of all other taxa by at least one qualitative difference. This means that the individuals will possess one or more discrete characters that members of the other taxa lack. Qualitative differences refer to presence/absence of a feature (as opposed to a discontinuity in a continuously varying character)."

B) "At least one age/sex class is separated by a complete discontinuity in at least one continuously varying character (e.g. wing length) from the same age/sex class of otherwise similar taxa. By complete discontinuity we mean that there is no overlap with regard to the

AC2 FINAL REPORT

character in question between two taxa.” To detect a discontinuity the number of individuals compared should be based on sound judgement.

C) “If there is no single diagnostic character we regard a taxon as statistically diagnosable if individuals of at least one age/sex class can be clearly distinguished from individuals of all other taxa by a combination of two or three functionally independent characters.” Body measurements are not considered independent characters.

A useful example here is the one presented by Helbig *et al.* (2002). *Larus michahellis* and *L. armenicus* “can be distinguished by a combination of wing-tip pattern, darkness of mantle and mtDNA haplotypes, although none of these characters is diagnostic on its own.”

Because of the difficulties assessing reproductive isolation in allopatric taxa Helbig *et al.* (2002) apply more stringent criteria to allopatric than sympatric taxa. They suggest that allopatric taxa should be recognised as species only if “they are fully diagnosable in each of several discrete or continuously variable characters relating to different function contexts, e.g. structural features, plumage colours, vocalisations, DNA sequences, and the sum of the character differences corresponds to or exceeds the level of divergence seen in related species that exist in sympatry.”

References

- Amadon, D. (1966). The superspecies concept. *Systematic Zoology* **15**:245-249.
- Cracraft, J. (1983). Species concepts and speciation analysis. *Current Ornithology* **1**:159-187.
- de Queiroz, K. (1998). The general lineage concept of species, species criteria, and the process of speciation. In: 'Endless forms: species and speciation' (Ed. D. J. Howard & S. H. Berlocher) Oxford University Press, New York.
- de Queiroz, K. (1999). The general lineage concept of species and the defining properties of the species category. In: 'Species: New Interdisciplinary Essays' (Ed. R. A. Wilson.) pp. 49-89. MIT Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Helbig, A. J., Knox, A. K., Parkin, D. T., Sangster, G. & Collinson, M. (2002). Guidelines for assigning species rank. *Ibis* **144**:518-525.
- Mayden, R. L. (1997). A hierarchy of species concepts: the denouement in the saga of the species problem. In: 'Species: the Units of Biodiversity' (Ed. M. F. Claridge, H. A. Dawah & M. R. Wilson.) Chapman & Hall Ltd: London.
- Shirihai, H. (2002). 'A complete guide to Antarctic wildlife.' (Alula Press: Degerby, Finland).
- Short, L. L. (1969). Taxonomic aspects of avian hybridization. *Auk* **86**:84-105.
- Sibley, C. G. & Monroe, B. L. (1990). 'Distribution and Taxonomy of Birds of the World.' (Yale University Press: New Haven & London).
- Wiley, E. O. (1978). The evolutionary species concept reconsidered. *Systematic Zoology* **27**:17-26.

AC2 FINAL REPORT

ATTACHMENT TWO

WORKING GROUP TO REVIEW THE TAXONOMY OF ALBATROSSES AND PETRELS LISTED ON ANNEX I OF THE AGREEMENT

TERMS OF REFERENCE (REVISED FOR CONSIDERATION BY AC)

Article IX 6 (b) of the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP) requires the Advisory Committee to “endorse a standard reference text listing the taxonomy and maintain a listing of taxonomic synonyms for all species covered by the Agreement”. This reflects the current state of flux in the taxonomy of Procellariiformes and, in particular, of albatrosses.

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 Taxonomy of albatross and petrel species covered by the Agreement.

The terms of reference for the group are to:

1. establish a transparent, defensible and highly consultative listing process for the recognition of taxa of albatrosses and petrels listed under Annex 1 of the Agreement.
2. review the specific status of all taxa of albatrosses and petrels listed under Annex 1 of the Agreement;
3. collate and maintain a bibliographic database for published scientific papers relevant to the taxonomy of ACAP listed species;
4. develop and maintain a morphometric database of albatrosses and petrels to assist in taxonomic assessments and ensure long-term storage of valuable data in accordance with agreed data confidentiality arrangements;
5. report to the Meeting of Parties through the Advisory Committee on taxonomic assessments as appropriate.

AC2 FINAL REPORT

ATTACHMENT THREE

WORKING GROUP TO REVIEW THE TAXONOMY OF ALBATROSSES AND PETRELS LISTED ON ANNEX I OF THE AGREEMENT

WORK PROGRAM

Membership of Working Group

Party / Signatory/ Observer	Member	Organisation / position
Australia	Mike Double, CHAIR	Australian National University
New Zealand	Geoff Chambers	University of Wellington
South Africa	Peter Ryan	University of Cape Town
United Kingdom	Mark Tasker	Joint Nature Conservation Committee
Birdlife International	Michael Brooke	Birdlife International

Timetable of progress

Action	Completed by	Responsibility
Review the evidence supporting the specific status of the following taxa: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buller's and Pacific albatrosses • Northern royal albatrosses and southern royal albatrosses • Indian yellow-nosed albatrosses & Atlantic yellow-nosed albatrosses • Chatham albatrosses & Salvin's albatrosses • Northern giant-petrels & southern giant-petrels • Black petrels & Westland petrels • White-chinned petrels & spectacled petrels 	2006/2007	WG Chair
To migrate the WG's web site to ACAP Secretariat	2006/2007	WG Chair
Assess the utility of the subspecies rank for ACAP purposes and if appropriate develop guidelines for the recognition of subspecific status	2006/2007	WG Chair
To construct a morphological and plumage database, then canvas for, collate, archive and summarise available data	Ongoing	WG Chair
Maintain the WG's bibliographic database of published scientific papers relevant to the taxonomic status of ACAP listed taxa	Ongoing	WG Chair
Develop and provide advice to AC on the construction and maintenance of species lists as appropriate	Ongoing	WG
Provide annual reports to AC on WG activities	Ongoing	WG Chair
To draft resolutions (when necessary) for amendments to the species list in Annex 1 of the Agreement	Ongoing	AC

REPORT OF THE BREEDING SITES WORKING GROUP MEETING

2 JUNE 2006

1. Introduction

Participants in the meeting of the Breeding Sites Working Group (BSWG) were Susan Waugh (New Zealand, Chair), Barry Baker*, Rosemary Gales, Mike Double (Australia), Onildo Joao Marine Filho*, Claudia Rocha Campos, Tatiana Neves, Leonardo V. Mohr (Brazil), Anjali Pande, Johanna Pierre (New Zealand), John Cooper* (South Africa), Mark Tasker*, Richard Phillips (United Kingdom), Kim Rivera (United States of America), (*National coordinators). Mike Double and Anjali Pande acted as rapporteurs.

2. Progress to date

Data were submitted for 168 of approximately 300 of the known breeding areas of ACAP species by Argentina, Australia, France, South Africa, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom. Data were submitted for 19 species. These data were used for testing the database and to produce extracts to illustrate the kinds of analyses that could be undertaken from the database. Data submissions took place very close to the closing date for the report (12 May 2006) therefore detailed analyses were not completed. It is significant to note however, that information on a broad range of sites and species is now compiled, and intersessional work will allow the BSWG to advance the work programme considerably before the next Advisory Committee meeting.

Extensive commentary was received from the BSWG members during testing, of the database and modifications made to the database structure and functionality to address relatively minor issues identified by users relating to the ease of data entry.

The BSWG agreed to accelerate the data submission deadlines, given the significant data contributions provided to date, and the need to produce comprehensive analyses of the information in time to contribute to reporting of the Status and Trends Working Group. Outstanding data would be sought from Parties prior to the end of 2006.

Data remained to be submitted for the following Breeding-Range States: Chile, Ecuador, and data for a number of sites remained outstanding for the remaining Breeding-Range States. The BSWG noted that the SCAR Group of Experts on Birds (SCAR-GEB) had not yet submitted any data but it was acknowledged that SCAR-GEB had encountered technical problems with the database. John Cooper, as a member of SCAR-GEB, agreed to enable the submission of data to the Breeding Sites database before the end of 2006.

3. Membership

The current membership of the Breeding Sites Working Group is appended in Annex 1.

AC2 FINAL REPORT

4. Review Terms of Reference and future direction

The BSWG agreed that the Terms of Reference (TOR) indicate that fisheries mortality and other marine-based threats were outside the scope of the BSWG and therefore should be removed from the list of threats.

The BSWG agreed that the TOR needed to include an updating and review process.

In relation to the work programme, the BSWG agreed that outstanding data could largely be submitted by December 2006.

The BSWG reviewed the TOR and identified the need to add a review to the TOR periodically. A revised work programme was therefore agreed:

1. Recommend data submission proforma
2. Identify suitable database structure
3. Collate and submit data and populate database
4. Conduct gap analyses to identify requirements for additional data for sites
5. Collect additional data to fill gaps and complete review
6. Coordinate with the ACAP Status and Trends Working Group, especially with respect to database structure.

The TOR should be reviewed periodically, as appropriate.

5. Revised work programme

The BSWG agreed to the following revised work programme. This would allow coordination of analyses between the BSWG and the Status and Trends Working Group, and reporting of these at the third Advisory Committee.

Action	To be completed *already complete	Responsibility
Advise national coordinators	October 2005*	Parties and Signatories (Breeding Range States)
Examine options for data storage and access to information	November 2005*	Chair and WG members
Adopt terms of reference	December 2005*	Parties and Signatories (Breeding Range States)
Confirm a database format for use by ACAP	December 2005*	Chair and WG members
Revise proformas and implement data compilation	March 2006*	
Conduct initial gap analysis	May 2006*	
Data submission from Parties 1 st tranche (1/2 of available data) 2 nd tranche (remaining data) 3 rd tranche (newly collected data)	May 2006* December 2006 Annually	Parties and Signatories (Breeding Range States)
Report on the assessment of database structure and data quality issues and recommend analyses for prioritisation	June 2006*	Chair and WG members
Request a list of breeding sites from parties	July 2006	Chair

AC2 FINAL REPORT

Revise the database lists and structures following the recommendations of the BSWG in June 2006	September 2006	Chair and WG member
Develop a list of alien species	July 2006	Chair and WG member
Develop analyses as set out in the report of the BSWG of June 2006	March 2007	Chair and WG member
Review analyses of data and gaps Recommend priority sites / threat management actions Recommend data-gathering priorities	June 2007 and ongoing	Chair and WG members
Work with other ACAP WGs to report on analyses of threats to ACAP species	June 2007 and ongoing	Chair and WG members

6. Definition of 'site'

The original definition suggested a breeding area could be a colony, an island or an island group and was loosely defined as 'a single species breeding locality'. It was reported that most data had been submitted at the island level, as opposed to island group or colony. It was suggested that the term 'site' be removed from the data submission process because of its ambiguity and be replaced with 'breeding area'.

The BSWG acknowledged that entering site data at finer than island level created difficulties when some within-island breeding areas were well-researched and others not. This would make data amalgamation to island level difficult if census data were not available for less well known breeding areas. This problem would also impact island level submissions, as island totals for species might be greater than the sum of well-researched breeding areas.

The BSWG agreed that the following guidelines describe the appropriate level of resolution required for data submission:

Data for the breeding sites (and status and trends) database are needed at the island level, or finer scale. Data may be entered at a finer scale than a whole island if suitable, particularly if the birds breed on continents or large islands (e.g. the Antarctic Continent, discrete parts of Kerguelen Island Group, or breeding areas within the South Island of New Zealand).

The BSWG agreed that these guidelines negated the need for a strict definition of 'breeding site'.

- The chair would work members to compile a complete list of breeding sites.

7. List of threats and consistency in threat levels

The BSWG agreed that the current list of threats needed to be reduced for ease of reporting and to facilitate meaningful analysis of data. The BSWG recognised that there were problems with consistency in assigning threat levels in the current database, and current submissions would likely result in misinterpretation. If the list of threats is changed then it was recommended that the database manager consult closely with all data providers to ensure accurate conversion of threat categories.

AC2 FINAL REPORT

The BSWG acknowledged that the database design must be able to accommodate potential listing of additional species by ACAP. The inclusion of data for species which were not listed was not recommended by the BSWG.

The BSWG agreed that the threats under consideration should be restricted to those impacting on birds at their breeding sites (i.e. not include threats encountered in the marine ecosystem such as plastic pollution, oil spills, or fishing mortality). The BSWG further agreed that the list of threats should not be restricted to anthropogenic threats and the following list was considered appropriate:

Category	Examples
Human disturbance	tourism, science, recreation, military action
Human take	hunting, poaching
Natural disaster	flood, volcanic activity, lightning strike
Disease	pathogens, parasites
Habitat alteration by alien species	invasive plant species, grazing
Habitat alteration by humans	agriculture, extraction
Predation by alien species	rats, cats, mice
Change in impact by native species	increasing seal numbers altering habitat
Contamination at breeding site	toxic waste, plastics, onshore oil

The BSWG noted that the data will not have to be re-submitted to use the revised categories above. The previous list of threats would be condensed after consultation with those that have submitted data to the database. Within these main threat categories, provision would be made for detailing the specific nature of threats, e.g. whether human disturbance was by military action, tourism, or research activity.

The BSWG agreed that the concept of potential threats was removed from the definition of low-level threat, as this appeared to lead to inconsistencies between submitters in what should be considered a potential threat. Threats defined in the database should be those for which there was evidence of an impact on an ACAP breeding population or individuals.

The BSWG considered that predation by native predators (such as skuas and sheathbills) should not be considered a threat unless there was anthropogenic perturbation in the system that had led to an increase pressure from native predators.

Non-native species were not to be considered a threat except where there was direct evidence of impact on ACAP species. The BSWG considered it useful, however, to list those alien species that could potentially have adverse effects on ACAP species, in a separate part of the breeding area record, in order to keep track of which species were present at a site.

- A list of alien species of relevance to the ACAP species conservation status is to be developed.

The BSWG recommended the following specific definitions for levels of threat at breeding areas:

Low – An existing threat that may be causing a slow decline, or slowing the recovery of a population.

AC2 FINAL REPORT

Medium – An existing threat that is likely to cause a substantial decline, or substantially slow the recovery of a population.

High – An existing threat that is likely to be the main cause of a rapid or catastrophic decline, or reversal of recovery of a population, at a breeding area. The threat is likely to lead to the local extinction of a species from the breeding area.

- The BSWG noted that the Parties submitting data would need to be contacted to request re-assessment of low-level threats submitted.

8. Potential outcomes from the Breeding Sites database

The BSWG recognised that the database would be used initially to provide the following products:

1. The number/percent of a) global population of a species, and b) breeding areas affected by particular threats. This analysis would guide the assessment of which were the most significant threats.
2. A list of 'key' breeding areas requiring urgent management in order of priority for each Party and internationally. This list would be arrived at by a combination of the above analyses and expert opinion of the BSWG.
3. A list of breeding areas that require management plans.
4. The ability to compare the suite of threats that are affecting different classes of ACAP-listed species – for example surface-nesting species and burrow-nesting species.

The BSWG noted that there was merit in carrying out a range of analyses along the themes of those listed above, and that these should be considered by the next meeting of the BSWG for further examination. It was recognised that national priorities would also have to be taken into account by Parties. Both national and international priority lists would require further assessment by the BSWG before submission to the Advisory Committee

- The Chair would work with members to develop / review a range of methodologies for these analyses intersessionally, and preliminary analyses would be circulated prior to the next meeting of the BSWG.

9. Publication

The BSWG agreed that simple summaries of the data within the database should be published on the ACAP website, where this was consistent with the TOR of the BSWG. It was noted that some data providers were sensitive to the general availability of the database and so it was considered unlikely that the full database would be made freely available.

- The Chair would work with the ACAP Secretariat to deliver database extracts and appropriate levels of access to Parties and via the ACAP website to the wider public.

10. Integration with Status and Trends WG

AC2 FINAL REPORT

The BSWG noted that there would be considerable benefit of a greater collaboration with the Status and Trends Working Group and this association will be discussed and developed in Status and Trends Working Group meeting. The need for compatibility of databases was recognised in the revisions to the detail of the BSWG database.

11. Gap analysis

A similar analysis to that described under threats prioritisation was considered appropriate to identify important gaps in the information contained in the database.

12. Software

The BSWG discussed the continued use of Microsoft Access, given one member's reports of high institutional licence fees. Fees became problematic, given the number of users required to contribute data to the database and verify its content. Other Working Group members did report difficulties with the use of Microsoft Access. Suggestions were put forward to resolve the issues identified by New Zealand, such as exporting tables which would allow data entry in Microsoft Excel.

