



Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels

Fifth Meeting of Advisory Committee

Mar del Plata, Argentina, 13-17 April 2010

Title: Report of the Status and Trends Working Group

Author: Status and Trends Working Group Participants

'This paper is presented for consideration by ACAP and may contain unpublished data, analyses, and/or conclusions subject to change. Data in this paper shall not be cited or used for purposes other than the work of the ACAP Secretariat, ACAP Advisory Committee or their subsidiary Working Groups without the permission of the original data holders.'

1. PURPOSE

This draft report briefly outlines inter-sessional progress against the Status and Trends Working Group (hereafter STWG) Work programme agreed at the ACAP Advisory Committee meeting in Cape Town in 2008 (AC4).

It will also reflect discussions and advice resulting from the STWG meeting on 8 April 2010 at Mar del Plata, Argentina

2. WELCOME, PARTICIPANTS AND MEMBERSHIP

A Status and Trends Working Group (STWG) meeting was convened on the 8th April 2010 at Mar del Plata in Argentina.

The convenor of the STWG, Dr. Rosemary Gales, introduced the meeting agenda (STWG Doc 02 Rev 1) and thanked Working Group members and observers for attending. The meeting was attended by members of the STWG from Argentina, Australia, France, New Zealand and the United Kingdom, observers from the United States of America and BirdLife International, AC Officials and members of the Secretariat. The membership of the group was reviewed and the current membership is provided in Annex 1.

3. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The STWG considered and accepted the proposed agenda (STWG 5 Doc 2 Rev 1).

4. PROGRESS REPORT

This report outlines progress that has been achieved against the Status and Trends Working Group Work Programme that was endorsed at the AC4 meeting in 2008. The report also describes discussions and recommendations arising from the STWG meeting on 8 April 2010 (Mar del Plata, Argentina).

4.1 Activities undertaken in the Inter-sessional period

4.1.1 Species Assessments, coordination and revisions

With the recent finalisation of the two remaining species assessments for the North Pacific albatross species, by AC 5 all 29 species assessments were completed and posted on the ACAP website. The Working Group reflected on the invaluable resource that these assessments represent, and acknowledged the wide interest being shown in them, confirmed by the high volume of downloads that have occurred from the ACAP website (over 8500 hits in the last eight months), and also their use at various meetings (including CCAMLR, ICCAT and outreach programs in Argentina).

Translation of the assessments is progressing; 27 of the 29 assessments (all except those for Laysan and Black-footed Albatross) have been translated into Spanish. The Working Group gratefully acknowledged the assistance of Joanna Alfaro (Pro Delphinus) for her ongoing assistance with the Spanish translations. Currently only one species assessment, for the

Amsterdam albatross, has been translated into French. The Working Group recognised that progressing these translations is important, with priority being assigned to those species that breed in the French territories. Dr Henri Weimerskirch (France) committed to continue to work with the ACAP Science Officer to progress these translations.

The Working Group recognised the significant work that has been invested in these assessments, the valuable resource that they represent and the requirement to keep their content up-to-date. It was agreed that the information on population statistics should be updated annually in line with the provision of status and trends data from the Parties. Any changes in conservation status should also be updated as these changes occur. Other more general revisions of the assessments would occur every 1-2 years, or as information becomes available.

4.1.2 Database development

Significant progress has been made in the development, data input and application of the relational database to curate and coordinate data from the ACAP Working Groups (see **Item 2.2** of AC Work Program). All Status and Trend data received by the Secretariat have now been verified and entered, and can be analysed via a number of queries. The basic table structure remained largely unchanged for the population and demographic data, but the need for a part-site population table has been noted in the data update process, as many annual monitoring schemes are of one or more colonies or a study area, and not necessarily an entire breeding site.

