



Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels

Fifth Meeting of Advisory Committee

Mar del Plata, Argentina, 13 – 17 April 2010

**Amended Format for National Reports on Implementation
of the Agreement**

Author: **Australia**

Amended Format for National Reports on Implementation of the Agreement

Australia

Following agreement at MoP3 that changes were needed to the template used by Parties to report on implementation of the Agreement, this paper :

- proposes a revised template for adoption;
- notes that part of the template will need revision to include the results of the two ad-hoc, intersessional working groups developing the prioritisation framework and the format for national seabird bycatch reporting; and
- seeks the advice of the Advisory Committee and its working groups on the contents of that template, including on what might be suitable basic performance indicators to be reported on by Parties.

Background

In 2006, MoP2 discussed the format for Parties' reporting and, recognising the evolving needs of the Agreement, agreed to a new template for future reporting based on the reporting requirements of Annex 2. That template (see MoP2 Doc 29) was a compilation of the many reporting obligations contained in the Agreement and the Action Plan and, with minor refinements made at AC3, was used by most Parties as the basis for their reports to AC4. Those reports were also consolidated by the Secretariat (AC4 Doc 16 Rev 1). AC4 agreed that, while reporting had improved, further development of the format and content of Parties' implementation reports was required to address remaining concerns, including:

- it was difficult to quantitatively assess actions to implement the Agreement and their effectiveness (AC4 Report paragraph 7.1.6);
- it was difficult for the Secretariat to consolidate individual reports into a single report that summarised the collective position of all Parties;
- the template should be amended to include status and trend data, and seabird bycatch data required by AC Working Groups (AC4 Report paragraph 7.1.6); and
- the large number of topics and open text format for answers meant reporting was complex, lengthy and time consuming and, subsequently, expensive to translate all Parties' reports.

At MoP3 in 2009, Australia and the United Kingdom proposed a revised reporting process (MoP3 Doc 28). MoP3 (MoP3 Report paragraphs 7.2.1 and 7.2.2) agreed to task the Advisory Committee with further revising the reporting template intersessionally in accordance with the principles and broad content proposed at MoP3, noting that:

- national reporting should be outcome oriented and fulfill the aims of the Agreement and work of the Advisory Committee, with the frequency of reporting being linked to the priority of the topic (ie high priorities are reported more frequently); and
- the revised national reporting template would need to address the results of the two ad-hoc, intersessional working groups developing the prioritisation framework and the format for national seabird bycatch reporting.

Comments

Consistent with the discussion at MoP3, Australia has developed a draft revised reporting template (see Annex 1) for consideration by the Advisory Committee and its Working Groups. The draft template:

- proposes a mixture of higher and lower priority reporting items, with higher priority items to be reported on annually and lower priority items to be reported on once every three years;
- significantly reduces the amount of free text required (and the time needed for a Party to complete the report) and, making use of data already submitted to the ACAP database, seeks mostly quantitative information in a standard format from all Parties;
- provides for inclusion of a section on bycatch reporting and for the adjustment of other reporting items once the work of the two ad-hoc working groups (on bycatch reporting and development of the prioritisation framework) is complete; and
- proposes some possible basic performance indicators for the extent and quality of information collectively held by ACAP (and submitted by Parties) and what progress has been made towards achieving the objective of the Agreement.

Recommendations

1. That, consistent with their respective Terms of Reference, the Advisory Committee Working Groups on Status and Trends, Breeding Sites and Seabird Bycatch:
 - review those parts of the suggested reporting template, including the proposed low and high priority items and associated reporting intervals;
 - review the suggested basic performance indicators; and
 - advise the Advisory Committee (AC) on how a revised reporting template and the introduction of performance indicators can best assist their work and that of the AC and the Agreement.
2. That the Advisory Committee :
 - note and consider the request of MoP3 regarding developing a revised reporting template;
 - note and consider the suggestions in this paper and the advice of its Working Groups; and
 - agree on an interim revised reporting template, including basic performance indicators.