The BSWG members agreed that it was not advisable to develop and implement an alternative, internet-based data entry interface given the high cost and time investment, and technical challenges that this would entail.

The BSWG agreed that data submissions in formats other than MS Access would not be accepted in the future.

13. Other matters

The members of the BSWG thanked New Zealand and the Chair of the BSWG in particular, for building the Breeding Sites Database and coordinating data submissions. The BSWG also thanked Anjali Pande of New Zealand for her significant contribution to the development of the database.

14. Recommendations from the Breeding Sites Working Group to the Advisory Committee

The BSWG recommend that the Advisory Committee:

- Accept the report of the BSWG, and the proposed work programme contained therein;
- Recommend changes to the TOR, as appropriate;
- Support the analyses proposed in Sections 6 and 11; and
- Transfer responsibility of the development and maintenance of the ACAP Breeding Sites Working Group Database to the ACAP Secretariat.

AC2 FINAL REPORT

Annex 1: List of Breeding Site Working Group members and other contacts

Breeding Range States	Working Group members (*National Coordinators)(# chair)
Argentina (National Coordinator TBC)	Flavio Quintana Maria Laura Tombesi
Australia	Barry Baker* Rosemary Gales
Chile	Marcelo Garcia Alvarado*
Ecuador (National Coordinator TBC)	Augusto Corriere Gabrielle Montoya
France	Henri Weimerskirch* Martine Bigan
New Zealand	Simon Banks* Susan Waugh#
Norway (National Coordinator TBC)	Oystein Storkersen
South Africa	John Cooper* Robert Crawford
United Kingdom	Mark Tasker* Richard Phillips
Signatories that are not Breeding Range States and Interested Non-Signatories	Contacts
Brazil	Onildo Marini-Filho
Peru	Liliana Gomez
Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (for Antarctic Continent)	Eric Woehler John Cooper
United States of America	Kim Rivera
BirdLife International	Ben Sullivan John Croxall

SEABIRD BYCATCH WORKING GROUP

TERMS OF REFERENCE & INDICATIVE WORK PROGRAMME

The Second Meeting of the Advisory Committee agreed to the establishment of a Working Group on Bycatch of albatrosses and petrels listed in Annex 1 of the Agreement.

Terms of Reference

1. Undertake actions that will assist in assessment, mitigation and reduction of negative interactions between fishing operations and albatrosses and petrels. Efforts to achieve this aim will include the provision of information and products to assist Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (RFMOs) and other relevant international and national bodies.
2. In developing solutions to reduce bycatch of albatrosses and petrels consideration will be given to ensure approaches to mitigation do not adversely affect other marine species.
3. The work of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group should broaden and enhance the existing work of other international and national bodies in the assessment, reduction and mitigation of seabird bycatch and conservation of albatrosses and petrels.
4. Develop a work programme for the above Terms of Reference, to be updated at each meeting of the Advisory Committee.

Indicative Work Program for the Seabird Bycatch Working Group

Develop a strategy for ACAP and Parties to engage and assist RFMOs and other relevant international and national bodies to assess and minimise bycatch of albatrosses and petrels.

Where required by the above strategy, and consistent with the overall recommendations of the Second Meeting of the Advisory Committee, the following work items will be undertaken:

1. Collate available information on the foraging distribution of ACAP species and the degree of spatial and temporal overlap with fisheries;
2. Review and utilise available information on foraging distribution and seabird bycatch to assess the risk of fishing operations on ACAP species in fishing regions (e.g. RFMO areas of competence, national EEZs);
3. Review information on mitigation measures for fishing methods known to impact albatrosses and petrels. Initial work shall focus on pelagic longline methods;
4. Develop products to assist RFMOs and other relevant international and national bodies in reducing seabird bycatch. These could include:
 - observer programme designs including protocols for the collection of seabird bycatch data,
 - analytical methods for assessing seabird bycatch, and
 - best-practice mitigation measures;

AC2 FINAL REPORT

5. Assist in the preparation, adoption and implementation of FAO NPOA-Seabirds, including the development of best-practice guidelines;
6. Develop materials and guidelines to assist ACAP representatives attending RFMO and other relevant meetings to maximise effective participation and consideration of issues relevant to ACAP.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME

The First Session of the Meeting of the Parties to ACAP (MOP1) established a work programme for the Advisory Committee for 2005-2007, set out in Annex 2 of Resolution 1.5. Progress against tasks in this work programme is shown in Attachment 1 to this paper.

Resolution 1.5 also provides for the revision of the work programme after each meeting of the Advisory Committee (point 3), with any amendments to be adopted by the Parties (via the Secretariat) using the intersessional voting procedures of the MOP.

The Advisory Committee work programme includes the following tasks. Progress with several of these tasks is reported in other papers to this meeting, as indicated below.

Task	Reference to Paper(s) for the first Advisory Committee Meeting (AC1)
1. Taxonomy Review	Doc.11 (Agenda 9.1)
2. Review of Status and Trends	Doc.10 (Agenda 8.1)
3. Protection of Breeding Sites and Status of Non-native Species	Doc.12 (Agenda 10.1)
4. Foraging Ranges and Overlap with Fisheries	Doc 13 (Agenda 11.1)
5. Assessment of impacts of threats	
6. Mitigation of threats	Doc (Agenda 11)
7. Criteria development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of internationally important breeding sites 	(Agenda 10.3)
• Addition of species to Annex 1	Doc 21 (Agenda 16)
9. Reporting for MOP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • System of indicators 	Doc.18 (Agenda 14.1)

ACTION BY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The Advisory Committee is invited to review and revise the work programme as appropriate.

AC2 FINAL REPORT

ATTACHMENT 1

ADVISORY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2006-2009 (Annex 2 of Resolution 1.5)						
	Task/Topic	Paragraphs of ACAP/MoP1/Doc. 15	Responsible group	Timeframe	Action	Status
1	Taxonomy Review					
1.1	Establishment of a working group to review the taxonomy of albatrosses	4.5	Interim Secretariat and Advisory Com.	By Jan 2005	AC to establish Working Group.	Completed
1.2	Development of terms of reference		AC	By Nov 2004	Chair of WG to develop terms of reference in conjunction with Secretariat and circulate to Advisory Committee	Completed
1.3	Develop draft report		AC	By July 2005	AC to prepare its final report for MOP2. Report includes a standard reference text listing the taxonomy.	Ongoing
1.4	Review the evidence supporting the specific status of selected ACAP taxa.		WG Chair	2006/2007	Review the evidence supporting the specific status of the following taxa: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buller's and Pacific Albatrosses • Northern Royal Albatrosses and Southern Royal Albatrosses • Indian Yellow-nosed Albatrosses & Atlantic Yellow-nosed Albatrosses • Chatham Albatrosses & Salvin's Albatrosses • Northern Giant-petrels & Southern Giant-petrels • Black Petrels & Westland Petrels • White-chinned Petrels & Spectacled Petrels 	Ongoing
1.5	To construct a morphological and plumage database		WG Chair	Ongoing	To construct a morphological and plumage database, then canvas for, collate, archive and summarise available data	Ongoing

AC2 FINAL REPORT

ADVISORY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2006-2009 (Annex 2 of Resolution 1.5)						
	Task/Topic	Paragraphs of ACAP/MoP1/ Doc. 15	Responsible group	Timeframe	Action	Status
1.6	Assess the utility of the subspecies rank for ACAP purposes		WG Chair	2006/2007	Assess the utility of the subspecies rank for ACAP purposes and if appropriate develop guidelines for the recognition of subspecific status	Ongoing
1.7	Maintain the WG's bibliographic database		WG Chair	AC3	Maintain the WG's bibliographic database	Ongoing
1.8	Provide annual reports to AC on WG activities		WG Chair	AC3	Provide annual reports to AC on WG activities	Ongoing
1.9	Write draft resolutions (when necessary) for amendments to the species list in Annex 1 of the Agreement		AC	AC3	To draft resolutions (when necessary) for amendments to the species list in Annex 1 of the Agreement	Ongoing
1.10	Migrate the Taxonomy WG website to the ACAP Secretariat		Chair	2006/2007	Migrate the Taxonomy WG website to the ACAP Secretariat	2006/07
2	Review of Status and Trends					
2.1	Establishment of a working group to review the status and trends of species in ACAP Annex 1	See Section 5	Interim Secretariat and AC	By March 2005	AC members to submit nominations and establish working group.	Completed
2.2	Development of terms of reference		AC	By Nov 2004	Chair of working group to develop terms of reference and circulate to AC for agreement.	Completed
2.3	Development of data proforma and database format	5.4	Australia	By August 2005	Proforma reviewed by WG.	Completed
2.4	Identify and review national coordinators to compile and submit data. Review coordinators as required.			By August 2005 and ongoing	Parties and Signatories to notify Sec. of national coordinators	Ongoing

AC2 FINAL REPORT

ADVISORY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2006-2009 (Annex 2 of Resolution 1.5)						
	Task/Topic	Paragraphs of ACAP/MoP1/Doc. 15	Responsible group	Timeframe	Action	Status
2.5	Data collation and submission. Request annual submissions	5.8-5.10	National Coord. and Australia	By Sept. 2005	Compiled data from Parties, Signatories, SCAR, BirdLife etc. to be submitted to Sec.	Ongoing
2.6	Populate database		Australia	AC2 and ongoing	Data entry.	Ongoing
2.7	Undertake initial gap analysis	5.2	WG	Prior AC2 meeting	WG review data and identify gaps and priorities	Ongoing
2.8	Population data collection		Parties and Signatories	2006/07	Encourage and support parties to initiate collection of priority data as identified and recommended by the Advisory Committee.	Ongoing
2.9	Determine frequency for data submission		S&T WG chair and WG and AC2	June 2006	Agree upon appropriate frequency of requests for data submission	AC2
2.10	Progress further development for data submission		S&T WG chair and WG	Jan-June 2007	Liase with Parties to ensure comprehensive data submission	Ongoing
2.11	Establish agreed process for analyses of trends		S&T WG chair and WG	Jan-Feb 2007	Continue assessment of relevant and appropriate statistical approaches to analyses of trend data	Ongoing
2.12	Develop proforma for ACAP species assessments		S&T WG chair and WG	Jan-March 2007	Refine draft of species assessment and circulate to WG for approval	Ongoing
2.13	Coordinate synthesis based on species conservation assessments		S&T WG chair and WG	July 2007	Develop executive summary of species assessments	Ongoing
2.14	Develop strategy of publication of species assessments in public domain – web, print, electronic		S&T WG chair and WG	July-Nov 2007	Finalise and implement communication strategy for species assessments	Ongoing

AC2 FINAL REPORT

ADVISORY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2006-2009 (Annex 2 of Resolution 1.5)						
	Task/Topic	Paragraphs of ACAP/MoP1/ Doc. 15	Responsible group	Timeframe	Action	Status
2.15	Consider amalgamation of Status and Trends WG and Breeding Sites WG		AC3	2007-09		
3	Protection of Breeding Sites and Status on Non-Native Species					
3.1	Advise national coordinators for BSWG		Parties and Signatories for BSWG (Breeding Range States)	October 2005	Contact Parties and Signatories and seek nominated National Coordinators	Ongoing
3.2	Examine options for data storage and access to information		Chair and BSWG members	November 2005	Examine a range of data storage options and formats, circulate these options to the BSWG for their comments	Completed
3.3	Adopt terms of reference		Parties and Signatories (Breeding Range States)	December 2005	Circulate the TOR to the Parties and Signatories and seek their views and any changes	Completed
3.4	Confirm a database format for use by ACAP		Chair and BSWG members	December 2005	Examine costing and implementation issues on agreed database format in 3.2 above	Completed
3.5	Revise proforma and implement data compilation		Chair and BSWG members	March 2006	Proformas circulated to BSWG members, seek data to test and populate the database partially for examination of its fitness-for-purpose	Completed

AC2 FINAL REPORT

ADVISORY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2006-2009 (Annex 2 of Resolution 1.5)						
	Task/Topic	Paragraphs of ACAP/MoP1/ Doc. 15	Responsible group	Timeframe	Action	Status
3.6	Conduct initial gap analysis		Chair and BSWG members	May 2006	Compile a comprehensive list of known breeding areas and identify those for which data are outstanding across the range of ACAP species and jurisdictions	Completed
3.7	Data submission from Parties 1 st tranche (1/2 available data) 2 nd tranche (remaining data) 3 rd tranche (newly collected data)		Parties and Signatories (Breeding Range States)	May 2006 Dec 2006 Annually	Seek data submissions from BSWG members	Completed for 2006
3.8	Report on the assessment of database structure and data quality issues and recommend analyses for prioritisation		Chair and BSWG members	June 2006	Examine data-entry interface and ability of the database structures to provide appropriate extracts to enable analyses, via feedback from the BSWG members	Completed
3.9	Request a list of breeding sites from parties		Chair and BSWG	July 2006	Seek detail on any outstanding breeding site details not already covered by submissions (site details remain outstanding for Chile, United Kingdom and Ecuador, and New Zealand)	Ongoing
3.10	Revise the database lists and structures following the recommendations of the BSWG in June 2006		Chair and BSWG	September 2006	Following feedback from the BSWG, revise the list of threats, species identified	Ongoing
3.11	Develop a list of alien species		Chair and BSWG	July 2006	A list will be derived that identifies any alien species of relevance to the conservation of ACAP species. This replaces the need for 'potential' threats to be identified for each alien species at the breeding sites.	Ongoing

AC2 FINAL REPORT

ADVISORY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2006-2009 (Annex 2 of Resolution 1.5)						
	Task/Topic	Paragraphs of ACAP/MoP1/ Doc. 15	Responsible group	Timeframe	Action	Status
3.12	Develop analyses as set out in the report of the BSWG of June 2006		Chair and BSWG	March 2007	Liaise with the BSWG to refine analyses to be conducted to meet item 3.13 of the work programme. Implement these analyses intersessionally with the BSWG	Ongoing
3.13	Review analyses of data and gaps. Recommend priority sites / threat management actions Recommend data-gathering priorities		Chair and BSWG members	June 2007 Prior to AC3	Review the range of analyses conducted under 3.12 at the BSWG meeting in 2007, and recommend priority sites / threat management actions and data gathering priorities for the AC	Ongoing
3.14	Work with other ACAP WGs to report on analyses of threats to ACAP species		Chair and BSWG members	June 2007 and ongoing	Report the analyses of WGs through agreed reporting formats (e.g. as set out in 2.13, 2.14 above)	Ongoing
X	Seabird Bycatch Working Group					
X.1	Analysing existing remote tracking data and complete initial reports on overlaps with fisheries	5.11, 6.24	AC	2006/07	Analyse the distribution data for all Annex 1 species. BirdLife contract to complete.	Ongoing
X.2	Continued tracking data collection and collation and analysis of overlap with fisheries	5.11, 6.24	ACAP WGs	2007/09	Support and encourage tracking data collections for Annex 1 species as identified by existing gap analysis. Encourage submission to the Global Tracking Database of BirdLife International. Analyse overlap with fishing distribution.	Ongoing
X.3	Confirm the indicative work programme of the SBWG		Chair and SBWG	End 2006	Develop work programme for the working group, also taking account of relevant items from previous ACAP Work programmes	Ongoing
X.4	Convene workshop		SBWG	2008/09?	Convene workshop with RFMOs to identify areas of key overlap with foraging areas. Workshop report produced by Year 3.	Not started
6	Management of Land Based Threats					

AC2 FINAL REPORT

ADVISORY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2006-2009 (Annex 2 of Resolution 1.5)						
	Task/Topic	Paragraphs of ACAP/MoP1/ Doc. 15	Responsible group	Timeframe	Action	Status
6.1	Produce best-practice conservation guidelines for ACAP Species breeding sites		BSWG	2007/09	Identify and access information from current and planned programs that address land-based threats. Information currently derived via national reports. Encourage and support adoption of existing and appropriate mitigation measures and/or eradication programs.	
6.2	Undertake protection measures for breeding sites		Parties & Signatories	2006/09	Encourage and support Parties & Signatories to enhance protection status of breeding sites where required. Minimise and where possible eliminate threats at breeding sites. Plan and secure funding for eradication of non-natives at priority sites.	Ongoing
7	Criteria Development					
7.1	Identification of Internationally Important Breeding Sites	6.1	IASOS	By AC3	Preparation of discussion paper based on review of existing criteria that may assist in development of new criteria to identify Internationally Important Breeding Sites critical for Annex 1 species	Ongoing
7.2	Develop a system of indicators for the success of the ACAP Agreement		BirdLife, South Africa and New Zealand	2007/09	Develop a system of indicators to measure the collective success of the Parties to the Agreement [ACAP IX(6)(f)].	Ongoing
7.3	Develop a framework to guide the listing of species in Annex 1.	7.3	South Africa & Australia	2007 for revised version	Continue to develop the framework	Ongoing
8	Cross-Cutting Themes					

AC2 FINAL REPORT

ADVISORY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2006-2009 (Annex 2 of Resolution 1.5)						
	Task/Topic	Paragraphs of ACAP/MoP1/Doc. 15	Responsible group	Timeframe	Action	Status
8.1	Technical Cooperation		AC and Parties	2006/09	Seek advice from Parties & Signatories on obstacles preventing implementation of priority Work program items. Identify opportunities for assisting Parties & Signatories through exchange of skills, knowledge, training, and other resources. Technical cooperation includes capacity building and other exchanges.	Ongoing
8.2	Education and Information Programs		Secretariat with interested Parties.	by AC3	-Develop a communication strategy and products for ACAP in all official languages, e.g. -Audio-visual presentations for representatives of ACAP at meetings (e.g. RFMOs, IFFs) -ACAP promotional brochure and other material -Dedicated sections on ACAP websites -Species assessments from WGs -Compile an internet-based directory of legislation concerning albatrosses and petrels	Ongoing
8.3	Exchange of technical information and expertise		Secretariat	2006/09	Consider funding programmes that encourage the exchange of information and technical expertise e.g. between experts in mitigation.	
9	Administrative items					
9.1	Finalise Headquarters Agreement		Secretariat	MOP2		
9.2	Annual budget management		Secretariat	2006/09		

**REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AGREEMENT ON THE
CONSERVATION OF ALBATROSSES AND PETRELS, 2004-2006**

COMPILED BY THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE FROM REPORTS PROVIDED TO THE SECRETARIAT

This report has been compiled pursuant to Article X (j) and in fulfilment of Articles VII (1)(c) and IX (6)(d) of the Agreement. The information contained within the report has been obtained by the Secretariat from Parties pursuant to Article VII (1) (c) and Article VIII (10). As noted by the Parties at the 1st Meeting of the Parties (MOP), a key function of the Advisory Committee (AC) is to report to the MOP on the implementation of the Agreement. The key objectives for reporting on the implementation of the Agreement are to:

- provide information regarding the assessment of progress towards the objectives of the Agreement;
- gather information on lessons learned, including successes and failures, in order to conduct albatross and petrel conservation in the most efficient and effective manner; and
- provide a resource of material on albatross and petrel conservation.

