

 <p>Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Fifth Meeting of the Parties</b> <i>Santa Cruz de Tenerife, Spain, 4 - 8 May 2015</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Indicators to measure the success of the Agreement - performance indicators for capacity building</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Chile, New Zealand and United Kingdom</i></b></p>
---	--

### SUMMARY

A contact group is developing performance indicators for capacity building under the Agreement with participation by Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Chile, and New Zealand and the United Kingdom. Progress has been made in developing relevant performance indicators (see **AC8 Doc 23 Rev 1**). Preliminary indicators for capacity building were developed, and examples provided on relevant information Parties could submit to assess performance.

The Eighth Meeting of the Advisory Committee: Punta del Este, 15-19 September 2014 (AC8) reviewed development of performance indicators for capacity building. The Committee recommended the preliminary indicators be reformulated following a state, pressure, response approach that is being applied to other performance indicators for the Agreement, and that outcome-based performance indicators be identified, where feasible (**AC8 Final Report, 14.4**).

Current progress in reformulating performance indicators for capacity building is set out below. This work is ongoing and the contact group will report on progress to the Ninth Meeting of the Advisory Committee in 2016.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are provided for the consideration of the Meeting of the Parties:

1. Note the progress by the Advisory Committee in developing performance indicators for capacity building under the Agreement.
2. Provide comment about the form and content of performance indicators for capacity building under the Agreement.

## 1. INDICATORS OF CAPACITY BUILDING

Capacity building is important to all Parties to the Agreement. Each Party has specific requirements concerning implementing their obligations under the Agreement that would more readily be met through capacity building in support of other approaches. The need for capacity building varies from Party to Party, region to region, and over time. Accordingly, the need for capacity building is dynamic, such that new, more nuanced needs may emerge once existing needs are met, and priority attached to specific needs may change with time.

Capacity building covers a range of areas of importance to the Parties to the Agreement. Article 4 of the Agreement refers, among other things, to capacity building concerning research, training, monitoring, and institutional arrangements:

### **ARTICLE IV Capacity Building**

1. Effective implementation of this Agreement requires assistance to be provided to some Range States, including through research, training or monitoring for implementation of conservation measures for albatrosses and petrels and their habitats, for the management of those habitats as well as for the establishment or improvement of scientific and administrative institutions for the implementation of this Agreement.
2. The Parties shall give priority to capacity building, through funding, training, information and institutional support, for the implementation of the Agreement.

This is not an exhaustive list, but provides a useful focus for further work by the contact group on relevant performance indicators. The contact group recognises that over time, this focus may shift to include other matters relevant to capacity building.

A contact group is developing performance indicators for capacity building under the Agreement with participation of Argentina Australia, Brazil, Chile, and New Zealand and the United Kingdom. Progress has been made in developing relevant performance indicators (see [AC8 Doc 23 Rev 1](#)). Further improvement is envisaged to the preliminary performance indicators for capacity building that were considered by AC8 (see **AC8 Doc 23 Rev 1**).

The Advisory Committee considers that the state, pressure response approach merits consideration (see [AC8 Report](#), 14.4):

1. State indicators identify what are the needs for capacity building.
2. Pressure indicators identify why there is a need for capacity building
3. Response indicators identify what is to be done about capacity building.

Performance indicators for capacity building will focus on measures of effectiveness (e.g. 0 to 100%) and efficiency (input/output rate), rather than activity/workload (amount). In developing performance indicators for capacity building intersessionally, the contact group is focusing its work on identifying state, and response measures of effectiveness and efficiency. As required, the pressures for capacity building will be described.

## 2. CAPACITY BUILDING INDICATORS

### 2.1. State indicators

Further work is being undertaken intersessionally by the contact group to establish state indicators identifying *what* are the needs for capacity building. Preliminary thinking about state indicators includes:

#### 1. Research

Parties recognise the need to better address on land threats to the conservation of albatrosses and petrels.

Relevant performance indicator(s):

- a. Proportion of high priority feral species threats that have been assessed (or addressed) through conservation projects x past ten years x past five years.
- b. Proportion of albatross and petrel populations facing high priority disease threats where there is a quarantine and disease management plan in place.
- c. Proportion of albatross and petrel populations x Party where adult, juvenile and non-breeding adult tracking data needs have been assessed (or addressed) through conservation projects.
- d. Proportion of albatross and petrel breeding sites x Party monitored within the past 5 years/10 years/20 years.