4.1.3 Data portal improvements

The data portal was launched as part of the improved ACAP website in 2009. Selected data custodians have assisted the Science Officer with testing the portal and following their feedback, the interface and functionality was refined to better suit the needs of the data providers. All STWG representatives and/or data providers have been issued with login details allowing them to review and update data relevant to their jurisdiction. A demonstration of accessing the database through the data portal was presented to the STWG. It is an ongoing project and any suggestions for further improvements are welcomed. The need for part site data entry option was noted as a future development. It was also suggested that the trend setting option needs to take account of changing trends over a number of years, and that this option could be restricted to the administrator level of access to ensure a consistent trend method is applied across populations. The STWG also agreed that it would be useful for data contributors to also indicate in the database which monitoring programs are ongoing.

5. POPULATION STATUS AND TRENDS DATA

5.1 Update of IUCN Red List for ACAP Species

There are currently 29 species listed by ACAP in Annex 1 of the Agreement, comprising 22 albatross and 7 petrel species.

The Working Group considered the 2009 and 2010 updates of the IUCN Red List that has resulted in three changes to the status of ACAP listed species (AC5 Doc 34). Southern giant

petrel was down-listed from Near Threatened to Least Concern in 2009 owing to a new synthesis of population trends that showed even the most pessimistic overall trends did not qualify it for Near Threatened. In May 2010 the Chatham albatross will be down-listed from Critically Endangered to Vulnerable, as populations have not declined in recent years, and Laysan albatross will be down-listed from Vulnerable to Near Threatened as previously projected population declines have not eventuated.

Recognising the recent/imminent IUCN changes to the conservation status of three ACAP species (AC5 Doc 34), 21 (72%) of the 29 species are listed as threatened with extinction (see Annex 2, Table 1). This is in stark contrast to the overall rate of 12% for the 9799 bird species worldwide. Three ACAP albatross species that are ranked as *Critically Endangered* face an “*extremely high risk of extinction in the wild*”. Six ACAP albatross species qualify as *Endangered*, and so face a “*very high risk of extinction in the wild*”, with the current overall population trends for four species documented as declining. For the 12 ACAP species listed as *Vulnerable*, it is their restricted number of breeding locations that is the criteria that most frequently qualifies the species for listing. Reflecting this localised breeding is the high degree of endemism of these birds, with seven of these species being endemics, most of them to New Zealand.

5.2 ACAP Important Breeding Sites

The Working Group reviewed the BirdLife International paper AC5 Doc 33 that applied an Important Bird Area (IBA) analysis to the ACAP colony database in order to help identify potential Important Breeding Sites. The paper provided information on the breeding sites for the ACAP-listed species that are known to reach designated thresholds (1%, 2%, 5% and 10%) of the global population for each species. Based upon these analyses, it was reported that the jurisdictions of France, New Zealand and Disputed Territories contain the most sites by number that exceed the 1% of global population threshold. The authors recognised that these initial analyses were incomplete as 34% of the breeding sites had no associated population data in the ACAP database. Sites under the jurisdiction of Antarctica, Disputed Territories, France and New Zealand accounted for ca. 90% of these cases. It was recommended that sourcing updated population estimates for these sites, where they exist, should be a priority.

The STWG considered these analyses and agreed that they provided a useful starting point. The WG however, recognised that further analyses should include consideration of the accuracy of the population estimates, as the results for some sites where the estimates are of very low confidence could be misleading. The Working Group also recognised the discrepancies between BirdLife International and ACAP data for population estimates for some species. In order to progress this exercise, the STWG agreed that the best way forward was to work with parties in the inter-sessional period to ensure all available data were entered into the ACAP database, and to undertake more comprehensive analyses of IBAs for ACAP species that also considered the accuracy of the population data. The WG also agreed to the importance of resolving the discrepancies in population data between the BirdLife and ACAP databases. It is intended to progress this exercise and to prepare updated results for consideration by AC6.

5.3 Current Status and Population Trends of ACAP species

The most recent information on population status and trends that has been made available to ACAP by the Parties has been summarised for consideration by the STWG (see Annex 1, Tables 1-4). It is important to note that these summaries and analyses reflect only data from whole sites submitted by April 2010. The rigour therefore of this information is reliant on timely and comprehensive provision of relevant data by all Parties.