**ANNEX 1: SUGGESTED REVISED FORMAT AND REQUIREMENTS
FOR ACAP NATIONAL REPORTS**

PART 1: ANNUAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

SECTION A: PARTY INFORMATION

Name of Party, Range State, or Other:

Designated National Contact Point:

Institution:

Email:

Mailing Address:

Telephone:

SECTION B: POPULATIONS OF ACAP SPECIES AND THREATS ON LAND

The ACAP Secretariat would provide each Party with a table from the ACAP database containing a summary of the most recent population data for each of their breeding sites/populations, as previously supplied to the STWG, BSWG and SBWG. To indicate how the table would look, a sample has been prepared below using Australia as a hypothetical example.

For each population, each Party is asked to review the first **six (6)** columns in the summary table below and respond to the questions in the next **three (3)** highlighted columns by using appropriate Y/N checkboxes and including comments.

Table 1

| Breeding populations | Population at last count (breeding pairs) | Date of last count | Accuracy of count (whatever is database choice, eg H/M/L ¹) | Assessment of trend (whatever is database choice, and reliability eg I/S/D/U ²) | Threats with a level rating (a product of threat scope and severity) of "High" or "Very high" as at 2009 | For each listed threat, is an effective management response in place (Y/N). If "No" explain why not using the "Comments" column | Comments, including about past or future counts, existing or planned management responses, | Are more recent data or assessments available for this population? (Y/N; if Y use separate table/electronic database menu to submit new data to the ACAP database) |
|----------------------------|---|--------------------|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Macquarie Island | | | | | | | | |
| • Wandering albatross | 13 | 2009 | H | Stable – High | - | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| • Grey-headed Albatross | 115 | 2009 | H | Stable - High | - | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| • Black-browed Albatross | 61 | 2009 | H | Stable - High | - | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| • Grey Petrel | 32 | 2009 | H | Decreasing | - | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| • Light –mantled Albatross | 1000-1500 | 2005 | M | Unknown | - | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |

¹ H= High, M= Medium, L= Low

² I= Increasing, S= Stable, D= Decreasing, U= Unknown

Agenda items 14 & 16

Table 2 (The ACAP Secretariat would provide each Party with a table from the ACAP database containing a summary of the most recent population data for each of their breeding sites/populations, as previously supplied to the STWG, BSWG and SBWG. To indicate how the table would look, a sample has been prepared below using Australia as a hypothetical example)

For each population, each Party is asked to review the first **four (4)** columns in the summary table below and respond to the questions in the next **two (2)** highlighted columns by using appropriate Y/N checkboxes and including comments.

| Breeding population | Last available tracking data | | | Comments, including about adequacy of past tracking, plans for further tracking, use of tracking data in management responses?) | Are more recent data available? (Y/N; if Y use separate table/electronic database menu to submit new data to the Birdlife Int. GP database) |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---|--|
| | Breeders | Non-breeding adults | Non-breeding juveniles | | |
| Macquarie Island | | | | | |
| • Wandering albatross | 2007 | No data | No data | | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| • Grey-headed Albatross | 200? | No data | No data | | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| • Black-browed Albatross | 200? | No data | No data | | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| • Grey Petrel | No data | No data | No data | | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| • Light –mantled Albatross | 200? | No data | No data | | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |

Notes

For tables 1 and 2, after Parties have provided information in the highlighted rows, the ACAP Secretariat would consolidate information (in a pre-agreed manner) and produce summary report tables, for consideration by the Advisory Committee or MoP, to analyse:

- population censuses – are they improving over time, do we have more knowledge of populations, how many populations are unknown?
- knowledge – are coverage and quality, including age, of data improved, or not?; and
- coverage gaps by species/populations/regions?
- trend data by populations/species/region – are they improving or not
- trends in threats (positive or negative) or elimination of threats for each population, and management actions taken to address threats

Examples of suggested analyses are suggested on the final page (page 12).

Note: Tables 1 and 2 cover the reporting requirements for:

- population data for breeding sites (AC)
- status of populations listed under the Agreement (AC)
- conservation measures required for each population (AC)
- data on the occurrence at ACAP breeding sites of alien mammals, on proposed eradications of these species (AC)
- breeding sites (AC)

- threats to breeding sites (AC)
- measures to mitigate threats to breeding sites (AC)
- tracking / distribution data including gaps (AC)
- foraging distribution data (AC)

No data have been sought on pathogens and parasites present at breeding sites and which may impact on breeding populations (AC)

SECTION C: THREATS AT SEA

Format and content of this section to be completed after the work of the ad-hoc working group led by US (Kim Rivera) is completed.

