



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

**Fourth Meeting of Advisory Committee**

*Cape Town, South Africa, 22 – 25 August 2008*

---

**Title: Report on ATCM, 2-13 June 2008**

**Author: United Kingdom**

Observer Report – Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting

Meeting Title: Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting (ATCM)

Meeting Organisation: Committee for Environmental Protection (CEP)

Date and Location: 2-13 June 2008, Kyiv

Website Address: <http://v3.ats.aq/e/cep.htm>

Your Name/Affiliation: Rachel Clarke, British Antarctic Survey

Capacity of Attendance: UK delegate

Relevant Paper(s) Tabled:

SCAR WP10 (Rev 1)

NZ WP30 (Rev 3)

Author(s) and/or Presenter if Different:

Summary of Content and Outcome (e.g. summary of relevant discussion, resolution, etc):

The following paragraphs are extracted from the draft CEP report.

***b) Specially Protected Species***

- (1) SCAR introduced WP 10 rev 1 *Status of the Regional, Antarctic Population of the Southern Giant Petrel – Progress*, and summarized the steps taken by SCAR to advise the ATCM on whether the Southern Giant Petrel should be listed as a Specially protected Species under Annex II to the Protocol on Environmental Protection, particularly a workshop held in Cambridge in May 2008, where members of several parties, SCAR, BirdLife International and ACAP had participated. For the purposes of this workshop, SCAR compiled an extensive database on abundance and trends of the species at all known breeding sites, and scrutinized the data according to the IUCN red list criteria for regional assessments.
- (2) SCAR also raised several caveats. First, that data for several sites are not current, but that by comparison with assessments for other bird species globally, the data are extensive. Second, that data on fledging success, juvenile and adult survival, and breeding frequency are available for only a few breeding sites, and much variation exists between these site-specific data, so precluding demographic modelling of future trends. Third, that census data at sites are often not comparable among years.
- (3) SCAR concluded that:
  - According to the IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria, the southern giant petrel population south of 60°S is of Least Concern under Criteria A2 and B-E. Therefore it does not qualify as Critically Endangered, Endangered, Vulnerable

or Near Threatened, and the present data and analysis do not support the designation of the southern giant petrel as a SPS under Annex II.

- Additional censuses of breeding sites and of fledging success should be undertaken in a consistent scientific manner, which SCAR outlined, to enable better estimates to be made of current trends in the southern giant petrel population (north and south of 60°S). Should such work indicate a change in the status of the species, it should be reassessed.
  - Further quantitative work should be undertaken, using both current and new data, so that quantitative demographic models can be applied to the species. Because these models rely on carefully collected, time series information, the collection of such information was encouraged.
  - Sites that have been censused more than 10 years ago should be revisited at an appropriate time so that an assessment of the status of the species at these sites can be made.
  - The lessons learned from this process should be applied to other species.
- (4) A number of countries thanked SCAR for the quality of their advice, noting it was a good example of cooperation between the CEP and SCAR. The SCAR recommendations were supported.
- (5) Australia stated that making the workshop data available to ACAP would assist with its global assessment of the species and would also help with determining the level of uncertainty with the Antarctic regional assessment. Australia strongly supported the development of a standardised methodology for population counts, and suggested the guidance contained in SCAR's paper could be referred to ACAP for consideration and further advice to the CEP if required. It also noted that the current assessment does not reduce the sensitivity of the species to disturbance, so the Parties should continue the commitments made in earlier Resolutions to limit such disturbance, including by taking steps to protect breeding habitat. These sentiments were endorsed by the Committee.
- (6) The UK described their future plans for survey and for continued convening of the ACAP breeding sites working group, and noted that advice and cooperation from experts within SCAR and CEP would be appreciated.
- (7) IUCN also noted that the IUCN Red List status of the species, released in May 2008, is "near threatened" and that the Red List assessment notes the ongoing threats from Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) fishing. The assessment also recommended conservation measures including, continued monitoring, minimising disturbance at breeding sites, and adoption of mitigation measures in all fisheries within the species range.
- (8) New Zealand presented WP 30 Rev 3 *Draft Action Plan for Southern Giant Petrel *Macronectes giganteus**, noting that the primary objective of the document was to provide a means of continuing to test the *Guidelines for CEP Consideration of Proposals for New and Revised Designations of Antarctic Specially Protected Species under Annex II of the Protocol* adopted at CEP VIII and to illustrate how a draft Action Plan could be developed following the accompanying template.

- (9) New Zealand noted that this test of the CEP's SPS guidelines was being conducted in the full knowledge that the range of southern giant petrels included areas outside of the Antarctic Treaty area and CAMLR Convention areas and, therefore, the concept of the Antarctic environment and dependent and associated ecosystems was particularly relevant to the protection of southern giant petrels. New Zealand also expressed that hopefully the test would be useful in clarifying the roles of the CEP, CCAMLR and the Antarctic Treaty Parties on this matter.
- (10) Several Parties thanked New Zealand for producing a useful model, noting that, together with SCAR's robust review, the process of producing the Action Plan was a good test of the CEP's guidelines and the process for collaboration between CEP and CCAMLR-SC about protected marine species.
- (11) France noted that it intends to make use of the draft action plan for its own management purposes and encouraged other Members to do so.
- (12) Noting that the Parties that had contributed to the draft Action Plan largely operate in Eastern Antarctica, Australia invited Parties with experience of the Antarctic Peninsula region to consider whether the types of actions identified in the plan would be appropriate to that region also.
- (13) The Committee agreed that because the southern giant petrel would not be listed as a specially protected species, it was not appropriate to formally adopt the draft as an Action Plan. The draft action plan will be made available through the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat website as an example, and for comment.

Outlook for Future ACAP Involvement:

Recommended Actions for ACAP:

Have relevant papers been forwarded to Secretariat:

No (data in some tables are confidential)