Information was submitted to the Secretariat following the format of a revised version of AC1/Doc.15, Attachment 2. Additional information regarding the status and trends of populations of albatross and petrel species listed under Annex 1 of the Agreement and a review of current taxonomy was provided by the Status and Trends Working Group and the Taxonomy Working Group, respectively, at AC2. The framework of this document closely resembles the Action Plan within Annex 2 of the Agreement. The AC developed and agreed to a more efficient protocol-based reporting system with precise questions, as envisioned by the Parties at MOP1 (Annex 10).

Executive Summary

Eight Parties and Range States submitted the information contained within this report. They comprise six Parties (Australia, Ecuador, France, New Zealand, South Africa, and the United Kingdom) and two Range States: Brazil, a signatory, and the United States, an observer. These data and a separate report describing some of the activities of BirdLife International detail a substantial amount of work being done to implement the Agreement. Although the United Kingdom did not include information on Antarctic territories and waters on the basis that these activities are coordinated through the Antarctic Treaty System, AC decided that in the future this information should be reported. Unless otherwise indicated, this report reflects activities carried out during the reporting period December 2004 - May 2006. The information provided in this report is not meant to be exhaustive of that which is contained in the individual Party and Range State reports, but is rather a summary of reported activities with specific reference to the Action Plan, the AC Work Programme, and the Agreement, as appropriate. Specific noteworthy examples of a few of the activities are included for illustration and for the purpose of information exchange. For detailed information about various programmes and activities, the individual reports should be consulted. The relevant documents are as follows: New Zealand (AC2 Doc 24), the United States (AC2 Doc 25), Ecuador (AC2 Doc 26), South Africa (AC2 Doc 27), the United Kingdom (AC2 Doc 28), Australia (AC2 Doc 29), Brazil (AC2 Doc 30 and 39), France (AC2 Doc 33), and BirdLife International (AC2 Doc 38).

AC2 FINAL REPORT

In an attempt to gauge the progress of Parties in implementing the Agreement, a brief assessment of Parties' reported actions in response to four major threats to seabirds was conducted. In most cases, the Parties that submitted information to the Interim Secretariat are addressing these four threats to some extent. It is not possible, however, to gauge ACAP Parties' overall progress as only six of nine Parties provided information for the preparation of this report. Of these six, five reported taking actions to address fisheries bycatch, five reported efforts to minimise IUU fishing, three reported actions addressing non-native species, and four reported on efforts to address the threat pollution and marine debris in relation to seabird species. This level of reporting represents a gap in information either on reported or actual activities. It is essential that this gap be filled before an accurate evaluation of the Parties' progress in implementation can be conducted. Likewise, more information on the relevance of certain efforts, such as enactment of national legislation and the findings of research and monitoring projects, must be provided before a robust evaluation of both policy and science needs can be made. It is also unclear given the current information what the most significant obstacles to fulfilling the obligations of the Agreement are for the various Parties, or whether other Parties may be of assistance in overcoming these obstacles, such as with technology transfer or other capacity-building efforts.

Although only five Parties submitted information regarding the conduct of research and monitoring activities, although the amount of research being undertaken appears to be substantial. Three primary categories of research activity clearly emerged: 1) population assessment and monitoring; 2) fisheries bycatch and gear-related research; and 3) satellite tracking of seabird movements. Unfortunately, in many cases, the relevance of research findings is not clear, making assessment of research priorities difficult.

These and other reporting gaps are likely due to a lack of specific guidance in the reporting process. For example, Parties were asked to provide a list of research activities, not the relevance of associated findings. Consequently, the information provided lacks the level of detail that would prove more suitable for analysis by the Interim Secretariat and for decision-making by the MOP. There are also a number of important issues contained within the Agreement that Parties are not specifically obliged to report on under the current reporting system, including capacity building and the importance of working with Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (RFMOs) to address the incidental capture of seabirds in commercial fisheries. It is for these reasons that revised guidance for the submission of information for this document has been agreed and will be applied in the next reporting period.

Overview of Implementation of Agreement and Action Plan

<i>Outline of planned actions for national implementation over the next three years</i>	<i>Action Plan Reference</i>	<i>AC Work Programme Reference</i>	<i>Agreement Reference</i>

Six Parties and one Range State (Australia, Ecuador, France, New Zealand, South Africa, the United Kingdom and Brazil, respectively) reported on proposed activities on a variety of topics over the next three years, with some of the details reported in other sections of the national reports. All seven nations reported on the development and implementation of one or more national-level plans and strategies to conserve seabird species. Three of the seven indicated a

AC2 FINAL REPORT

desire to continue or expand key research activities, including seabird population monitoring and foraging patterns, as well as non-native predator eradication. All seven nations expressed an interest in carrying out activities to reduce the incidental capture of seabirds in commercial fisheries, including working through RFMOs and other international fora. In particular, Brazil reported on its efforts to organize the 1st South American Fishers Forum to Reduce the Incidental Capture of Seabirds to be held later in 2006, and its intent to provide seabird bycatch experts on the delegations of upcoming RFMO meetings. Two of the seven nations expressly communicated their continued supplemental support of the essential functions of Agreement and the Secretariat, including Australia's offer to continue hosting the interim Secretariat and the United Kingdom's offer a further £10,000 for the sponsorship of delegates at future MOPs.

Action Plan

Article VI of the Agreement sets forth an Action Plan for the achievement and maintenance of a favourable conservation condition for albatrosses and petrels. Progress in carrying out the Action Plan is to be assessed at each MOP, based on information provided to the MOP by the AC. As previously indicated, this document generally follows the outline of the Action Plan and contains information submitted by the Parties describing its implementation.

1. Species Conservation

<i>Measures to eliminate, control or prevent introduction of non-native species to breeding sites</i>	<i>Action Plan Reference</i>	<i>AC Work Programme Reference</i>	<i>Agreement Reference</i>
	1.4	3	III (1) b)

Three Parties and one Range State (Australia, France, South Africa, and Brazil, respectively) submitted information regarding actions taken to address the threat of non-native species to seabirds under this heading, although additional information may be found in the Habitat Conservation section. Activities include the adoption of strict quarantine measures for specific species' breeding sites, efforts to assess the risk of exposure to non-native species for albatross chicks, the holding of a national workshop wherein the scientific community and others discussed ways to prevent, control, and eradicate non-native species, and large-scale eradication projects. Australia reported on the development of an eradication programme for Macquarie Island, where the presence of rabbits threatens the integrity of vegetation communities across the island, and therefore, threatens albatross and petrel breeding sites. The United Kingdom reported on successful eradication of non-native predators from islands previously used by white-chinned petrels, indicating that following eradication in some locations, natural re-colonisation of the species has occurred. France reported on a number of substantial and large-scale efforts to eradicate non-native species from important seabird breeding islands, including one island 2000 hectares in size, and another large eradication project funding partly by the European Development Fund.

<i>Report on any exemptions to prohibitions on the taking or harming of albatrosses and petrels</i>	<i>Action Plan Reference</i>	<i>AC Work Programme Reference</i>	<i>Agreement Reference</i>
	1.1.2		III (3)

Three Parties (Australia, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom) reported information under this heading, including details of specific exemptions provided for the legal take of two Agreement species for indigenous cultural reasons (New Zealand) and complete protection for Agreement species (Australia), while the United Kingdom indicated that permits are issued for scientific research that may affect seabirds.

AC2 FINAL REPORT

<i>Use and trade</i>	<i>Action Plan Reference</i>	<i>AC Work Programme Reference</i>	<i>Agreement Reference</i>
	1.1.1, 1.1.2		III (3)

Two Parties (Australia and New Zealand) reported information regarding the use and trade of seabird parts, including a strict permitting process that allows for the use of seabird carcasses obtained through fisheries bycatch for indigenous cultural purposes (New Zealand) and total protection pursuant to CITES membership and obligations (Australia).

<i>Single or multi-species conservation strategies / action plans</i>	<i>Action Plan Reference</i>	<i>AC Work Programme Reference</i>	<i>Agreement Reference</i>
	1.1.3		

Four Parties and two Range States (Australia, Ecuador, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and Brazil and the United States, respectively) reported a substantial amount of information regarding the development and implementation of seabird conservation strategies and action plans. Some of the activities described are national in scale, including New Zealand's efforts to develop a national seabird strategy, whereas other efforts are regional or species-specific. For example, the United Kingdom reported on an international workshop held in March 2006 for the consideration of priorities for the conservation of albatrosses and petrels in the South Atlantic. Discussions focused on the responsibilities and obligations of Parties and aimed to identify priorities for the management and conservation of albatross and petrel species, on land and at sea, in and around seabird colonies in the South Atlantic.

Many of the activities described also include research endeavours and priorities, including the development of plans that identify knowledge gaps, place seabird conservation in the context of larger biodiversity initiatives, and facilitate international cooperation on seabird research. One such effort, by the United Kingdom in Tristan da Cunha, includes involvement of the local community in conservation efforts and the establishment of monitoring protocols for key seabird species. To address seabird-fishery interactions, the threat of marine debris and predation by non-native species, Australia reported progress toward the implementation of existing, and the development and adoption of other threat abatement plans to address each of these issues.

<i>Emergency Measures</i>	<i>Action Plan Reference</i>	<i>AC Work Programme Reference</i>	<i>Agreement Reference</i>
	1.2		VIII (11) e)

There were no items reported under this heading.

<i>Re-establishment schemes</i>	<i>Action Plan Reference</i>	<i>AC Work Programme Reference</i>	<i>Agreement Reference</i>
	1.3		

One Party (New Zealand) reported the status of activities related to re-establishment schemes. New Zealand reported efforts to translocate Hutton's shearwater (not an ACAP species) chicks, as a part of a larger programme to develop and apply techniques for translocating burrow- and surface-nesting seabirds to new sites in order to establish new breeding colonies.

<i>Any other conservation projects for ACAP species</i>	<i>Action Plan Reference</i>	<i>AC Work Programme Reference</i>	<i>Agreement Reference</i>

AC2 FINAL REPORT

There were no items reported under this heading.

<i>Legal and policy instruments for species protection of albatrosses and petrels</i>	<i>Action Plan Reference</i>	<i>AC Work Programme Reference</i>	<i>Agreement Reference</i>
	5.1 l)	3	

Information on this item was provided by six Parties and one Range State (Australia, Ecuador, France, New Zealand, South Africa, the United Kingdom, and Brazil, respectively). Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa indicated that they had national and/or state and overseas territory legislation providing protection to either all or most seabird species onshore and within their Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs), while Ecuador provided a list of specific measures that have been enacted to protect a number of sites important to seabirds. The United Kingdom indicated that in 2006 its ratification of the Agreement was extended to include its Overseas Territory of Tristan da Cunha. This territory adopted new environmental conservation legislation that meets the Agreement's obligations in early 2006. Brazil reported on the adoption of its National Plan of Action - Seabirds.

2. Habitat Conservation

<i>Measures (legal and policy instruments and actions) to implement protection and management of breeding sites including habitat restoration.</i>	<i>Action Plan Reference</i>	<i>AC Work Programme Reference</i>	<i>Agreement Reference</i>
	2.1	3	III (1) a)

All Parties and Range States that submitted reports included information regarding measures to implement protection and management of breeding sites, although the United Kingdom reported that information on this topic is being provided via the AC Working Group on Breeding Sites. Six nations provided detailed information that focused attention on efforts to eradicate non-native predators from key seabird breeding sites as a part of habitat-restoration activities. New Zealand and Brazil described the authorities by which important seabird sites were protected, while South Africa announced its nomination of the Prince Edward Islands, declared a Special Nature Reserve under domestic law, to both the Ramsar (Wetlands of International Importance) and World Heritage Conventions. Also of note, Australia, the United Kingdom, and the United States provided details on a number of intensive non-native predator eradication efforts, some of which are being carried out in large part by non-governmental organisations. France also reported on several large-scale eradication programmes, noting the monitoring of secondary mortality from poisoning and vegetation recovery as important for judging their success.

<i>Sustainable management of marine living resources which provide food for albatrosses and petrels</i>	<i>Action Plan Reference</i>	<i>AC Work Programme Reference</i>	<i>Agreement Reference</i>
	2.3.1 a)		

Three Parties (Australia, France, and the United Kingdom) reported activity under this heading, including recognizing the importance of appropriately managed fish stocks, consistent with the principles of ecologically sustainable development and ecosystem-based fisheries management. Australia noted that its *Recovery Plan for Albatrosses and Giant-Petrels* requires that the dietary requirements of albatross and giant-petrel populations be taken into account when setting fisheries management arrangements (e.g., Total Allowable Catches) in fisheries that overlap with the foraging grounds of such seabird species.

AC2 FINAL REPORT

<i>Management and protection of important marine areas for albatrosses and petrels</i>	<i>Action Plan Reference</i>	<i>AC Work Programme Reference</i>	<i>Agreement Reference</i>
	2.3.2, 2.3.3	4	

Five Parties (Australia, Ecuador, New Zealand, South Africa, and the United Kingdom) reported on actions related to the management and protection of important marine areas for albatrosses and petrels. All five nations' submissions emphasized the establishment and continued monitoring of marine protected areas, some of which are associated with the Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR) conservation measures. Consistent with Australia's Ocean Policy, the South-east Marine Region Plan was released in 2004. This approach attempts to establish representative marine protected areas within large-scale offshore regions, the south-east marine region incorporating important foraging areas of shy albatrosses. This protected area would encompass more than 226,000 square kilometres of Australia's oceans and is expected to be designated as 13 protected reserves in late 2006 or early 2007. New Zealand and South Africa are also working to designate marine protected areas within their own and CCAMLR-regulated waters and have already closed a number of ecologically important areas to fishing activities that may impact seabirds. In another international effort, Australia, Chile, and New Zealand are co-sponsoring an initiative that seeks to fill a gap on the management of high seas areas in the South Pacific, as well as to ensure the long-term conservation and sustainable use of fish stocks and to protect biodiversity in the marine environment.

3. Management of Human Activities

<i>Legal and policy instruments for environmental impact assessments</i>	<i>Action Plan Reference</i>	<i>AC Work Programme Reference</i>	<i>Agreement Reference</i>
	3.1		

Three Parties and one Range State (Australia, Ecuador, United Kingdom and Brazil) reported on the status of legal and policy instruments for conducting environmental impact assessments, indicating that national policies and instruments are in place to protect important species, including seabirds. In some cases, CCAMLR regulations and the requirement for environmental impact assessment in accordance with the Environmental Protocol to the Antarctic Treaty apply.