At present, there are 302 sites where populations of ACAP species breed. Based on submitted data, the currently listed 29 ACAP species comprise 3.05 million pairs each year, breeding at 140 island groups, which in turn comprise 568 populations (population-site combinations, excluding sites with single or mixed pairs). The rarest of the ACAP species remains the Critically Endangered Amsterdam albatross (30 pairs pa) whilst the most abundant is the Vulnerable White-chinned petrel (> 1 million pairs pa).

Abundance of ACAP species (number of breeding pairs per annum)

Species that are known to be **declining** in numbers are indicated in bold, while species population status is *unknown* are italicised.

| Number of breeding pairs per annum | ACAP listed species |
|------------------------------------|---|
| 1 – 100 | Amsterdam albatross |
| 101 – 1000 | Short-tailed albatross |
| 1001 – 10 000 | Black petrel, Westland petrel, Southern royal albatross, Chatham albatross, Tristan albatross , Wandering albatross , Antipodean albatross , Waved albatross , <i>Northern royal albatross</i> |
| 10 001 – 100 000 | Spectacled petrel, Northern giant petrel, Shy albatross, Southern giant petrel, Black-footed albatross, Buller's albatross, Sooty albatross , Salvin's albatross , Atlantic yellow-nosed albatross , Indian yellow-nosed albatross , <i>Grey petrel</i> , <i>White-capped albatross</i> , Grey-headed albatross , <i>Light-mantled albatross</i> , <i>Campbell albatross</i> , |
| 100 001 – 1 000 000 | Laysan albatross, Black-browed albatross |
| 1 000 001 + | White-chinned petrel |

Two ACAP species are extremely rare, and three species particularly abundant. However, two of the most abundant of the ACAP species, the Endangered Black-browed albatross and the Vulnerable White-chinned petrel continue to decline in numbers.

5.3.1 Status of knowledge relating to population size and trends

The overall current global population trends of the ACAP species are listed in Table 1. Ten species continue to decline in numbers, while six species have documented recent increases, seven species are currently stable, and the global population trend for six species remains unknown.

Knowledge of the population size and trends of ACAP species varies among species (see Table 2). For 18 (62%) of the ACAP species there is at least some information on population size across their range. Eight species, including some listed as Critically Endangered and Endangered, do not have information on population size for between 1 and 50% of the sites. There is extremely limited information on population size for three species, particularly for the widely distributed Light-mantled albatross and White-chinned petrel, for which the size of the population is known for ca 20% of populations of both species. It is recognised that these simple overviews do not consider the relative size of the populations, but they do provide an indication of the species which are well studied, in contrast to those for which population data are deficient.

Extent of knowledge of population size for ACAP species across their range

| | |
|--|---|
| High level of knowledge - some data for all sites | Amsterdam albatross, Antipodean albatross, Atlantic yellow-nosed albatross, Black petrel, Black-footed albatross, Chatham albatross, Grey-headed albatross, Indian yellow-nosed albatross, Laysan albatross, Salvin's albatross, Short-tailed albatross, Shy albatross, Sooty albatross, Southern royal albatross, Spectacled petrel, Tristan albatross, Westland petrel, White-capped albatross. |
| High – moderate level of knowledge of population size for most sites | Black-browed albatross, Northern giant petrel, Southern giant petrel, Wandering albatross, |
| Moderate to Low level of knowledge on population size across range | Buller's albatross, Campbell albatross, Northern royal albatross, Waved albatross, |
| Low level - most sites (50% +) of unknown population size | Grey petrel, Light-mantled albatross, White-chinned petrel |

The currency of the population data also varies between species (Table 2), but there are current population counts for at least one population of most species. The most dated population data exist for the New Zealand endemic Campbell albatross for which no population data have been collected at any site for over ten years.

