



Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels

Third Meeting of Advisory Committee

Valdivia, Chile, 19 – 22 June 2007

Capacity Building

Author: **Secretariat**

Capacity Building

During MoP2, Parties expressed a wish for the Advisory Committee to prioritise capacity building in its work programme. In the period since MoP2, the Secretariat requested Parties (through their National Contact Point) to identify needs and opportunities for capacity building by answering seven questions relating to capacity building in the context of ACAP.

The main purpose of the questionnaire was to offer some talking points for discussion on capacity building during AC3. The seven questions aim to identify a) the potential value of capacity building to ACAP; b) opportunities for capacity building initiatives between Parties and as an organisation and c) possible approaches to developing capacity building initiatives in ACAP.

Of the 10 Parties to receive the questionnaire, five parties returned completed responses to the Secretariat. Norway, as a new Party, was not asked to participate in the exercise though Norway's participation in capacity building discussion at AC3 is certainly welcomed. The questionnaire is attached at Appendix 1.

The value of capacity building to ACAP

The term 'capacity building', while not formally defined in the Agreement, is referred to throughout it. In particular, Article 4 refers to capacity building explicitly:

- "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."

Parties were asked through the questionnaire to comment on the need for capacity building projects in ACAP and their potential benefits to Parties and ACAP as a whole. All responses acknowledged the importance of capacity building as a valuable tool for overcoming obstacles to the implementation of ACAP. These obstacles primarily involved strong financial/economic constraints on the government agencies of ACAP Parties.

Some Parties described their inability to complete simple tasks due to budget

restrictions, as much of their governments' national revenue is directed at the funding of health, education and other basic services.. As a consequence, such Parties rely to a large extent on the services provided by non-government organisations and universities whose long-term commitment to ACAP-related tasks is uncertain. They stressed the need to promote ACAP and its objectives within and between their own government agencies.

More specifically, some Parties suggested that capacity building initiatives might prove useful to developing a network of suitably trained scientists and policy-makers, maintaining adequate training for observers onboard fishing vessels and raising awareness of ACAP and the NPOA between government and the fishing industry.

Some Parties also considered that capacity building initiatives might facilitate efforts to increase interest and awareness of ACAP and establish networks and partnerships with related organisations.

Opportunities for Capacity Building Activities

Parties were asked to identify specific activities or initiatives that might assist their national programme in meeting its obligations as a Party, as well as areas through which they could provide support and/or assistance to other Parties.

It was suggested that a list be created included 'Areas Requiring Assistance/Attention' and 'Possible Areas of Assistance' for each Party to be reviewed and discussed at AC3. This list has been created according to questionnaire responses, and is shown in Table 1. A more comprehensive table, including all ACAP Parties, might prove a useful guide for identifying potential capacity building actions to be implemented in the near future.

Approaches to capacity building in ACAP.

All questionnaire responses suggested the need for a focused capacity building discussion during AC3. As well as the completion and review of information provided in Table 1, Parties suggested that one or two chairs/officers might be appointed to interact with Parties and coordinate development of a capacity building strategy. Such a strategy may establish priorities according to the importance of ACAP listed species, set out a work programme to be included in the final report and identify focused capacity building projects.

Some Parties provided examples of existing capacity building activities both within and outside of ACAP that may provide useful for developing focused capacity building projects during AC3. The Secretariat has also contacted the central (Bonn-based) Convention on Migratory Species officer responsible for capacity building who is keen to provide information and assistance to ACAP Parties.

The following list of existing capacity building activities is provided for Parties to consider and expand during AC3:

- Cooperation Agreement between IMARPE (Peru) and Southern Seabird Solutions including knowledge and training exchange;
- BirdLife International Global Seabird Programme;
- Examples of successful government workshops with industry (i.e. New Zealand);
- Ecotourism (e.g. Albatross Encounters, Kaikoura);
- European Union Invasive Species Programme;
- Norwegian programme to host young South African scientists to them for fisheries management;
- UNEP/CMS Regional Capacity-building Workshop for Latin America (Panama, 25-29 August 2007).

Table 1: Areas identified by Parties as a) requiring assistance/attention and b) possible sources of assistance for capacity building activities.

Party	a) Areas Requiring Assistance/Attention	b) Potential Areas of Assistance
Argentina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education & training; • Funding for a) intragovernmental workshops, b) training of observers; c) informing and training industry; d) seabird monitoring programs; e) training tour guides; f) equipment purchase; and g) postgraduate specialization in taxonomy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scientific expertise in a) longline mitigation; and b) banding of albatrosses and petrels.
New Zealand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of database of literature & authorities directory; • Training, raising awareness & technical advice for fishing industry; • Partnerships with key stakeholders; • Establishment of classification scheme through exchange of molecular systematists. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expertise, procedures, regulations and policies. • Experience in management of offshore breeding sites, pest management and working with the fishing industry; • Funding (if available).
Peru	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical support for development and implementation of NPOA; • Workshops on advocacy of NPOA; • Technical assistance in training onboard observers; • Advice for raising awareness of government, industry and non-government stakeholders; • Reinforcement of national and regional legal frameworks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge/expertise/resources in fisheries, oceanography and conservation via Peruvian Marine Research Institute (IMARPE).
Republic of South Africa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of young scientists; • Funding to support participation of ACAP official and scientists for South Africa's planned survey of seabird and seal populations at its Prince Edward Islands (3-23 December 2007). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four berths on its Prince Edward Island survey including food and accommodation on the island.
United Kingdom	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training to undertake basic monitoring of breeding sites and data management; • Monitoring by-catch mitigation; • Development of Marine Protected Areas; • Direct advocacy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience/advice on preparing NPOA; • At-Sea Monitoring; • Scientific Expertise.

Appendix 1

Capacity Building Questionnaire

1. Why is capacity building important for the conservation of ACAP listed species?
2. How has a lack of capacity hindered the operation of a) your national programme and b) ACAP as a whole?
3. Identify and give details on how your national programme could be implemented more effectively through capacity building. What particular types of capacity building activities (e.g. knowledge exchange, technical training, etc) would best meet your needs?
4. Identify and give specific details of capacity building activities (knowledge, expertise or resources) that you are able to provide other Parties to facilitate their national programme.
5. Identify and give details of specific capacity building activities that you consider would facilitate ACAP (as a whole) in working toward its objectives.
6. Identify and describe any existing examples of capacity building activities being employed by other organisations that are also relevant to ACAP.
7. Suggest ways through which the issue of capacity building could be discussed and developed further within ACAP.