<i>Report on environmental impact statements related to albatrosses and petrels</i>	<i>Action Plan Reference</i>	<i>AC Work Programme Reference</i>	<i>Agreement Reference</i>
	3.1		

Two Parties and one Range State (Australia, the United Kingdom, and the United States, respectively) reported on actions taken regarding environmental impact assessments carried out in relation to albatrosses and petrels. One environmental impact assessment was reported to cover fishery interactions with three albatross species in the North Pacific (not ACAP species), while two others were carried out for the purposes of assuring that seabirds were not adversely affected by exploration and development activities.

<i>Measures to reduce or eliminate incidental mortality in fisheries</i>	<i>Action Plan Reference</i>	<i>AC Work Programme Reference</i>	<i>Agreement Reference</i>
	3.2	6	

Five Parties, two Range States (from Australia, France, New Zealand, South Africa, the United Kingdom, and Brazil and the United States), and BirdLife International submitted information

AC2 FINAL REPORT

describing activities related to reducing the incidental mortality of seabirds in fisheries. A substantial amount of information was provided in fulfilment of this item, illustrating a high level of focus on this aspect of seabird conservation. Testing of bycatch mitigation measures, observer programmes, and working with RFMOs to address seabird bycatch were the predominant activities described under this heading, although only examples of actual measures employed are summarised here.

France, South Africa, and the United States reported substantial efforts to reduce seabird capture in longline fisheries. For example, France described extensive mitigation measures required for all vessels licensed to fish in the waters of its overseas territories, including offal discharge management, night setting, and the use of bird-scaring lines, among other things. Brazil also indicated that it requires seabird bycatch mitigation measures as a criterion for conferring permits for leased fishing vessels in Brazilian waters and that it is developing standard underwater setting device criteria in the building of new vessels under the Program for Renewing of the Brazilian Fishing Fleet. The United Kingdom reported that, based on the results of recent research efforts, the implementation of bird-scaring lines in a trawl fishery operating from one of its overseas territories resulted in a 90% decrease in seabird bycatch (mostly of an ACAP species). The United Kingdom also reported that BirdLife International's Global Seabird Programme has been working to strengthen the United Kingdom's input into the European Commission's position at RFMO and other meetings relevant to bycatch. The United Kingdom further noted that BirdLife International has prepared an information paper for AC2, entitled, "Opportunities for ACAP in making progress in the conservation of albatrosses and petrels through Regional Fisheries Management Organisations", to help target efforts under the Agreement into reducing seabird bycatch within key RFMOs. This document, in part, stemmed from BirdLife International's work in expanding its Procellariiform Tracking Database, which is used to analyse the overlap between albatross and petrel distribution and longline fishing effort.

<i>Measures to combat illegal, unregulated, and unreported (IUU) fishing</i>	<i>Action Plan Reference</i>	<i>AC Work Programme Reference</i>	<i>Agreement Reference</i>
	3.2.4	6	

Five Parties and one Range State (Australia, France, New Zealand, South Africa, the United Kingdom, and the United States, respectively) submitted information regarding measures to combat IUU fishing. Efforts included domestic measures, such as improvements in satellite-based vessel monitoring systems, the institution of improved catch documentation schemes to improve the monitoring of trade in toothfish, as well as direct surveillance and apprehension of fishing vessels within nations' EEZs. France, in particular, described the use of a RADARSAT monitoring system to detect vessels fishing illegally in the waters of their overseas territories and the use of the French Navy and a seized and refitted vessel to enforce fishing regulations, including the use of bycatch measures. These measures are believed to have resulted in a dramatic reduction in the number of illegal vessels entering its EEZ. International participation in efforts to eliminate IUU fishing includes membership in the High Seas Task Force and the International Monitoring, Control and Surveillance Network. Australia reported that it has committed AUS \$217.2 million over five years for fisheries surveillance and patrols in Australian waters around Heard and McDonald Islands. This initiative has already significantly reduced illegal fishing in that part of Australia's EEZ. Australia has also been working closely with countries such as France, South Africa, New Zealand and the United Kingdom to reduce IUU activities. South Africa noted the activities of its new deep-water fisheries protection vessel, the *Sarah Baartman*, which occasionally patrols sub-Antarctic waters, and three smaller fisheries protection vessels, which patrol continental waters to prevent IUU fishing.

AC2 FINAL REPORT

<i>Measures to minimise discharge of pollutants and marine debris (with reference to the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL))</i>	<i>Action Plan Reference</i>	<i>AC Work Programme Reference</i>	<i>Agreement Reference</i>
	2.3.1 b), 3.3		

Four Parties and two Range States (Australia, South Africa, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and Brazil and the United States, respectively) submitted information on minimizing the discharge of pollutants and marine debris. Submissions included information on the general authorities responsible for controlling marine pollution within nations' EEZs, with specific mention to nations' obligations under MARPOL, as well as information on regional activities. Some of the specific activities listed include an effort to prevent exposure to lead-based paint by chicks of the Laysan albatross (not an ACAP species) on Midway Island National Wildlife Refuge and marine debris clean-up efforts near seabird nests in South Africa. Other activities under this heading are more directly related to fishing efforts and include restrictions on discard of hooks and other measures required under CCAMLR regulations. Efforts by Parties and Range States in a variety of international fora, such as the United Nations Informal Consultative Process on Oceans and Law of the Sea and the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Marine Resources Conservation Working Group are also being undertaken.

<i>Measures to minimise disturbance in marine and terrestrial habitats</i>	<i>Action Plan Reference</i>	<i>AC Work Programme Reference</i>	<i>Agreement Reference</i>
	3.4		

Two Parties and one Range State (South Africa, the United Kingdom, and Brazil, respectively) submitted documentation regarding activities under this heading. All three reporting nations have mechanisms in place to limit approach by tourists, scientific researchers, and/or petroleum exploration activities. In some cases, such measures are species-specific. In others, they are based on location, such as in South Africa in which case the Prince Edward Islands are a Special Nature Reserve, where no tourism is permitted.

4. Research and Monitoring

<i>Ongoing research programmes relating to the conservation of albatrosses and petrels</i>	<i>Action Plan Reference</i>	<i>AC Work Programme Reference</i>	<i>Agreement Reference</i>
	4.1		

Five Parties, two Range States (Australia, France, New Zealand, South Africa, the United Kingdom, and Brazil and the United States, respectively), and BirdLife International reported on ongoing research activities. A substantial amount of information was submitted under this section heading, with the United Kingdom reporting on 28 different ongoing research projects conducted in its overseas territories and France noting the continued progress of a 40-year old study of white-chinned and grey petrels on two of its overseas territories. Reported activities from all seven nations emphasized population assessment and monitoring, fisheries and gear-related research, and five nations' efforts to employ satellite tracking as a method to improve understanding of seabird habitat use, foraging patterns, and overall spatial distribution. Given the breadth of activities being conducted, several notable examples are briefly described below.

One example includes a collaboration between Australia and the United Kingdom, whereby a whole-island census of wandering, black-browed and grey-headed albatrosses at an island group in the South Atlantic was conducted. This was the first time that all colonies of these three

AC2 FINAL REPORT

species of albatrosses had been surveyed using scientifically robust methodologies. Another collaborative example reported by Australia includes a multi-factorial seabird bycatch mitigation experiment on the Spanish method of demersal fishing (the dominant longline fishing practice in the CCAMLR Convention area). The experiment was conducted in collaboration with Chile and Argentina on a chartered fishing vessel. Australia intends to present the results of this effort to CCAMLR in 2006 along with recommended changes to the Conservation Measures pertaining to Spanish system vessels operating in the CCAMLR Convention area. The USA reported on Project GLOBAL (Global Bycatch Assessment of Long-Lived Species), an effort launched by Duke University and the Blue Ocean Institute to improve understanding of the patterns and implications of incidental bycatch of seabirds, sea turtles, and marine mammals, by integrating data on bycatch, fishing effort, and its associated oceanographic context on regional, ocean-wide, and global scales. Also of note is New Zealand's work to collaborate with stakeholders, including the fishing industry and non-governmental organisations to raise awareness and to test and employ appropriate seabird bycatch mitigation measures, both in New Zealand and Peru.

<i>Observer programmes to monitor fisheries bycatch of albatrosses and petrels</i>	<i>Action Plan Reference</i>	<i>AC Work Programme Reference</i>	<i>Agreement Reference</i>
	4.2	5.1	

Five Parties and two Range States (Australia, France, New Zealand, South Africa, the United Kingdom, and Brazil and the United States, respectively) submitted information regarding the placing of observers on fishing vessels to monitor the bycatch of albatrosses and petrels. Some of the activities described derive from routine fishery observer assessments and others are specifically designed to monitor seabird bycatch. Brazil reported that a nationally run observer programme, along with observers from Projeto Albatroz, a Brazilian non-governmental organisation, which collects seabird bycatch data from both domestic and foreign longline vessels fishing in Brazilian waters. The United Kingdom reported on an effort at Tristan da Cunha, whereby plans to diversify fisheries and issue licenses to foreign longline vessels targeting pelagic and demersal fish species are underway. A previous study based on limited observer data suggested that the demersal fishery had little impact on seabirds. However, once observers were placed on vessels, a different picture emerged. Between January and May 2005, two observers recorded 650 great shearwaters (not an ACAP species), three sooty albatrosses, and one wandering albatross killed on 1.09 million hooks set. This average rate of 0.601 birds per 1000 hooks is 100 times more than that recorded from fishery log books, reinforcing the point that voluntary reporting greatly underestimates the bycatch of seabirds, as has been found globally with most similar voluntary schemes.

<i>National institutions (lists of authorities, research centres, scientists and nongovernmental organisations) involved in albatross and petrel conservation</i>	<i>Action Plan Reference</i>	<i>AC Work Programme Reference</i>	<i>Agreement Reference</i>

Four Parties and one Range State (Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, the United Kingdom and Brazil, respectively) expressly contributed submissions under this heading, although mention of collaborations between governments and other entities were found in nearly all submissions. Lists of institutions, in some cases, were lengthy. As such, collaborations between national authorities and stakeholders seem to be widespread, including those between government agencies, academic institutions, non-governmental organisations and tourism agencies. For a full listing of institutions, the individual nation reports should be consulted.

AC2 FINAL REPORT

Although not explicitly called for under this heading, collaborations between governments and fishing industry participants were also apparent in some cases.

5. Collation of Information by the Advisory Committee

This section of the Action Plan outlines the information that should be contained within this report. Many of these items are populated by information submitted within the national reports. However, some of the topics will require additional time for implementation of the Agreement and/or additional information to be submitted by the Parties before completion, including the more comprehensive or overarching reviews of information. Discussion of priorities for such reviews may be warranted.

6. Education and Public Awareness

<i>Dissemination of information / training for 'user audiences' e.g. scientists, fishermen, conservation bodies, and decision-makers</i>	<i>Action Plan Reference</i>	<i>AC Work Programme Reference</i>	<i>Agreement Reference</i>
	6.1		

Four Parties and two Range States (Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, United Kingdom, and Brazil and the United States, respectively) submitted a wide variety of information for this section of the Report. Fisheries observers, vessel crews and captains, and tourists were some of the audiences targeted in the reported efforts. Among other things, the United States reported that the American Bird Conservancy published a public awareness document regarding seabird bycatch in Spanish, English, and Chinese languages. This document describes seabird bycatch in fisheries and provides solutions based on research by fishery and seabird experts. Australia and New Zealand noted their activities related to obligations under CCAMLR, including conducting vessel crew and captain briefings on seabird mitigation measures at the beginning of each fishing season. The United Kingdom's efforts focused on producing educational materials for its fishing fleet and for visitors to overseas territories. The United Kingdom also reported the appointment of an elementary school teacher, employed specifically to teach environmental education in some of their overseas territories, including one on where ACAP species breed. BirdLife International reported that it is developing an international team of bycatch mitigation instructors (the Albatross Task Force) to work with fishers and fisheries managers in global seabird bycatch 'hotspots'. This involves conducting at-sea trips and holding on-shore workshops with fishers and fisheries managers, beginning with two instructors deployed in South Africa and negotiations for the placement of additional instructors in Brazil and Chile by the end of 2006. In addition, Brazil has published a volume of information regarding interactions between seabirds and pelagic and bottom longline fisheries. This document includes details of the foraging patterns for four seabird species in Brazilian waters as a part of its EEZ Live Resources Program.

<i>Dissemination of information to the general public</i>	<i>Action Plan Reference</i>	<i>AC Work Programme Reference</i>	<i>Agreement Reference</i>
	6.2		

Four Parties and two Range States (Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, the United Kingdom, and Brazil and the United States, respectively) reported activities related to the dissemination of information to the general public. Australia and the United States both indicated that they have regularly updated websites, which provide access to albatross and petrel conservation

AC2 FINAL REPORT

information; key policy documents such as recovery plans, threat-abatement plans and bycatch action plans; fishery effort data and reports on observer findings.

Brazil, the United Kingdom, and BirdLife International noted their roles in the development of the Save the Albatross Campaign. This campaign produces media programmes, articles and reports focusing on albatross conservation, many of which have been broadcasted on television, in newspapers, magazines, radio, and Internet directed to the public in general. BirdLife International noted that the Volvo Ocean Race has adopted the Save the Albatross Campaign as its environmental partner, allowing issues of seabird conservation to reach a larger global audience. South Africa reported that a children's book (Allie the Albatross) is being written based on the wandering albatrosses of Marion Island that will deal with such issues as longline mortality and should serve to raise awareness of this issue.

7. Implementation

<i>Summarise progress to implement decisions of previous Meetings of the Parties</i>	<i>Action Plan Reference</i>	<i>AC Work Programme Reference</i>	<i>Agreement Reference</i>
	7		

One Party (South Africa) submitted information expressly for this section of the report. However, a few items submitted under other headings have been placed here as they seem to be appropriate additions to the treatment of this topic. South Africa indicated that it has engaged in a collaborative at-sea research effort for albatrosses between the Percy FitzPatrick Institute, University of Cape Town, and the United Kingdom. Further collaborations on at-sea remote tracking are planned with Australia and Japan. South Africa also noted that Korean joint-venture longline vessels licensed to fish within South African waters carrying South African observers have experienced high levels of seabird mortality (especially of shy albatrosses and white-chinned petrels). Unfortunately, education and providing bird-scaring lines to these vessels has yet to reduce bycatch rates.

In terms of general implementation, the United Kingdom noted a number of financial and in-kind contributions it has made in support of the Agreement, including the secondment of a full-time person to the Interim Secretariat between October 2004 and August 2005, a donation of UK£45,000 to fund priority projects identified by the AC, including a project to count southern giant, northern giant, and white-chinned petrels in South Georgia. Brazil strongly encouraged the creation of a fund for implementing the Action Plan and providing technical assistance to develop conservation, management, and research in the least developed countries.

<i>List of recent relevant publications (since the last report) including scientific and popular articles, videos, websites, pamphlets, manuals, identification guides etc.</i>	<i>Action Plan Reference</i>	<i>AC Work Programme Reference</i>	<i>Agreement Reference</i>

A large number of relevant publications were provided in the submission of information by the Parties. A comprehensive list, including information on nations of origin, may be found in Appendix 1.