Fewer than half (42.2%, n = 240) of the sites of ACAP species have been counted in their entirety in the last decade (since 2000). Indeed, less than a quarter (23.6%, n = 134) of the sites have been counted in their entirety in the last five years (since 2005). The species which have been counted in their entirety across their range are restricted to the five endemic species that breed only at a single site (Spectacled and Westland petrels, Tristan, Chatham and Amsterdam albatrosses).

The extent of continuous current population size data also varies considerably between species and sites. Only the Critically Endangered Amsterdam albatross which breeds at a single site has been counted annually in its entirety since 2000. Annual population monitoring of entire sites since 2000 has only occurred for 28 (4.9%) of the 568 populations of ACAP species. For 16 species, there has been no annual monitoring since 2000. Only the Short-tailed, Shy, and

Amsterdam albatross have been monitored annually since 2000 at at-least 50% of their breeding sites.

The above analyses are based upon data that have been submitted to the ACAP database for sites that have been counted in their entirety. Some sites are partially counted (part-sites); however, it became apparent that these part-sites had not been included in the results of the queries to the database. This deficiency shall be redressed during 2010 and future trend summaries will include data from these part-site monitoring programs, which are in place in the French territories, Tristan da Cunha and Gough, and Disputed Territories.

5.3.2 ACAP Species – demographic data

It has previously been stated that in order to understand population status of many albatross species, appropriate action requires knowledge, derived from studies of survival rates, of which elements of the population are being affected, as well as when and where this might be happening. Determination of survival rates requires long term detailed mark-recapture studies and, as assessed from data submitted to the ACAP database, these have been undertaken for few ACAP populations (Table 3). For albatrosses and petrels, population trends are most sensitive to factors that affect adult survival, then juvenile survival and then productivity.

Based upon the information provided to ACAP by the Parties to date, of the 568 ACAP populations, there are adult survival statistics for only 46 (8.1%) populations, and no studies of four species. There are no recent data relating to adult survival in the ACAP database for five species, and only 29 adult survival rate time-series that include years since 2000. This may reflect a lapse in analyses or reporting, or that some long-term studies have been discontinued.

The investment necessary to secure information on juvenile survival is even greater than that for adult survival because of long delays to recruitment. There are therefore very few data available for juvenile survival for ACAP species. Indeed there are no reports of juvenile survival rates for 14 of the 29 ACAP species. A total of 25 (4.4%) of the ACAP populations have reported rates of juvenile survival, with the longest studies being of Wandering, Grey-headed and Black-browed albatrosses.

| Demographic statistics | ACAP species |
|-------------------------------|---|
| No data for adult survival | Grey petrel, Salvin's albatross, Spectacled petrel, White-capped albatross |
| No data for juvenile survival | Buller's albatross, Chatham albatross, Grey petrel, Light-mantled albatross, Northern giant petrel, Salvin's albatross, Short-tailed albatross, Shy albatross, Southern royal albatross, Spectacled petrel, Tristan albatross, Waved albatross, Westland petrel, White-capped albatross |
| No data for productivity | Chatham albatross, Salvin's albatross, Spectacled petrel |

5.3.3 ACAP species status data by Jurisdiction

An examination of the information available from the ACAP database illustrates the extent of responsibility of different jurisdictions responsible for management of breeding sites of ACAP species. This examination was based upon the information provided for the ACAP database and also treats the Disputed areas separately (see Table 4).

New Zealand has responsibility for a greater number of ACAP species, including endemics, than any other jurisdiction. This high seabird diversity is reflected in the investment by New Zealand into long term population studies on a number of populations, and hence for the majority of studies of survival and productivity. However, over a third of the New Zealand ACAP populations are of unknown size.

France is also responsible for a range of ACAP breeding populations, with more populations than any other jurisdiction. The population size is known for most (76%) of these populations, but the trend is known for significantly fewer populations because of difficult access of many archipelagos. The long term focus of French researchers at Crozet, Amsterdam and Kerguelen has produced important information of survival and productivity of a range of ACAP species.