Parties also recognise the importance of using grant project monies to focus on the above research priorities.

Relevant performance indicator(s):

- a. Proportion of grant monies spent on projects directly linked to capacity building related research.

Parties recognise the importance of mitigatory, proven, practical (including safety aspects), cost-effective, widely available, and compliance friendly seabird mitigation technologies and methods that to the extent practicable maintain catch rates of target species and avoid bycatch of other species.

Relevant performance indicator(s):

- a. Rate of development and implementation of new and emerging technologies and methods for seabird bycatch mitigation.

#### 2. Training

Parties recognise the need to implement minimum harmonised observer protocols to improve standards of regional monitoring of incidental bycatch of albatrosses and petrels in capture fisheries.

Relevant performance indicator(s):

- a. Extent that Parties national observer programs x fleet x domestic/high seas meet minimum harmonised observer protocols underpinning regional monitoring of albatrosses and petrels.

3. Monitoring

Parties recognise the importance of understanding the bycatch rates for each listed albatross and petrel species at the regional level.

Relevant performance indicator(s):

- a. Extent that bycatch rates for each ACAP-listed species are known across the species' range x fleet x domestic/high seas.

4. Institutional arrangements

Parties recognise the need to implement legislation that addresses albatross and petrel conservation at sea and on land.

Relevant performance indicator(s):

- a. Extent that Parties' legislation/regulation addresses albatross and petrel conservation at sea and on land.
- b. Extent to which each Party monitors compliance with mitigation measures established by legislation/regulation x fleet x domestic/high seas.

Parties recognise the need to implement national plans of action concerning incidental catch of seabirds in capture fisheries that address guidelines established by the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO).

Relevant performance indicator(s):

- a. Proportion of Parties that have implemented national plans of action to reduce the incidental catch of seabirds in capture fisheries.
- b. Extent that Parties' national plans of action address guidelines in *International Plan of Action for reducing incidental catch of seabirds in longline fisheries* (FAO, 1999), and *Best practices to reduce incidental catch of seabirds in capture fisheries* (FAO, 2009).

Parties recognise the need to consider implementing the best practice guidelines developed by ACAP if albatross and petrel conservation is to be improved.

Relevant performance indicator(s):

- a. Extent that Parties' seabird bycatch mitigation in capture fisheries meets/complements best practice guidelines developed by ACAP.

Parties recognise the need to work collaboratively internationally to enhance the reputation of ACAP globally, particularly (a) by ensuring regional fisheries and conservation bodies adopt binding seabird bycatch mitigation conservation measures that take account of best practice advice developed by ACAP, and (b) by ensuring Range States take positive steps to conserve albatrosses and petrels within their jurisdiction and when distant water fishing operations are conducted.

Relevant performance indicator(s):

- a. Proportion of regional fisheries and conservation bodies that have implemented binding seabird bycatch mitigation conservation measures x fishing gear type.

- b. Extent that binding seabird bycatch mitigation conservation measures x fishing gear type correspond/complement best practice advice developed by ACAP.
- c. Proportion of ACAP Parties in each regional fisheries and conservation body co-sponsoring proposals for binding seabird bycatch mitigation conservation measures.

## 2.2. Response indicators

Further work will be undertaken intersessionally by the contact group to establish response indicators identifying *what* needs to be done about capacity building. An example of a response indicator is provided for institutional arrangements.

1. Research  
Pending
2. Training  
Pending
3. Monitoring  
Pending
4. Institutional arrangements

Parties recognise the benefits of implementing a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the ACAP Secretariat and Secretariats of relevant regional fisheries and conservation bodies.

- a. Proportion of Secretariats of relevant regional fisheries and conservation bodies that have adopted a MoU with the ACAP Secretariat.

## 3. NEXT STEPS

This work is ongoing and the contact group will report on progress to the Ninth Meeting of the Advisory Committee in 2016. Parties are invited to participate in this work.

## 4. REFERENCES

- FAO. (1999). International Plan of Action for reducing incidental catch of seabirds in longline fisheries. International Plan of Action for the conservation and management of sharks. International Plan of Action for the management of fishing capacity. Rome
- FAO. (2009). Fishing operations. 2. Best practices to reduce incidental catch of seabirds in capture fisheries. *FAO Technical Guidelines for Responsible Fisheries*. No. 1, Suppl. 2. Rome