AC2 FINAL REPORT

Appendix 1. Bibliography Submitted by the Advisory Committee

Citation	Submitting Nation
Abbott, C.L., Double, M. C., Gales, R., Baker, G. B., Lashko, A., Robertson, C. J. R. & Ryan, P. G. 2006. Molecular provenance analysis for shy and white-capped albatrosses killed by fisheries interactions in Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa. <i>Conservation Genetics</i> , published on line.	Australia
Afanasyev, V. 2004. A miniature daylight level and activity data recorder for tracking animals over long periods. <i>Memoirs of the National Institute of Polar Research, Special Issue 58</i> : 227-233.	United Kingdom
Agnew, D.J. 2004. Fishing South. Penna Press, ISBN 0-9547948-0-X.	United Kingdom
Alderman, R., Double, M. C., Valencia, J., Gales, R. P. 2005. Genetic affinities of newly sampled populations of wandering and black-browed albatrosses. <i>Emu</i> 105, 169-179.	Australia
Angel, A., & Cooper, J., 2006. A review of the impacts of introduced rodents on the islands of Tristan da Cunha and Gough (South Atlantic).. <i>RSPB Research Report No. 17</i> . RSPB, Sandy, UK.	United Kingdom
Angel, A., Wanless, R.M., Hilton, G.M. & Ryan, P.G. 2005. Niche expansion, competitive release and the evolution of predation in the house mouse: lessons from Gough Island, South Atlantic. P26 in Abstracts of the 19th Annual Meeting of the Society for Conservation Biology, Universidade de Brasília, Brasília, DF, Brazil, 15 th - 19th July 2005. http://www.conbio.org/Activities/Meetings/2005/pdf/abstract.pdf	United Kingdom
Arata, J., Robertson, G., Valencia, J., Moreno, C., and Xavier, J. 2004. Diet of the grey-headed albatross at the Diego Ramirez Islands, Chile: ecological implications. <i>Antarctic Science</i> 16 (3) 263-275.	Australia
Arata, J., Robertson, G. Valencia, J., Xavier, J.C. & Moreno, C. 2004. The diet of greyheaded albatrosses at Diego Ramirez Islands, Chile: ecological implications. <i>Antarctic Science</i> 16: 263-275.	United Kingdom
Arnold, J.M., Brault, S. & Croxall, J.P. 2006. Albatross populations in peril? A population trajectory for black-browed albatrosses at South Georgia. <i>Ecological Applications</i> 16, 419-432.	United Kingdom
Awkerman, J.A., A. Fukuda, H. Higuchi, D.J. Anderson. 2005. Foraging activity and submesoscale habitat use of waved albatrosses <i>Phoebastria irrorata</i> during chick-brooding period. <i>Marine Ecology Progress Series</i> 291:289-300.	United States
Black, A.D. 2005. Seabird and marine mammal distribution in the waters around South Georgia 2002 – 2004. Stanley: Falklands Conservation.	United Kingdom
Brothers, N., E. Gilman. 2006. Technical Assistance for Hawaii Pelagic Longline Vessels to Change Deck Design and Fishing Practices to Side Set. Hawaii Longline Association, U.S. NOAA Fisheries Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center and Pacific Islands Regional Office, and Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council: Honolulu, Hawaii. http://www.fakr.noaa.gov/protectedresources/seabirds/sidesetassistancefinal.pdf Executive Summary at http://www.fakr.noaa.gov/protectedresources/seabirds/executivesummarysideset.pdf	United States
Burg, T.M. & Croxall, J.P. 2004. Global population structure and taxonomy of the wandering albatross species complex. <i>Molecular Ecology</i> 13:2345-2355.	United Kingdom
Calabuono, F.I., C.M. Vooren. <i>In press</i> . Hábitos alimentares dos albatrozes <i>Thalassarche melanophris</i> e <i>T. chlorohychnos</i> e dos petréis <i>Procellaria aequinoctialis</i> e <i>P. conspicillata</i> no sul do Brasil. In: Aves oceânicas da região sudeste-sul do Brasil. T. Neves, L. Bugoni, F. Olmos, C.M. Vooren and C.L.B. Rossi-Wongtschowski (Eds.). REVIZEE.	Brazil
Carey, Hawke, D. J.; Holdaway, R. N. 2005. Avian assimilation and dispersal of carbon and nitrogen brought ashore by breeding Westland petrels (<i>Procellaria westlandica</i>): a stable isotope study. <i>Journal of Zoology (London)</i> 266 (4): 419-426.	New Zealand
Catry, P., Phillips, R.A. & Croxall, J.P. 2004. Sustained very fast travel by a greyheaded albatross riding an Antarctic storm. <i>Auk</i> 121: 1208-1213.	United Kingdom
Catry, P., Phillips, R.A., Forcada, J. & Croxall, J.P. <i>In press</i> . Nestling mortality and parental decisions in grey-headed albatrosses: how long should brood-guard last? <i>Animal Behaviour</i> .	United Kingdom
Catry, P., Phillips, R.A., Phalan, B. & Croxall, J.P. (in press) Senescence effects in an extremely long-lived bird: the grey-headed albatross <i>Thalassarche chrysostoma</i> . <i>Proceedings of the Royal Society, Series B</i> .	United Kingdom
Catry, P., Phillips, R.A., Phalan, B., Silk, J.R.D. & Croxall, J.P. 2004. Foraging strategies of grey-	United

AC2 FINAL REPORT

headed albatrosses <i>Thalassarche chrysostoma</i> : integration of movements, activity and feeding events. <i>Marine Ecology Progress Series</i> 280: 261- 273.	Kingdom
Catry, P., Phillips, R.A. & Croxall, J.P. 2005. Sexual segregation in birds: patterns, processes and implications for conservation. In: Sexual segregation: ecology of the two sexes (eds. Ruckstuhl, K.E. and Neuhaus, P.). Pp. 351-378. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.	United Kingdom
CEC. 2005. North American Conservation Action Plan: Pink-footed Shearwater. Montreal, Quebec, Canada. http://www.cec.org	United States
Cherel, Y., Phillips, R.A. & McGill, R. In press. Stable isotope evidence of diverse species-specific and individual wintering strategies in seabirds. <i>Biology Letters</i> .	United Kingdom
Chown, S.[L.], Davies, S., & Joubert, L. 2005. <i>Prince Edward Islands Environmental Management Plan. Version 0.1</i> . Stellenbosch: DST-NRF Centre of Excellence for Invasion Biology, University of Stellenbosch.	South Africa
Cooper, J. 2005. Ridding Tristan and Gough of rats & mice. <i>Tristan da Cunha Newsletter</i> , January 2006: 14-15.	United Kingdom
Cooper, J. In press. Conservation of albatrosses and petrels of the Southern Ocean. In: Boere, G.C., Galbraith, C., Scott, D.A., Stroud, D.A. & Underhill, L.G. (Eds). <i>Waterbirds Around the World: Proceedings of the Global Flyway Conference, April 2004</i> . Scottish Natural Heritage: Edinburgh.	South Africa
Croxall, J.P., Silk, J.R.D., Phillips, R.A., Afanasyev, V. & Briggs, D.R. 2005. Global circumnavigations: tracking year-round ranges of non-breeding albatrosses. <i>Science</i> 307, 249-250.	United Kingdom
Cuthbert, R. & Hilton, G. 2004. Introduced house mice <i>Mus musculus</i> : a significant predator of threatened and endemic birds on Gough Island, South Atlantic Ocean? <i>Biological Conservation</i> 117: 483-489.	United Kingdom
Cuthbert, R., Hilton, G., Ryan, P. & Tuck, G.N. 2005. At-sea distribution of breeding Tristan albatrosses <i>Diomedea dabbenena</i> and potential interactions with pelagic longline fishing in the South Atlantic Ocean. <i>Biological Conservation</i> 121: 345-355.	United Kingdom
Cuthbert, R.J. & Sommer, E.S. 2004. Population size and trends of four globally threatened seabirds at Gough Island, South Atlantic Ocean. <i>Marine Ornithology</i> 32: 97-103.	United Kingdom
Cuthbert, R., Sommer, E., Ryan, P., Cooper, J. & Hilton, G. 2004. Demography and conservation of the Tristan albatross <i>Diomedea [exulans] dabbenena</i> . <i>Biological Conservation</i> 117: 471-481.	United Kingdom
De Bruyn, P.J.N. & Cooper, J. 2005. Who's the boss? Giant petrel arrival times and interspecific interactions at seal carcasses at sub-Antarctic Marion Island. <i>Polar Biology</i> 28: 571-573.	South Africa
De Villiers, M.S. & Cooper, J. in press. Conservation and management. In: Chown, S.L. & Froneman, P.W. (Eds). <i>The Prince Edward Islands: land-sea interactions in a changing ecosystem</i> . Stellenbosch: Sun Media.	South Africa
De Villiers, M.S., Bause, M., Giese, M. & Fourie, A. In press. Hardly hard-hearted: heart rate responses of incubating Northern Giant Petrels (<i>Macronectes halli</i>) to human disturbance on sub-Antarctic Marion Island. <i>Polar Biology</i> .	South Africa
De Villiers, M.S., Cooper, J. & Ryan, P.G.2005. Individual variability of behavioural responses by Wandering Albatrosses (<i>Diomedea exulans</i>) to human disturbance. <i>Polar Biology</i> 28: 255-260.	South Africa
Douse, A. (2005) <i>Natural Priorities: A draft Conservation and Biodiversity Strategy for the Falkland Islands</i> . Stanley: Falkland Islands Government	United Kingdom
Elliott, G. & Walker, K. (2005). Detecting population trends of Gibson's and Antipodean albatrosses. <i>Notornis</i> 52:215-222.	New Zealand
Finkelstein, M., B.S. Keitt, D.A. Croll, B. Tershy, W.M. Jarman, S. Rodriguez-Pastor, D.J. Anderson, P.R. Sievert, & D.R. Smith. 2006. Albatross species demonstrate regional differences in North Pacific marine contamination. <i>Ecological Applications</i> 16:678-686.	United States
Fischer, D., Heyendenrych, R., Cooper, J. & Bester, M.N. 2005. <i>Prince Edward Islands: World Heritage Nomination</i> . Pretoria: Department of Environmental Affairs & Tourism.	South Africa
Gilman, E., Dalzell, P., Martin, S. In Press. Fleet communication to abate fisheries bycatch. <i>Marine Policy</i> .	United States
Fukuda, A., Miwa, K., Hirano, E., Suzuki, M., Higuchi, H., Morishita, E., Anderson, D., Waugh, S. & Phillips, R.A. 2004. BGD-LI: A GPS Data Logger for Birds. <i>Memoirs of National Institute for Polar Research, Special Issue</i> 58: 234-245.	United Kingdom
Gilman E., Brothers N., Kobayashi D. In press. Comparison of the efficacy of three seabird bycatch avoidance methods in Hawaii pelagic longline fisheries. <i>Fisheries Science</i> 73(1).	United States
Gilman, E., N. Brothers & D. Kobayashi. 2005. Principles and approaches to abate seabird bycatch in longline fisheries. <i>Fish and Fisheries</i> 6(1): 35-49.	United States
Gonzalez-Solis, J. 2004. Regulation of incubation shifts near hatching by giant petrels: a timed mechanism, embryonic signalling or food availability? <i>Animal Behaviour</i> 67: 663-671.	United Kingdom
Gonzalez-Solis, J. 2004. Sexual size dimorphism in northern giant petrels: ecological correlates and scaling. <i>Oikos</i> 105: 247-254.	United Kingdom

AC2 FINAL REPORT

Gonzalez-Solis, J. & Croxall, J.P. 2005. Differences in foraging behaviour and feeding ecology in giant petrels. In: Sexual segregation: ecology of the two sexes (eds. Ruckstuhl, K.E. & Neuhaus, P.). Pp. 92-114. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge	United Kingdom
Goodman, D. and J-D. Lebreton. 2005. Integrated modeling for Hawaiian albatross populations. Progress reports submitted to Joint Institute for Marine and Atmospheric Research (JIMAR), School of Ocean and Earth Science and Technology, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, Hawaii. http://www.soest.hawaii.edu/PFRP/protected_species/goodman.html	United States
Hall, M.E., Nasir, L., Daunt, F., Gault, E.A., Croxall, J.P., Wanless, S. & Monaghan, P. 2004. Telomere loss in relation to age and early environment in long-lived birds. <i>Proceedings of the Royal Society, Series B</i> 271: 1571-1576.	United Kingdom
Hedd, A. and Gales, R. 2005. Breeding and overwintering ecology of shy albatrosses in southern Australia: year-round patterns of colony attendance and foraging-trip durations. <i>Condor</i> 107:375-387	Australia
Honig, M.B. & Petersen, S.L. 2006. An investigation of mitigation methods to abate vulnerable bycatch in the South African hake longline fishery. BirdLife/WWF Responsible Fisheries Programme report.	South Africa
Huin, N. 2006. Albatross and penguin census of the Falkland Islands 2005/06. Stanley: Falklands Conservation.	United Kingdom
Hyrenbach, K.D., C. Baduini, M. Hester, C. Keiper, H. Nevins, and J. Adams. 2006. Post breeding movements and fisheries overlap of black-footed albatross (2004-2005). Abstract from 33 rd Annual Meeting of the Pacific Seabird Group, Girdwood, Alaska, 15-19 February, 2006.	United States
Latham, P.C. M.; Marin, M.; Powlesland, R.G. 2004. Chatham albatross (<i>Thalassarche eremita</i>) off the Chilean coast. <i>Notornis</i> 51: 47-49.	New Zealand
Lawton, K., Robertson, G, Kirkwood, R., Valencia, J., Schlatter, R., and Smith, D. 2006. An estimate of the population size of burrowing seabirds at the Diego Ramirez archipelago, Chile, using distance sampling and burrow scoping. <i>Polar Biology</i> 29: 229-238.	Australia
Maunder, M. and S. Hoyle. 2005. A generally Bayesian integrated population dynamics model for protected species. Progress reports submitted to Joint Institute for Marine and Atmospheric Research (JIMAR), School of Ocean and Earth Science and Technology, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, Hawaii. http://www.soest.hawaii.edu/PFRP/protected_species/maunder.html	United States
Melvin, E.F., K.S. Dietrich & Tim Thomas. 2004. Pilot tests of techniques to mitigate seabird interactions with catcher processor vessels in the Bering Sea Pollock trawl fishery: final report. Washington Sea Grant Program. WSG-AS 05-05. http://www.wsg.washington.edu/research/living/pilotlr.pdf	United States
Melvin, E. F., Sullivan, B., Robertson, G. & Wienecke, B. 2004. A review of the effectiveness of streamer lines as a seabird by-catch mitigation technique in longline fisheries and CCAMLR streamer line requirements. 11. CCAMLR Science 11: 189-201.	Australia
Melvin, E.F. & M.D. Wainstein. 2006. Seabird avoidance measures for small Alaskan longline vessels. Washington Sea Grant Program. Project A/FP-7. http://www.wsg.washington.edu/pubs/seabirds/seabirdsolvinghr.pdf	United States
Melvin, E.F., M.D. Wainstein, K.S. Dietrich, K.L. Ames, T.O. Geernaert & L.L. Conquest. 2006. The distribution of seabirds on the Alaskan longline fishing grounds: implications for seabird avoidance regulations. Washington Sea Grant Program. Project A/FP-7. http://www.wsg.washington.edu/pubs/seabirds/seabirddistlr.pdf	United States
Moore, P.J. & Bettany, S.M. 2005. Band recoveries of southern royal albatrosses (<i>Diomedea epomophora</i>) from Campbell Island, 1943-2003. <i>Notornis</i> 52: 195-205.	New Zealand
Munro, G. (2004) Waste discard management in the Falkland Islands trawl fishery: A discussion document. Stanley: Falklands Conservation.	United Kingdom
Neves, T.S., L. Bugoni, D. S. Monteiro, L. Nascimento, and F. Peppes. 2005. Seabird abundance and bycatch on Brazilian longline fishing fleet. Unpublished manuscript presented at the CCAMLR Meeting. Hobart, Australia, October 2005.	Brazil
Neves, T., C.M. Vooren, L. Bugoni, F. Olmos and L. Nascimento. <i>In press</i> . Distribuição e abundância de aves marinhas no sul do Brasil. In: Aves oceânicas da região sudeste-sul do Brasil. T. Neves, L. Bugoni, F. Olmos, C.M. Vooren and C.L.B. Rossi-Wongtschowski (Eds.). REVIZEE.	Brazil
NOAA 2005. Final Environmental Impact Statement on Seabird Interaction Avoidance Methods under the Fishery Management Plan for the Pelagic Fisheries of the Western Pacific Region and Pelagic Squid fishery Management under the Fishery Management Plan for the Pelagic Fisheries of the Western Pacific Region and the High Seas Fishing Compliance Act. Prepared for NOAA, NMFS, Pacific Islands Regional Office, April 2005.	United States