Australia, South Africa and the **United Kingdom** (excluding Disputed Territories) are also responsible for the breeding colonies of a range of ACAP species, including endemics (UK 3 and Australia 1). There is at least some information on population size for all the 16 UK populations, for 13 South African populations, and for 83% of colonies occurring in Australian jurisdiction, although information on population trend is much more limited. A number of long term demography programs have however at least provided some information on survival rates and breeding success in these regions.

There are fewer ACAP species, but large numbers of breeding populations occurring in the **Antarctic, Chile** and **US**, with the level of knowledge of population size being deficient only for the Antarctic region. Again, similar to other regions, there is limited information on population trends for these regions, with no population trend information available from Chile.

Argentina (excluding Disputed Territories), **Ecuador, Japan** and **Mexico** are responsible for fewer breeding locations of ACAP species, and there is population size information available for all populations under these jurisdictions. Population trend information again is lacking for most of these populations, although data have been collected at one site in Argentina. There are adult survival and productivity statistics available for the endemic ACAP species in Ecuador, and Argentina has reported productivity data for their single ACAP species.

Significant work has been undertaken on the eight ACAP species that breed in territories whose sovereignty is under **Dispute**. Forty percent of all ACAP populations occur in these regions, and the population size remains unknown for many (39%) of these populations. Several long term population monitoring programs have provided important statistics on survival and productivity rates.

5.3.4 Conclusions/Actions

It is widely acknowledged that comprehensive population studies are fundamental to many aspects of albatross and petrel conservation, and vital to monitoring the effectiveness of management actions. Current status of knowledge regarding population size, trends and

demographic parameters remains inadequate for many ACAP populations. Importantly these analyses have been based upon the information made available to ACAP by the Parties. Some contributions remain incomplete which make the analyses incomplete. Modifications to the database shall also include uptake of part-site data that will enable more comprehensive analyses of a more complete dataset.

Data owners must be encouraged to submit data to the ACAP so that the global and regional analyses are comprehensive and complete. Also, there is a need to work with other data custodians (e.g. BirdLife International) to ensure that the population information held and cited by both organisations are the most accurate data available.

Immediately after the STWG meeting, an expert group compiled a regional assessment of the current status of population and demographic monitoring programs for ACAP species. Importantly this collation is based upon our collective understanding of current programs across the world, rather than data already submitted to ACAP (Table 5). This collation confirms that, for a significant number of regional populations of ACAP species, there are no current annual population or demographic monitoring studies. These are in areas under the jurisdiction of Australia, Chile, Ecuador, New Zealand, UK as well as the Antarctic Treaty area and Disputed Territories.

Parties and others responsible for breeding populations of ACAP species must ensure continuation of current long term programs. Where information is significantly lacking, Parties should also prioritise (and implement where required) regional programs to increase current knowledge of population size, trend and demographic parameters of ACAP species.

5.4 Data Updates

During the inter-sessional period, all National Representatives on the STWG (Argentina, Australia, Chile, Ecuador, France, New Zealand, South Africa and UK) were approached with a request for updated demographic and annual population data for all species breeding within their territories as per Item 2.1 in the AC Working Program. All Parties, with the exception of Argentina, Chile, Ecuador and New Zealand, provided up-dated data which have been incorporated into the ACAP database.

New Zealand is yet to nominate a STWG member who will coordinate any future data updates. In the meantime, the National Contact Point (Ian Angus) has advised that requests for new data have been forwarded to the relevant researchers. Representatives from Chile and Ecuador were not able to attend the STWG meeting, however both Parties are encouraged to contribute any new data as soon as possible to ensure any analyses based on the database are current and accurate. Argentina reported at the meeting that although recent census data has been collected for the Southern Giant Petrel, it was still being analysed and therefore there were no new updates available to submit to the database at this stage.