Note: covers reporting requirements for:

- Parties activities relating to RFMOs (AC)
- measures to reduce or eliminate incidental mortality in fisheries (Action Plan 3.2)
- measures to combat IUU fishing (Action Plan 3.2.4)
- observer programmes to monitor fisheries bycatch of albatrosses and petrels (Action Plan 4.2)
- past / current levels of bycatch (for each fishery)

SECTION D: OTHER ANNUAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

| | Yes / No | If Yes, please provide additional information on the amount of funding, the recipients/providers and the purpose of the activities funded, and or attach relevant reports |
|---|--|---|
| Since the last report, has the Party funded any ACAP-related research? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| Since the last report has the Party received any funding for ACAP-related research? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| Since the last report has the Party undertaken or funded any capacity building activities relevant to ACAP? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |

| |
|---|
| Please list and provide any recent publications, including scientific and popular articles, videos, websites, pamphlets, manuals, identification guides, etc. |
| |

Note: covers reporting requirements for:

- research funded/gained (by ACAP, by others) (AC)
- capacity building activities and funding (AC)
- recent relevant publications including scientific and popular articles, videos, websites, pamphlets, manuals, identification guides etc (AC)
- request for images for the image database (AC)

PART 2: TRIENNIAL OR 'AS REQUIRED' REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

(to be completed, say, 90 days prior to a MoP, and in reference to actions taken since the last tri-ennial report)

| | Yes / No | Where Yes, please provide additional information and / or attach any relevant reports |
|--|--|---|
| Overview of implementation of Agreement and Action Plan | | |
| Since the last report, has action been taken to implement the decisions of previous MoPs? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| Is action for national implementation planned to occur in the next three years? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| Species conservation | | |
| Has the Party provided any exemptions to prohibitions on the taking or harmful interference with albatrosses and petrels? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| Has any use or trade in albatrosses or petrels occurred? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| Has the Party implemented any new single or multi-species conservation strategies / Action Plans? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| Has the Party taken any emergency measures involving albatrosses or petrels? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| Has the Party conducted any re-establishment schemes? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| Has the Party introduced any new legal and policy instruments for species protection of albatrosses and petrels? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| Has the Party introduced any legal and policy instruments for environmental impact assessments? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| Does the Party have any species it would like to submit for addition to Annex 1? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| Are there any other conservation projects for ACAP species not already mentioned? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| Habitat conservation | | |
| Has the Party introduced any legal or policy instruments or actions to implement protection and management of breeding sites, including habitat restoration? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| Has the Party implemented any sustainable management measures for marine living resources which provide food for albatrosses and petrels? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| Has the Party implemented any management or protection of important marine areas for albatrosses and petrels? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| Management of human activities | | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| Does the Party have any new environmental impact assessments related to albatrosses and petrels to report? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| Has the Party implemented any new measures to minimise discharge of pollutants and marine debris (MARPOL)? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| Has the Party introduced any new measures to minimise the disturbance to albatrosses and petrels in marine and terrestrial habitats? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| Does the Party have any ongoing research programmes relating to the conservation of albatrosses and petrels not already reported on? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| Does the Party have any additional national institutions (authorities, research centres, scientists, NGOs) involved in albatross and petrel conservation it would like to submit in this report? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| Education and public awareness | | |
| Has the Party conducted any training or provided any information for user audiences (eg scientists, fishers, etc)? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| Has the Party conducted any training or provided any information to the general public? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| Other | | |
| Does the Party have any new information to report regarding research into; observed impacts of; or mitigation in relation to climate change? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |

Covers reporting requirements for:

- progress to implement decisions of previous MOPs (Action Plan 7)
- outline of planned actions for national implementation over the next three years
- report on any exemptions to prohibitions on the taking or harmful interference with albatrosses and petrels (ACAP III(3))
- use and trade (Action Plan 1.1.1, 1.1.2)
- single or multi-species conservation strategies / Action Plans (Action Plan 1.1.3)
- emergency measures (Action Plan 1.2 and ACAP VIII (11) e))
- re-establishment schemes (Action Plan 1.3)
- legal and policy instruments for species protection of albatrosses and petrels; legal and policy instruments for environmental impact assessments (Action Plan 5.1 I), 3.1 and AC)
- additional species for addition to Annex 1 (AC)
- any other conservation projects for ACAP species (AC)
- measures (legal and policy instruments and actions) to implement protection and management of breeding sites including habitat restoration (Action Plan 2.2, ACAP III (1) a), (AC))
- sustainable management of marine living resources which provide food for albatrosses and petrels (Action Plan 2.3.1 a))
- management and protection of important marine areas for albatrosses and petrels (Action Plan 2.3.2, 2.3.3)

- report on EIAs related to albatrosses and petrels (Action Plan 3.1)
- measures to minimise discharge of pollutants and marine debris (with reference to MARPOL) (Action Plan 2.3.1 b), 3.3)
- measures to minimise disturbance in marine and terrestrial habitats (Action Plan 3.4)
- ongoing research programmes relating to the conservation of albatrosses and petrels (Action Plan 4.1)
- national institutions (lists of authorities, research centres, scientists and non-governmental organisations) involved in albatross and petrels conservation (AC)
- dissemination of information / training for user audiences eg scientists, fishers, conservation bodies, and decision makers (Action Plan 6.1)
- dissemination of information to the general public (Action Plan 6.2)
- climate change (AC)

Possible basic performance indicators at a whole-of-Agreement level

The following would be produced by the ACAP Secretariat as a summary report for each Advisory Committee meeting or session of the Meeting of the Parties. The reports would use the data submitted by Parties to the ACAP database and would show the latest year's data plus data from one "interval" (eg 3 years) previous and two "intervals" previous in successive columns (ie current, 3 years ago, 6 years ago).

The printout and an analysis of salient points would be presented as a meeting paper and review of the paper and consideration of consequential actions would be a standing agenda item for each meeting.

To make the tables easier to analyse, individual table cells could be automatically colour coded red, orange or green to denote trends of decline/unknown, stable or increase respectively, or to denote age (and other qualities) of data (eg <3 years old with sufficient data for assessing trend=green, 4-6 years old with sufficient data for trend assessment = orange, >6 years old and or insufficient data for trend assessment = red). Any such classifications and colour coding would be designed to facilitate the work of the AC and its Working Groups and their advice would be sought on the detail of how best to implement such aspects.

1. Basic summary information/indicators about populations/breeding sites

A summary table providing the proportion and number of breeding sites/populations for which ACAP has :

- a. a population estimate for current year, [insert agreed number] years ago and [insert agreed number] years ago (eg 2009, 2006 and 2003). Of these populations that have been estimated:
 - i. what were the proportion and number of populations in each category of accuracy (ie low/ medium/high/unknown) in the current year, [insert agreed number] years ago and [insert agreed number] years ago (eg 2009, 2006 and 2003)
- b. a population trend for current year, [insert agreed number] years ago and [insert agreed number] years ago (eg 2009, 2006 and 2003). Of these populations that have a trend assessment:
 - i. what were the proportion and number of populations in each category of accuracy (ie low/medium/high/unknown)for the current year, [insert agreed number] years ago and [insert agreed number] years ago (eg 2009, 2006 and 2003)
 - ii. what were the proportion and number of populations assessed as declining/ stable/increasing/unknown for current year, [insert agreed number] years ago and [insert agreed number] years ago (eg 2009, 2006 and 2003)
- c. all required data on threats for current year, [insert agreed number] years ago and [insert agreed number] years ago (eg 2009, 2006 and 2003)
 - i. proportion and number of populations in each category of the threat rating (ie low/medium/high/very high) for the current year, [insert agreed number] years ago and [insert agreed number] years ago (eg 2009, 2006 and 2003)
- d. there are threats rated above [insert agreed level]
 - i. for the threats in point d above, there is a management response with effectiveness rated above [insert agreed level] for each threat rated above [insert agreed threshold] (ie x% of breeding sites have a management response rated as "effective" for each threat(s) rated high or very high)