AC2 FINAL REPORT

NOAA 2006. Seabirds that interact with US longline fisheries in the North Pacific. Report submitted to the 1 st Meeting of the Bycatch Working Group (BWG) of the International Scientific Committee for Tuna and Tuna-like species in the North Pacific (ISC), in LaJolla, CA, March 20-21, 2006. Kim Rivera, NOAA Fisheries, Alaska Region, Juneau, AK, USA.	United States
Olmos, F., L. Bugoni, T. Neves, F. Peppes. In press. Aves oceânicas associadas a espinheleiros no Brasil. In: Aves oceânicas da região sudeste-sul do Brasil. T. Neves, L. Bugoni, F. Olmos, C.M. Vooren and C.L.B. Rossi-Wongtschowski (Eds.). REVIZEE.	Brazil
Otley, H. 2005. Seabird mortality associated with Patagonian toothfish longliners in Falkland Island waters during 2002/03 and 2003/04. Stanley: Falkland Islands Government.	United Kingdom
Olmos, F., L. Bugoni. In press. Aves associadas a espinheleiros de fundo no sul-sudeste do Brasil. In: Aves oceânicas da região sudeste-sul do Brasil. T. Neves, L. Bugoni, F. Olmos, C.M. Vooren and C.L.B. Rossi-Wongtschowski (Eds.). REVIZEE.	Brazil
Patterson, D.L., Woehler, E.J., Croxall, J.P., Cooper, J., Poncet, S & Fraser, W.R. In press. Breeding distribution and population status of the northern giant petrel <i>Macronectes halli</i> and southern giant petrel <i>M. giganteus</i> . <i>Marine Ornithology</i> .	United Kingdom
Petersen, S.L. 2004. Initial bycatch assessment: South Africa's domestic pelagic longline fishery, 2000-2003. BirdLife/WWF Responsible Fisheries Programme Report.	South Africa
Petersen, S.L. & Kirkman, S. 2004. Initial bycatch assessment: Hake longline fishery, July 2000-November 2004. BirdLife/WWF Responsible Fisheries Programme Report.	South Africa
Phalan, B., Phillips, R.A. & Double, M.C. 2004. A white-capped Albatross <i>Thalassarche steadi</i> at South Georgia: first confirmed record in the southwest Atlantic. <i>Emu</i> 104: 359-361.	United Kingdom
Phalan, B., Phillips, R.A., Silk, J.R.D., Afanasyev, V., Fukuda, A., Fox, J., Catry, P., Higuchi, H. & Croxall, J.P. In press. Foraging behaviour of four albatross species by night and day. <i>Marine Ecology Progress Series</i> .	United Kingdom
Phillips, R.A., Silk, J.R.D. & Croxall, J.P. 2005. Foraging and provisioning strategies of the light-mantled sooty albatross at South Georgia: competition and co-existence with sympatric pelagic predators. <i>Marine Ecology Progress Series</i> 285: 259-270.	United Kingdom
Phillips, R.A., Silk, J.R.D., Croxall, J.P. & Afanasyev, V. 2006. Year-round distribution of white-chinned petrels from South Georgia: relationships with oceanography and fisheries. <i>Biological Conservation</i> 129, 336-347.	United Kingdom
Phillips, R.A., Silk, J.R.D., Croxall, J.P., Bennett, V.J. & Afanasyev, V. 2005. Summer distribution and winter migration routes of nonbreeding black-browed albatrosses: Individual consistencies and implications for conservation. <i>Ecology</i> 81, 2386-2396.	United Kingdom
Phillips, R.A., Silk, J.R.D., Croxall, J.P., Briggs, D.R., & Afanasyev, V. 2004. Accuracy of geolocation estimates for flying seabirds. <i>Marine Ecology Progress Series</i> 266: 265-272.	United Kingdom
Phillips, R.A., Silk, J.R.D., Phalan, B., Catry, P. & Croxall, J.P. 2004. Seasonal sexual segregation in two <i>Thalassarche</i> albatross species: competitive exclusion, reproductive role specialization or trophic niche divergence? <i>Proceedings of the Royal Society, Series B</i> 271: 1283-1291.	United Kingdom
Piatt, J. F., J. Wetzel, K. Bell, A. R. DeGange, G. Balogh, G. Drew, T. Geernaert, C. Ladd & G. V. Byrd. 2006. Predictable hotspots and foraging habitat of the endangered short-tailed albatross (<i>Phoebastria albatrus</i>) in the North Pacific: Implications for conservation. <i>Deep-Sea Research II</i> In press.	United States
Pierre, J.P. 2005. Cutting out the free lunch. <i>Seafood</i> 13(8): 52	New Zealand
Pierre, J.P. 2005. Fish oil delivers in the Hauraki Gulf. <i>Seafood</i> 13(3): 4	New Zealand
Pierre, J.P. & Norden, W.S. 2006. Reducing seabird bycatch in longline fisheries using a natural olfactory deterrent. <i>Biological Conservation</i> 106: 406-415.	New Zealand
Poncet, S., Robertson, G., Phillips, R.A., Lawton, K., Phalan, B., Trathan, P.N. & Croxall, J. P. 2006. Status and distribution of wandering, black-browed and grey-headed albatrosses breeding at South Georgia. <i>Polar Biology</i> . Published on line, February 2006.	Australia
Projeto Albatroz 2006. Assessing the conservation status of the spectacled petrel. Unpublished report to RSPB. Projeto Albatroz, Santos, Brazil.	United Kingdom
Reid, T.A. & Catry, P. 2006. The white-chinned petrel population of the Falkland Islands. Falkland Islands and the New Island South Conservation Trust.	United Kingdom
Tristan Natural Resources Department and The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds 2006 Tristan Biodiversity Action Plan. Government of Tristan da Cunha, Edinburgh, Tristan da Cunha. In press	United Kingdom
Reid, K., Croxall, J.P., Briggs, D.R. & Murphy, E.J. 2005. Antarctic ecosystem monitoring: quantifying the response of ecosystem indicators to variability in Antarctic krill. <i>ICES Journal of</i>	United Kingdom

AC2 FINAL REPORT

<i>Marine Science</i> 62, 366-373.	
Reid, T. A. & N. Huin. 2005. Census of the southern giant petrel population of the Falkland Islands 2004/05. Stanley: Falklands Conservation.	United Kingdom
Reid, T.A. & B. J. Sullivan. 2004. Longliners, black-browed albatross mortality and bait scavenging: what is the relationship? <i>Polar Biology</i> , 27:131-139.	United Kingdom
Rice, S., T. Baker, and P. Cullenberg. 2006. Field evaluation of seabird deterrent gear and alternatives for Alaska small longline vessels. Alaska Sea Grant Marine Advisory Program, University of Alaska Fairbanks, March 2006. http://www.uaf.edu/map/Seabird/index.html	United States
Rice, S. and P. Cullenberg. 2006. Design and distribution of free lightweight streamer lines for longline vessels in Alaska. Alaska Sea Grant Marine Advisory Program, University of Alaska Fairbanks. http://www.uaf.edu/map/Seabird/index.html	United States
Robertson, G., McNeill, M., Smith, N., Wienecke, B., Candy, S., and Olivier, F. 2006. Fast sinking (integrated weight) longlines reduce mortality of white-chinned petrels (<i>Procellaria aequinoctialis</i>) and sooty shearwaters (<i>Puffinus griseus</i>) in demersal longline fisheries. <i>Biological Conservation</i> . In Press.	Australia
Robinson, P.W., Tremblay, Y., Antolos, M., Crocker, D.E., Kuhn, C.E., Shaffer S.A., Simmons, S., Costa, D.P. (in review) A comparison of ARGOS-tracking-based indirect measures of foraging behavior. <i>Deep-Sea Research II</i>	United States
Ryan, P.G. 2005. Inaccessible Island Bird Monitoring Manual. <i>RSPB Research Report</i> No 16. RSPB, Sandy, UK.	United Kingdom
Ryan, P.G. 2005. The long haul. <i>Africa Birds & Birding</i> 10(2): 52-59.	South Africa
Ryan, P.G. 2005. Ringeye: the inaccessible petrel. <i>Africa Birds and Birding</i> , Oct/Nov 2005, pp 63-69.	United Kingdom
Ryan, P.G. and Bester, M.N. In press. Pelagic predators. In: Chown, S.L. & Froneman, P.W. (Eds). <i>The Prince Edward Islands: land-sea interactions in a changing ecosystem</i> . Stellenbosch: Sun Media.	United Kingdom
Ryan, P.G., Dorse, C. & Hilton, G.M. In press. The conservation status of the spectacled petrel <i>Procellaria conspicillata</i> <i>Biological Conservation</i> .	United Kingdom
Ryan, P.G., Phillips, R., Nel, D.C & Wood, A.G. in press. Breeding frequency in Grey-headed Albatrosses. <i>Ibis</i> .	South Africa and United Kingdom
Sagar, P. M.; Stahl, J.-C. 2005. Increases in the numbers of breeding pairs in two populations of Buller's Albatross (<i>Thalassarche bulleri bulleri</i>). <i>Emu</i> 105: 49-55	New Zealand
Sagar, P. M.; Unwin, M. J.; Stahl, J. C., et al. 2005. Variation in the size of Buller's albatross (<i>Thalassarche bulleri</i>) eggs. <i>New Zealand Journal of Zoology</i> 32: 171-180.	New Zealand
Shaffer, S. A., Tremblay, Y., Awkerman, J., Henry, W. R., Teo, S. L. H., Anderson D. J., Croll, D. A., Block, B. A., and Costa, D. P. 2005. Comparison of light- and SST-based geolocation with satellite telemetry in free-ranging albatrosses. <i>Marine Biology</i> 147: 833-843.	United States
Spear, L.B.; Ainley, D.G. & Webb, S.W. 2005. Distribution, abundance, habitat use and behaviour of three <i>Procellaria</i> petrels off South America. <i>Notornis</i> 52: 88-105.	New Zealand
Strange, I.J. 2004. Black browed albatross <i>Diomedea melanophris</i> population census New Island South. New Island South Conservation Trust	United Kingdom
Sullivan, B. 2004. Falkland Islands FAO National Plan of Action for reducing incidental catch of seabirds in longline fisheries. Stanley: Falklands Conservation.	United Kingdom
Sullivan, B.J., Brickle, P., Reid, T.A., Bone, D.G. & Middleton, D.A.J. In press. Mitigation of seabird mortality on factory trawlers: trials of three devices to reduce warp cable strikes. <i>Polar Biology</i> .	United Kingdom
Sullivan, B.J., & T. A. Reid. 2004. Seabird mortality in fisheries and mitigation techniques in Falkland Island waters 2003/04. Stanley: Falklands Conservation.	United Kingdom
Sullivan, B.J., Reid, T.A. & Bugoni, L. In press Seabird mortality on factory trawlers in the Falkland Islands and beyond. <i>Biological Conservation</i> .	United Kingdom
Suryan, R.M. and G.R. Balogh. 2005. Marine habitats of endangered short-tailed albatrosses and spatial and temporal interaction with North Pacific commercial fisheries. Draft final report to the North Pacific Research Board, Anchorage, Alaska.	United States
Suryan, R. M., F. Sato, G. Balogh, K. D. Hyrenbach, P. R. Sievert, and K. Ozaki. 2006. Foraging destinations and marine habitat use of short-tailed albatrosses: a multi-scale approach using first-passage time analysis. <i>Deep-Sea Research II</i> In press.	United States
Terauds, A. and Gales, R. 2006. Provisioning strategies and growth patterns of Light-mantled	Australia

AC2 FINAL REPORT

Sooty Albatrosses <i>Phoebastria palpebrata</i> on Macquarie Island. <i>Polar Biology</i> . Published on line DOI 10.1007/s00300-006-0133-6.	
Terauds, A., Gales, R., Baker, G.B., Alderman, R. 2006. Foraging areas of black-browed and grey-headed albatrosses breeding on Macquarie Island in relation to marine protected areas. <i>Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems</i> 16: 133–146.	Australia
Terauds, A., Gales, R., Alderman, R. 2005. Trends in numbers and survival of black-browed (<i>Thalassarche melanophrys</i>) and grey-headed (<i>T. chrysostoma</i>) albatrosses breeding on Macquarie Island. <i>Emu</i> 105, 159-167.	Australia
Trathan, P.N. & Croxall, J.P. 2004. Marine predators at South Georgia: an overview of recent bio-logging studies. <i>Memoirs of National Institute for Polar Research, Special Issue</i> , 58: 118-132.	United Kingdom
Tremblay, Y., Shaffer, S. A., Fowler, S. L., Kuhn, C. E., McDonald, B. I., Weise, M. J., Bost, C.-A., Weimerskirch, H., Crocker, D. E., Goebel, M. E., Costa, D. P. 2006. Interpolation of tracking data in a fluid environment. <i>Journal of Experimental Biology</i> 209: 128-140.	United States
USFWS. 2005. Regional Seabird Conservation Plan, Pacific Region. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Migratory Birds and Habitat Programs, Pacific Region, Portland, Oregon. http://www.fws.gov/pacific/migratorybirds/Seabird Conservation Plan Webpages/Complete USFWS Seabird Conservation Plan.pdf	United States
USFWS. 2005. Short-tailed Albatross Draft Recovery Plan. Anchorage, AK, 62 pp. http://ecos.fws.gov/docs/recovery_plans/2005/051027.pdf	United States
Van Bekkum, M.; Sagar, P.M.; Stahl, J.-C., <i>et al.</i> 2006. Natal philopatry does not lead to population genetic differentiation in Buller's albatross (<i>Thalassarche bulleri bulleri</i>). <i>Molecular Ecology</i> 15: 73-79.	New Zealand
Walker, K; Elliott, G. 2005. Population changes and biology of the Antipodean wandering albatross (<i>Diomedea antipodensis</i>) <i>Notornis</i> 52: 206.	New Zealand
Walker, K. & Elliott, G. (2005). Population changes and biology of the Antipodean wandering albatross (<i>Diomedea antipodensis</i>). <i>Notornis</i> 52:206-214.	New Zealand
Wanless, R.M.; Angel, A., Hilton, G.M. & Ryan, P.G. 2005. Cultural evolution in the introduced house mouse: evidence for the cultural transmission of a unique predatory behaviour on Gough Island? p223 in Abstracts of the 19th Annual Meeting of the Society for Conservation Biology, Universidade de Brasília, Brasília, DF, Brazil, 15th - 19th July 2005. http://www.conbio.org/Activities/Meetings/2005/pdf/abstract.pdf	United Kingdom
Waugh, S.; Filippi, D.; Fukuda, A., <i>et al.</i> 2005. Foraging of royal albatrosses, <i>Diomedea epomophora</i> , from the Otago Peninsula and its relationships to fisheries. <i>Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences</i> 62: 1410.	New Zealand
Xavier, J.C. & Croxall, J.P. 2005. Sexual differences in foraging behaviour and food choice: a case-study of wandering albatrosses. In: Sexual segregation: ecology of the two sexes (eds. Ruckstuhl, K.E. & Neuhaus, P.). Pp. 74-91. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge	United Kingdom
Xavier J.C., Croxall, J.P. & Cresswell, K.A. Boluses 2005. An effective method for assessing the proportions of cephalopods in the diet of albatrosses. <i>Auk</i> 122: 1182- 1190.	United Kingdom
Xavier, J.C., Trathan, P.N., Croxall, J.P., Wood, A.G., Podesta, G. & Rodhouse, P.G.K. 2004. Feeding ecology of wandering albatrosses during their chick-rearing period at South Georgia. <i>Fisheries Oceanography</i> 13: 324-344.	United Kingdom

FORMAT FOR REPORTS ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AGREEMENT

Following the general framework of the Action Plan, all contributing reports should be accurate, up-to-date, and written with the purpose of identifying and facilitating opportunities for coordination and priority setting for future activities pursuant to the Agreement. As such, all entries should include information on the potential for cooperation and collaboration with Agreement Parties, Range States, and other participants.

In particular, responses should include specific information on the potential for technology transfer, information exchange, or capacity building that would facilitate or augment the described activities. Where a particular measure doesn't apply, this should be indicated. For example, if the control of invasive species for the protection of seabirds is not an issue of concern in your country, please indicate this rather than not reporting under this heading. Wherever there are obstacles or substantial challenges to full and effective implementation of the Agreement, such obstacles should be specified, as appropriate. Priority should be given to reporting on actions pertain directly to species of albatrosses and petrels listed under Annex I of the Agreement. Where activities related to non-listed species are described, the potential of those activities to produce substantial indirect benefits to Agreement-listed species through the development and testing of technology, scientific or management approaches, or other relevant activities, should be explained.

Name of Party, Range State, or Other:

Designated Point of Contact:

Institution:

Mailing Address:

Telephone:

Fax:

Email:

AC2 FINAL REPORT

1. Species Conservation

Outline of planned actions for national implementation over the next three years	Action Plan Reference	AC Work Programme Reference	Agreement Reference

Briefly list major planned actions for carrying out the Agreement over the next three years. Specifically highlight particular themes, focuses, gaps, and challenges to fully completing such actions.

Measures to eliminate, control or prevent introduction of non-native species to breeding sites	Action Plan Reference	AC Work Programme Reference	Agreement Reference
	1.4	3	III (1) b)

Briefly describe efforts to eliminate, control, or prevent the introduction of non-native species to the breeding sites of Annex I species, with specific reference to how the success or failure of such efforts would impact the long-term survival of one or more Annex I species.

Report on any exemptions to prohibitions on the taking or harming of albatrosses and petrels	Action Plan Reference	AC Work Programme Reference	Agreement Reference
	1.1.2		III (3)

Provide a brief list of exemptions granted for the taking or harming of Annex I species in your country (as appropriate). Estimate the impact of such exemptions on the species and indicate how such exemptions are consistent with efforts to protect such species under the species conservation provisions of the Agreement.

Use and trade	Action Plan Reference	AC Work Programme Reference	Agreement Reference
	1.1.1, 1.1.2		III (3)

Provide a brief list of activities related to the use and trade of Annex I species in your country (as appropriate). Estimate the impact of such use and trade, or the restriction of such use and trade, indicating how such activities are consistent with efforts to protect Annex 1 species under the species conservation provisions of the Agreement.

Single or multi-species conservation strategies / action plans	Action Plan Reference	AC Work Programme Reference	Agreement Reference
	1.1.3		

Provide a brief description of single or multi-species conservation strategies or action plans focusing on Annex 1 species. Are such strategies and plans effective at conserving seabird species? What have the significant results been? What are the lessons learned from the implementation of such strategies and action plans?

Emergency Measures	Action Plan Reference	AC Work Programme Reference	Agreement Reference
	1.2		VIII (11) e)

AC2 FINAL REPORT

Have any emergency measures been authorized?

Re-establishment schemes	Action Plan Reference	AC Work Programme Reference	Agreement Reference
	1.3		

Have you conducted any re-establishment schemes? For which species? What were the most important results of such schemes? Has an obvious benefit to at least one Annex 1 listed species been detected? What were the lessons learned?

Any other conservation projects for ACAP species	Action Plan Reference	AC Work Programme Reference	Agreement Reference

Briefly provide information on any other activities that you carried out for benefit or that have benefited Annex 1 species. What are the most substantial and transferable results of these activities?

Legal and policy instruments for species protection of albatrosses and petrels	Action Plan Reference	AC Work Programme Reference	Agreement Reference
	5.1 l)	3	

Provide a list including brief descriptions of the main elements of national legislation or other legal measures in your country (if applicable) that directly pertain to or could be applied to the species conservation provisions of the Agreement. Include information on how these measures are being specifically being used in or could potentially contribute to the protection Annex I species. Are existing measures adequate and/or effective for fulfillment of the Agreement? How so or how not?

2. Habitat Conservation

Measures (legal and policy instruments and actions) to implement protection and management of breeding sites including habitat restoration	Action Plan Reference	AC Work Programme Reference	Agreement Reference
	2.1	3	III (1) a)

Provide a list including brief descriptions of the main elements of national legislation or other legal measures in your country (if applicable) that directly pertain to or could be applied to the habitat conservation provisions of the Agreement. Include information on how these measures are being specifically being used in or could potentially contribute to the protection of breeding sites of Annex I species. Are existing measures adequate and/or effective for fulfillment of the Agreement? How so or how not?

Sustainable management of marine living resources which provide food for albatrosses and petrels	Action Plan Reference	AC Work Programme Reference	Agreement Reference
	2.3.1 a)		

Provide a summary of whether the management of living marine resources under your authority (as appropriate) was carried out in such a way that provides sufficient food for Annex 1 species. How so? Were direct or indirect benefits achieved?

AC2 FINAL REPORT

Management and protection of important marine areas for albatrosses and petrels	Action Plan Reference	AC Work Programme Reference	Agreement Reference
	2.3.2, 2.3.3	4	

Provide a brief description of the management and protection of important marine areas for or resulting in the benefit of Annex 1 species. Were these actions successful? In what ways? What were the most significant benefits?

3. Management of Human Activities

Legal and policy instruments for environmental impact assessments	Action Plan Reference	AC Work Programme Reference	Agreement Reference
	3.1		

Provide a brief description of legal and policy instruments in your country (as appropriate) for conducting environmental impact assessments as they directly pertain or have the potential to impact Annex 1 species.

Report on environmental impact statements related to albatrosses and petrels	Action Plan Reference	AC Work Programme Reference	Agreement Reference
	3.1		

Provide a description of environmental impact assessments conducted that directly pertain to Annex 1 species, their habitats, or significant food sources. Were any mitigation measures employed?

Measures to reduce or eliminate incidental mortality in fisheries	Action Plan Reference	AC Work Programme Reference	Agreement Reference
	3.2	6	

Describe activities related directly to reducing or eliminating the incidental mortality of Annex I species in fisheries. What are the greatest challenges or obstacles to the full realization of the potential for these actions?

Measures to combat illegal, unregulated, and unreported (IUU) fishing	Action Plan Reference	AC Work Programme Reference	Agreement Reference
	3.2.4	6	

Describe efforts conducted to combat illegal, unregulated and unreported fishing activities that have direct consequences for protecting Annex 1 species from either direct or indirect harm from such fishing activities.

Measures to minimise discharge of pollutants and marine debris (with reference to the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL))	Action Plan Reference	AC Work Programme Reference	Agreement Reference
	2.3.1 b), 3.3		

Describe activities related directly to the minimisation of pollutants and marine debris in or around important areas for seabirds. How are such activities contributing to the conservation of Annex I species?

AC2 FINAL REPORT

Measures to minimise disturbance in marine and terrestrial habitats	Action Plan Reference	AC Work Programme Reference	Agreement Reference
	3.4		

Describe measures conducted to minimise disturbance in marine and terrestrial habitats as they directly apply to Annex 1 species. Provide any noteworthy details of the execution of such measures.

4. Research and Monitoring

Ongoing research programmes relating to the conservation of albatrosses and petrels	Action Plan Reference	AC Work Programme Reference	Agreement Reference
	4.1		

Provide a summary of more notable research activities and findings that may be noteworthy or of particular interest to other Agreement Parties, Range States, or participants. This may include substantial results, identification of major information gaps, or noteworthy results regarding shared species.

Observer programs to monitor fisheries bycatch of albatrosses and petrels	Action Plan Reference	AC Work Programme Reference	Agreement Reference
	4.2	5.1	

Describe actions taken to monitor fisheries bycatch of seabird species, specifically detailing techniques, technologies, or other aspects of such monitoring that may be of interest and/or use to other Parties, Range States, or participants.

National institutions (lists of authorities, research centres, scientists and nongovernmental organisations) involved in albatross and petrel conservation	Action Plan Reference	AC Work Programme Reference	Agreement Reference

Provide a list of national institutions that are involved in seabird conservation, specifically noting any significant connections and collaborations between institutions and how such collaborations have facilitated seabird conservation.

5. Collation of Information by the Advisory Committee

There is no obligation for Parties to report under this heading.

6. Education and Public Awareness

Dissemination of information / training for 'user audiences' e.g. scientists, fishermen, conservation bodies, and decision-makers	Action Plan Reference	AC Work Programme Reference	Agreement Reference
	6.1		

Briefly describe actions taken in the dissemination of information/training for "user audiences". Have such materials been shown to be effective at furthering the goals of the Agreement?

AC2 FINAL REPORT

Dissemination of information to the general public	Action Plan Reference	AC Work Programme Reference	Agreement Reference
	6.2		

Provide a brief description of activities undertaken to disseminate information to the general public regarding seabirds and seabird conservation. Have these activities increased public awareness of such issues and how has this contributed to your overall seabird conservation efforts?

7. Implementation

Summarise progress to implement decisions of previous Meetings of the Parties	Action Plan Reference	AC Work Programme Reference	Agreement Reference

Provide a summary of progress made to implement specific decisions made at previous Meetings of the Parties, in addition to those outlined generally in the Action Plan. How have these actions been integrated into larger seabird conservation efforts?

**DRAFT AGENDA -
THIRD MEETING OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Agenda item
1. Opening Remarks
2. Adoption of the Agenda
3. Report from Interim Secretariat 3.1 Activities undertaken in 2006 3.2 Financial Report
4. Report of Depository
5. Reports from ACAP Observers At Other International Meetings
6. Reports on Implementation of the Action Plan
7. Rules of Procedure
8. ACAP Secretariat 8.1 Work Programme 2007 8.2 Agreement Budget 2008-2009 8.2 Performance Indicators
9. Review of the Status and Trends of Albatrosses and Petrels 9.1 Report of Working Group
10. Taxonomy of Albatrosses and Petrels 10.1 Report of Working Group
11. Breeding Sites 11.1 Report of Working Group 11.2 Application of Criteria for Identifying Internationally Important Breeding Sites
12. Seabird Bycatch Working Group 12.1 Report of Working Group
13. Advisory Committee Work Programme 13.1 Review Work Programme 2007 13.2 Development of Conservation Guidelines
14. Advisory Committee Report to MOP 14.1 Implementation of the Agreement 14.2 Activities of the Advisory Committee
15. Developing Indicators to Measure the Success of ACAP
16. Listing of New Species
17. Fourth Meeting of the Advisory Committee

AC2 FINAL REPORT

18. Other Business
19. Draft Agenda for AC4
20. Closing Remarks
21. Adoption of Report

FISHERIES BYCATCH RESOLUTION

Noting that ACAP III (h) supports the implementation of IPOA-S; and

Recognizing that RFMOs and national fishery management agencies manage a number of fisheries that [may] adversely impact albatrosses and petrels populations;

Parties are encouraged, for all fishing methods that are known to or may adversely impact seabirds, to;

- 1) Introduce, monitor and maintain effective seabird bycatch reduction measures;
- 2) Conduct assessments of the nature and extent of seabird bycatch, and the degree of overlap between fishing effort and albatross and petrel distribution;
- 3) Develop NPOA-S or similar plans to assist in the implementation of measures that provide for a continuing reduction in seabird bycatch in all fisheries that adversely impact seabirds;
- 4) Proactively engage and facilitate information exchange with all relevant RFMOs and other relevant international and national bodies;
- 5) Include technical advisors with relevant expertise in seabird bycatch mitigation and seabird biology in member delegation of RFMOs, where possible; and
- 6) Assist in the development, adoption and implementation of RFMO resolutions and other instruments that will result in the development of observer programmes for seabird bycatch data collection, use of effective mitigation measures and a reduction in the extent of seabird bycatch within the RFMO fisheries.

RESOLUTION ON ADOPTION OF THE RED LIST INDEX AS AN INTERIM HEADLINE INDICATOR

Noting that at the first meeting of the Advisory Committee the IUCN Red List Index was identified as a useful headline indicator to monitor the success of ACAP in achieving its objectives;

Aware that BirdLife International is the official IUCN Red List Authority for birds, supplying the categories and associated detailed documentation for all the world's birds to the IUCN Red List each year;and

Recognising that in the longer term a more temporally responsive and targeted population-trend based indicator will be developed by ACAP;

Parties are requested to adopt the Red List Index as an interim headline indicator.

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

PART I

MEETINGS, DELEGATES, OBSERVERS, SECRETARIAT

Rule 1: Meetings

1. The Advisory Committee (hereafter referred to as the 'Committee') shall meet annually, unless decided otherwise by the Committee or instructed by the Meeting of Parties, preferably in association with another event that would reduce the travelling costs of participants.
2. At each Meeting, the Committee shall decide on the date, location and duration of the next Meeting. The Secretariat shall notify Parties of these details not less than 120 days before the next Meeting.

Rule 2: Delegates

1. A Party to the Agreement (hereafter referred to as a "Party") shall be entitled to appoint one member to the Committee (hereafter referred to as the Committee Member) and such other Alternative Representatives and Advisers as the Party may deem necessary. Parties shall submit the names of their Committee Member and Alternate Committee Members and Advisers to the Secretariat through their coordinating authorities prior to the start of each Meeting.
2. Subject to the provisions of Rule 13 paragraph 1, the Committee Member shall exercise the voting rights of that Party. In the Committee Member's absence, an Alternate Committee Member of that Party shall act in the Committee Member's place over the full range of functions.
3. The appointed Committee Member or Alternate Committee Member shall be available for consultation between Meetings.

Rule 3: Observers

1. All signatories to the Agreement, other States which are not Parties, any member economy of the Asia Pacific Economic Co-operation Forum in respect of Article VIII, paragraph 15 of the Agreement, the United Nations, any specialised Agency of the United Nations, any regional economic integration organisation, any secretariat of a relevant international convention, particularly regional fisheries management organisations, may send observers to Committee meetings, who shall have the right to participate but not vote.
2. Any international scientific, environmental, cultural or technical body concerned with the conservation and management of marine living resources or the conservation of albatrosses and petrels may request admittance to Committee meetings. Such

AC2 FINAL REPORT

participation may include submitting documents to the Secretariat for distribution at meetings as information documents and addressing the Committee.

3. Written applications for attendance from such international bodies (described in paragraph 2) should be received by the Secretariat at least 90 days before the relevant meeting, and circulated forthwith by the Secretariat to Parties. Parties shall inform the Secretariat of their acceptance or rejection of all applications no less than 60 days before the meeting. An applicant shall be permitted to attend as a non-voting observer unless one third of the Parties that respond object to their application.
4. Any other scientific, environmental, cultural or technical body concerned with the conservation and management of marine living resources or the conservation of albatrosses and petrels may request admittance to Committee meetings. Such participation may include submitting documents to the Secretariat for distribution to the meeting as information documents and addressing the Committee.
5. Written applications for attendance from such other bodies (described in para 4) should be received by the Secretariat at least 60 days before the relevant meeting, and circulated forthwith by the Secretariat to Parties. Parties shall inform the Secretariat of their acceptance or rejection of all applications no less than 30 days before the meeting. An applicant shall be permitted to attend as a non-voting observer provided no objection is received.
6. Prior to the meeting, the names of representatives of observers shall be submitted to the Secretariat by the State, agency, organisation or body invited to attend.
7. Seating limitations and the financial capacity of the Secretariat may require that no more than two observers from any non-Party State or organisation be present at Meetings.

Rule 4: Secretariat

1. Unless otherwise instructed by the Parties, the Secretariat shall service the Committee.

PART II

OFFICERS

Rule 5: Chair

1. The Committee shall elect a Chair and a Vice-chair from among the Committee Members or their Alternate Committee Members in accordance with Rule 12.
2. After election, the Chair and Vice-chair of the Committee shall hold office until the end of the first Meeting of the Committee following the next session of the Meeting of Parties.
3. The Chair and Vice-chair may be nominated for re-election at the end of a term of office. The Chair and Vice-chair shall not normally hold office for more than three consecutive terms.

Rule 6: Presiding officer

AC2 FINAL REPORT

1. The Chair shall preside at all Meetings of the Committee.
2. If the Chair is absent or is unable to discharge the duties of Presiding Officer, the Vice-chair shall deputise.
3. In the event that both the Chair and the Vice-chair are absent or unable to discharge the duties of Presiding Officer, the appointed members present shall elect a Chair from amongst the Committee Members and their Alternate Committee Members for the duration of that Meeting.
4. If the Presiding Officer is a member of the Committee for whom no alternate has been appointed or an appointed alternate is not present, the Presiding Officer may vote.

PART III

RULES OF ORDER AND DEBATE

Rule 7: Powers of presiding officer

1. In addition to exercising powers conferred elsewhere in these Rules, the Presiding Officer shall at Meetings:
 - a) open and close the Meeting;
 - b) direct the discussions;
 - c) ensure the observance of these Rules;
 - d) accord the right to speak;
 - e) put questions to the vote and announce decisions;
 - f) rule on points of order; and
 - g) subject to these Rules, have complete control of the proceedings of the Meeting and the maintenance of order.
2. The Presiding Officer may, in the course of discussion at a Meeting, propose:
 - a) time limits for speakers;
 - b) limitation of the number of times the members of a delegation or an observer may speak on any question;
 - c) the closure of the list of speakers;
 - d) the adjournment or the closure of the debate on the particular subject or question under discussion;
 - e) the suspension or adjournment of any Meeting; and
 - f) the establishment of discussion and drafting groups on specific issues.

Rule 8: Seating, Quorum

1. No Committee meetings shall take place in the absence of a quorum. A quorum for Committee meetings shall consist of four Committee Members or one-half of the Committee Members present at the meeting, whichever is the greater.

Rule 9: Right to speak

1. The Presiding Officer shall call upon speakers in the order in which they signify their desire to speak, with precedence given to the Committee Members.

AC2 FINAL REPORT

2. A Committee Member, advisor or observer may speak only if called upon by the Presiding Officer, who may call a speaker to order if the remarks are not relevant to the subject under discussion.
3. A speaker shall not be interrupted, except on a point of order. The speaker may, however, with the permission of the Presiding Officer, give way during his speech to allow any participant or observer to request elucidation on a particular point in that speech.

Rule 10: Procedural motions

1. During the discussion of any matter, a Committee Member may call a point of order, and the point of order shall be immediately, where possible, decided by the Presiding Officer in accordance with these Rules. A Committee Member may appeal against any ruling of the Presiding Officer. The appeal shall immediately be put to the vote, and the Presiding Officer's ruling, shall stand unless a majority of the Parties present and voting decides otherwise. A delegate calling a point of order may not speak on the substance of the matter under discussion.
2. The following motions shall have precedence in the following order over all other proposals or motions before the Meeting:
 - a) to suspend the Meeting;
 - b) to adjourn the Meeting;
 - c) to adjourn the debate on the particular subject or question under discussion;
 - d) to close the debate on the particular subject or question under discussion.

Rule 11: Arrangements for debate

1. The Meeting may, on a proposal by the Presiding Officer or by a Committee Member, limit the time to be allowed to each speaker and the number of times anyone may speak on any question. When the debate is subject to such limits, and a speaker has spoken for the allotted time, the Presiding Officer shall call the speaker to order without delay.
2. During the course of a debate the Presiding Officer may announce the list of speakers, and, with the consent of the Committee, declare the list closed. The Presiding Officer may, however, accord the right of reply to any individual if a speech delivered after the list has been declared closed makes this desirable.
3. During the discussion of any matter, a Committee Member may move the adjournment of the debate on the particular subject or question under discussion. In addition to the proposer of the motion, a Committee Member may speak in favour of, and a Committee Member of each of two Parties may speak against the motion, after which the motion shall immediately be put to the vote. The Presiding Officer may limit the time to be allowed to speakers under this Rule.
4. A Committee Member may at any time move the closure of the debate on the particular subject or question under discussion, whether or not any other individual has signified the wish to speak. Permission to speak on the motion for closure of the debate shall be accorded only to a Committee Member from each of two Parties wishing to speak against the motion, after which the motion shall immediately be put to the vote. The

AC2 FINAL REPORT

Presiding Officer may limit the time to be allowed to speakers under this Rule.

5. During the discussion of any matter a Committee Member may move the suspension or the adjournment of the Meeting. Such motions shall not be debated but shall immediately be put to the vote. The Presiding Officer may limit the time allowed to the speaker moving the suspension or adjournment of the Meeting.

Rule 12: Taking of Decisions

1. The Presiding Officer shall put to all Committee Members all questions, proposals and actions requiring decisions. Decisions shall be adopted by consensus or, if consensus cannot be achieved, by voting.

PART IV

VOTING

Rule 13: Voting

1. Without prejudice to the provisions of Rule 2, Paragraph 2, each Committee Member shall have one vote.
2. Parties which are one year behind in paying their budget contributions on the date of the first day of the Committee meeting shall not be eligible to vote unless the Meeting of Parties have agreed to allow those Parties to exercise their vote in accordance with Rule 20 (paragraph 2) of the Rules of Procedure for the Meeting of Parties.
3. The Committee shall normally vote by show of hands at a meeting, but any Committee Member may request a roll-call vote. In the event of a vote between Meetings, there will be a postal or email ballot. Voting by email or postal voting shall be coordinated by the Secretariat.
4. At the election of officers, any Committee Member may request a secret ballot. If seconded, the question of whether a secret ballot should be held shall immediately be voted upon. The motion for a secret ballot may not be conducted by secret ballot.
5. Voting by roll-call or by secret ballot shall be expressed by "Yes", "No" or "Abstain". Only affirmative and negative votes shall be counted in calculating the number of votes cast by Committee Members present and voting.
6. If, during the course of a person being elected to a position, no candidate obtains the support of more than half of the Parties present and voting in the first ballot, a second ballot shall be taken between the two candidates obtaining the largest number of votes. If in the second ballot the votes are equally divided, the Presiding Officer shall decide between the candidates by drawing lots.
7. The Presiding Officer shall be responsible for the counting of the votes and shall announce the result. The Presiding Officer may be assisted by the Secretariat. Voting by email or postal ballot shall be co-ordinated by the Secretariat.

AC2 FINAL REPORT

8. After the Presiding Officer has announced the beginning of the vote, it shall not be interrupted except by a Committee Member on a point of order in connection with the actual conduct of the voting. The Presiding Officer may permit Committee Members to explain their votes either before or after the voting, and may limit the time to be allowed for such explanations.

Rule 14: Majority and voting procedures on motions and amendments

1. Decisions, within the limit of the power available to the AC, relating to rules of procedure and financial matters shall be adopted by consensus.
2. Any other decision taken by the AC shall be decided by a two thirds majority of the Committee Members present and voting with the exception of the election of officers which shall be undertaken in accordance with Rule 13.
3. If an amendment is moved to a proposal, the amendment shall be voted on first. If the amendment is adopted, the amended proposal shall then be voted upon.

PART V

LANGUAGES AND RECORDS

Rule 15: Working languages

1. English, French and Spanish shall be the working languages of any Committee meeting and working groups.
2. If requested by any Party, speeches made in any of the working languages shall, as feasible, be interpreted into another working language.
3. The official documents of the meeting shall be distributed in the working languages. Information papers will not normally be translated.
4. Interpretation services in a working language shall be provided at a Committee meeting where requested by a Party through the submission of a delegate registration form at least one month prior to the commencement of a Committee meeting.

Rule 16: Other languages

1. A speech may be made in a language other than a working language if the speaker provides for interpretation into a working language. Interpretation by the Secretariat into another working language may be based upon the first interpretation.
2. Any document submitted to the Secretariat in any language other than a working language shall be accompanied by a translation into one of the working languages, this translation being trustworthy.

Rule 17: Documents

AC2 FINAL REPORT

1. The documents for each meeting of the Committee shall be distributed to the Parties in the working languages by the Secretariat at least 30 days before the opening of the Meeting. If documents are to be translated by the Secretariat, they shall be sent to the Secretariat by those submitting them at least 60 days in advance of the Meeting. Information papers will not normally be translated.
2. At the discretion of the Chair, in exceptional circumstances documents may be accepted after these deadlines, but not later than two weeks before the Meeting. Such documents shall be submitted in all working languages.
3. Wherever practicable, documents will be distributed electronically.
4. A draft agenda shall be adopted by the Advisory Committee for the next meeting. This shall be circulated by the Secretariat 120 days prior to the meeting with a request that any new items for the agenda be notified within 30 days. The Secretariat shall circulate the revised draft agenda at least 60 days prior to the meeting.

Rule 18: Record of the Meeting

1. Records of the Meeting shall be circulated to all Parties in the working languages of the Meeting.
2. Once adopted, amendments to the Records of the Meeting shall not be made without the approval of all Parties attending the meeting. Typographical and minor editorial changes may be made by the Secretariat. A record of any changes made must be maintained by the Secretariat.
3. The Committee and working groups shall decide upon the form in which their records shall be prepared.

PART VI

OPENNESS OF DEBATES

Rule 19: Committee meetings

1. Subject to seating availability, all Meetings shall be open to the public unless two thirds of the Parties present and voting at the Meeting decide that a session be closed to the public.

PART VII

WORKING GROUPS

AC2 FINAL REPORT

Rule 20: Establishment of working groups

1. The Committee may establish such working groups as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions. It shall appoint a Convenor of each working group and define its terms of reference. It may also define the composition of each working group. The Convenor may co-opt members to the working group.
2. As a general rule, meetings of working groups shall be limited to the Committee Members, Alternate Committee Members, their advisors, members appointed by the Committee and to members co-opted by the Convenor of the working group.

Rule 21: Procedure

1. Insofar as they are applicable, these Rules shall apply *mutatis mutandis* to the proceedings of working groups.

LIST OF DOCUMENTS

JUNE 2006

Paper	Title	Agenda Item	Author
<u>AC2 Doc 1</u>	Agenda	2	Secretariat
<u>AC2 Doc 2</u>	Annotated Agenda	2	Secretariat
<u>AC2 Doc 3</u>	Schedule	2	Secretariat
<u>AC2 Doc 4</u>	Participant List		Secretariat
<u>AC2 Doc 5</u>	List of Papers		Secretariat
<u>AC2 Doc 6</u>	Interim Secretariat Report	3.1	Secretariat
<u>AC2 Doc 7</u>	Depository Report	4	Australia
<u>AC2 Doc 8</u>	Development of Headquarters Agreement	7	Secretariat
<u>AC2 Doc 9</u>	Financial Report	3.2	Secretariat
<u>AC2 Doc 10</u>	Report of Status and Trends Working Group	8.1	Chair Status & Trends WG
<u>AC2 Doc 11</u>	Report of Taxonomy Working Group	9.1	Chair Taxonomy WG
<u>AC2 Doc 12</u>	Report of Breeding Sites Working Group	10.1	Chair Breeding Sites WG
<u>AC2 Doc 13</u>	Opportunities for ACAP in making progress in the conservation of albatrosses and petrels through Regional Fisheries Management Organisations	11.1	BirdLife International
<u>AC2 Doc 14</u>	Identification and establishment of high seas marine protected areas	11.1	SCAR
<u>AC2 Doc 15</u>	Methodologies for estimating bycatch	11.3	New Zealand
<u>AC2 Doc 16</u>	Advisory Committee Work Programme	12	Chair Advisory Committee
<u>AC2 Doc 17</u>	Secretariat Budget 2007-2009	13	Secretariat
<u>AC2 Doc 18</u>	Reporting on the Implementation of the Agreement	14.1	Secretariat
<u>AC2 Doc 19</u>	Preparation of Report on the Activities of the Advisory	14.2	Secretariat

AC2 FINAL REPORT

	Committee		
<u>AC2 Doc 20</u>	ACAP Indicators	15	South Africa / BirdLife International / New Zealand
<u>AC2 Doc 21</u>	Listing of New Species	16	Australia / South Africa
<u>AC2 Doc 22</u>	Third Meeting of the Advisory Committee	17	Secretariat
<u>AC2 Doc 23</u>	Second Session of the Meeting of the Parties	18	New Zealand / Secretariat
<u>AC2 Doc 24</u>	New Zealand Country Report 2006	14.1	New Zealand
<u>AC2 Doc 25</u>	Report on USA Seabird Conservation Efforts 2005-2006	14.1	United States of America
<u>AC2 Doc 26</u>	Ecuador Country Report 2006	14.1	Ecuador
<u>AC2 Doc 27</u>	South African Country Report 2005 - 2006	14.1	South Africa
<u>AC2 Doc 28</u>	United Kingdom Country Report	14.1	United Kingdom
<u>AC2 Doc 29</u>	Australian Country Report	14.1	Australia
<u>AC2 Doc 30</u>	Brazil Country Report	14.1	Brazil
<u>AC2 Doc 31</u>	Analysis of Remote Tracking Data	11.1	BirdLife International
<u>AC2 Doc 32</u>	Review of Methods for Status and Trends	8	Secretariat
<u>AC2 Doc 33</u>	France Country Report 2006	14.1	France
<u>AC2 Doc 34</u>	Working Paper on Proposed Working Format for the Advisory Committee Report to the Meeting of the Parties	14.1	Secretariat
<u>AC2 Doc 35</u>	Revised Rules of Procedure	19.1	Secretariat
<u>AC2 Doc 36</u>	Seabird Bycatch Working Group Terms of Reference	11	Seabird Bycatch WG
<u>AC2 Doc 37</u>	Scale of Contributions	13	Secretariat
AC2 Doc 38	Brief Report on the Activities of BirdLife to Implement the Agreement	14.1	BirdLife International
AC2 Doc 39	Appendix to the Brazil Country Report	14.1	Brazil

LIST OF INFORMATION PAPERS

JUNE 2006

Paper	Title	Agenda Item	Author
<u>AC2 Inf 1</u>	A Review of Methodologies Aimed at Avoiding and/or Mitigating Incidental Catch of Protected Seabirds	11	New Zealand
<u>AC2 Inf 2</u>	Characterisation of Seabird Captures in Commercial Trawl and Longline Fisheries in New Zealand 1997/98 to 2003/04	11	New Zealand
<u>AC2 Inf 3</u>	New Zealand Management of Introduced Mammals-Bibliography	10	New Zealand
<u>AC2 Inf 4</u>	Seabird Translocations in New Zealand	10	New Zealand
<u>AC2 Inf 5</u>	Determining the Efficacy of Warp Strike Mitigation Devices: Trial Design for the 2006 Southern Squid Fishery	11	New Zealand
<u>AC2 Inf 6</u>	ACAP Representative's Report on the First International Meeting on the Establishment of the South Pacific RFMO	5	New Zealand
<u>AC2 Inf 7</u>	List of Information Papers		Secretariat
<u>AC2 Inf 8</u>	Field Evaluation of Seabird Deterrent Gear and Alternatives for Alaska Small Longline Vessels	11	United States
<u>AC2 Inf 9</u>	The Distribution of Seabirds on the Alaskan Longline Fishing Grounds: Implications for Seabird Avoidance Regulations	11	United States
<u>AC2 Inf 10</u>	Seabird Avoidance Measures for Small Alaskan Longline Vessels	11	United States
<u>AC2 Inf 11</u>	Technical Assistance for Hawaii Pelagic Longline Vessels to Change Deck Design and Fishing Practices to Side Set	11	United States
<u>AC2 Inf 12</u>	CCAMLR Observer Report	5	USA
<u>AC2 Inf 13</u>	IATTC Observer Report	5	USA
<u>AC2 Inf 14</u>	ERS WG Observer Report	5	Secretariat
<u>AC2 Inf 15</u>	UK Comments on HQA	7.1	UK
<u>AC2 Inf 16</u>	Argentine Comments on HQA	7.1	Argentina
<u>AC2 Inf 17</u>	List of RFMO Meetings	5	Secretariat

AC2 FINAL REPORT

Paper	Title	Agenda Item	Author
<u>AC2 Inf 18</u>	Birdlife International Reports from Attendance at meetings of Regional Fisheries Organisations May 2005-May 2006	5	BirdLife International
<u>AC2 Inf 19</u>	Future Meetings of other International Organisations	5.1	Secretariat
<u>AC2 Inf 20</u>	Statement of the Argentine Republic		Argentina
<u>AC2 Inf 21</u>	IUU Fishing		
<u>AC2 Inf 22</u>	2 nd WHOI Workshop on Albatross Demography	8	USA
<u>AC2 Inf 23</u>	3 rd Preliminary Report: WHOI Workshop on Albatross Demography	8	USA

ATTACHMENT 1

STATEMENT OF THE ARGENTINE REPUBLIC

To be recorded in the Report of the Second Meeting of the Advisory Committee of the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels
Brasilia, Brazil, 5-8 June 2006

The Argentine Government reiterates the statement made on the occasion of the First Meeting of the Parties to the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels in the sense of rejecting the extension of application to the Malvinas, South Georgia and South Sandwich islands made by the United Kingdom when ratifying ACAP. In this regard, Argentina also rejects references found in documents of the Second Meeting of the Advisory Committee in relation to the Malvinas, South Georgia and South Sandwich islands as separate from the Argentine Republic and with a nomenclature which does not correspond with the guidelines promulgated by Editorial Directive ST/CS/SER.A/42 of the United Nations, as well as references made by the alleged local authorities of said territories.

The Argentine Government recalls that the Malvinas, South Georgia and South Sandwich islands and the surrounding maritime spaces are an integral part of the territory of the Argentine Republic and that they have been illegitimately occupied by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, this being the subject of a sovereignty dispute between two countries which has been recognized by a number of international organizations.

In this regard, the General Assembly of the United Nations has adopted Resolutions 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII), 31/49, 37/9, 38/12, 39/6, 40/21, 41/40, 42/19 and 43/25, in which it recognizes the existence of the sovereignty dispute in relation to the "Question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas)" urging the Governments of the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to resume their negotiations in order to find as soon as possible a peaceful, just and lasting solution to the sovereignty dispute ". Furthermore, the Special Committee on Decolonization of the United Nations has pronounced itself on repeated occasions in the same sense, more recently through a resolution adopted on 15 June 2005. Further, the General Assembly of the Organization of American States adopted on 7 June 2005 a new statement of similar terms over this issue.

The Argentine Government further recalls paragraph 1.12 of the "Report of the First Meeting of the Advisory Committee": "It was noted that in documents produced by the Secretariat, all references to the Falkland Islands should be read as 'Falkland Islands / Islas Malvinas' and all references to South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands should be read as 'South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands / Islas Georgias del Sur e Islas Sandwich del Sur'. Corrections to the current documents will appear on the website and future documents will use this formulation".

ATTACHMENT 2

STATEMENT BY THE DELEGATION OF THE UNITED KINGDOM

In response to the statements made by Argentina the UK indicated that it has no doubt about its sovereignty over the Falkland Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands and their respective surrounding maritime areas. The UK stated that the extension of its ratification of the Agreement to the Falkland Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands and its Antarctic Territories was wholly in accord with its well-known position.

The UK reminded Argentina that both Governments' positions in respect of the Agreement and any acts or activities taking place under it, are held under the provisions of Article XIII of the Agreement.

The UK rejected Argentina's assertion as to the legitimacy of the status of representatives on the UK delegation. The UK stated that it will maintain the right to decide on the composition of its delegation to any future Meeting of the Parties or subsidiary body.

Furthermore, noting that one of the statements made by Argentina (relating to the UK's ratification of the Agreement) appeared to have the status of a formal diplomatic Note the UK reserved its right to respond subsequent to the meeting.

AC2 FINAL REPORT