Data for Southern Giant Petrels in the Antarctic Treaty Area remains incomplete due to uncertainty over quality of records and part-site counts. A new part-site data entry option for populations and demographic parameters will be added to the ACAP database to allow for a more complete coverage of census effort.

The next request for data updates is planned for June/July 2010, although it was noted that data custodians are able to provide data via the data portal at any time convenient to them.

6. DATA SHARING AGREEMENT

6.1 Review proposed data sharing agreement (AC5 Doc 35)

The previous rules for access for STWG data, as agreed at AC4, are provided in Annex 3. In light of the progress with data acquisition and recent developments of the ACAP database and data portal, the Secretariat drafted a policy to inform Parties and data providers about data management practices in the Secretariat (AC5 Doc 35). The proposed data policy includes the creation of a metadata catalogue, which will allow data holders to specify usage and access constraints for their data.

The Working Group was supportive of this initiative however, the STWG and BSWG convenors expressed concern that the new format might not adequately reflect the data access and usage rules agreed to at AC4 (Annex 3). The Science Officer acknowledged that the lack of a functioning catalogue to refer to at this stage made it somewhat difficult to interpret how the existing rules will be transferred into the new system. It was agreed that the WG Convenors will be extensively consulted in the development of the relevant database and data portal components to ensure that the resulting product is comprehensive and transparent and that it meets the needs of both Working Groups. The Working Group also agreed to work with the Secretariat to determine options for the data policy that would retain the intent (and detail) of the unambiguous specific rules relating to the STWG and BSWG data (possibly as a subordinate document/annex to the data policy).

7. ACAP PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AND NATIONAL REPORTING

7.1 Review Royal Society for the Protection of Birds/Secretariat paper on indicators to measure progress in meeting the objectives of ACAP

The STWG discussed the paper submitted by the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)/ACAP Secretariat on the development of preliminary integrated indices of the status of albatross populations (STWG5 Doc 05). The STWG concluded that the work had been very informative in terms of highlighting the differing trends among species, ocean basins, and populations, and of limitations in the availability of suitable time-series data for ACAP species. However, the STWG agreed with the authors that there were substantial methodological concerns: study species were not selected at random; extrapolation from one site to other islands or island groups was not recommended, and; differences in the start date and length of time-series datasets would be difficult to reconcile. Given these problems and the heterogeneous nature of the trends, the STWG concluded that any integrated index would inevitably reflect, and be biased towards, the trends of the most studied species, rather than be representative of albatross populations in general. Hence, the recommendation was that the AC not pursue the development of this single, integrated index and that a more balanced and straightforward reflection of albatross (and petrel) status would be a report of the number of species/populations which were increasing, decreasing, stable or unknown.

7.2 Review of the status and trends component of the national reporting template

Mr I. Hay presented AC5 Doc 16 on the draft revised template for national reporting by ACAP Parties, noting its format and contents had been developed in accordance with the guidance of MoP3. The STWG noted that some parts of the draft template would be revised to include the results of the ad-hoc, inter-sessional working groups currently developing the prioritisation framework and the format for national seabird bycatch reporting. The STWG reviewed those parts of the template and the suggested basic performance indicators that were relevant to its Terms of Reference. The STWG generally endorsed the basic format and content of those sections of the revised template relevant to its responsibilities and also agreed on some basic performance indicators (see 7.3 below).

7.3 Review performance indicators to measure success of the Agreement

A.Wolfaardt presented AC5 Doc 28 on performance indicators, reporting that the aim of the document was to provide some general principles and guidelines which may be helpful in developing performance indicators to measure the collective success of the Agreement. The Working Group discussed the BirdLife paper dealing with the same matter (AC5 Inf 8). The STWG highlighted the need to identify simple indicators, for which data or information are already available, or could easily be collected. Discussion in the STWG concluded that the selection and characteristics of suitable indicators should be based on the following criteria: (1) that ACAP is able to readily solicit from Parties, collate, hold and update the necessary information from which the indicators are derived; (2) that the initial indicators are straightforward and pragmatic (this would not preclude the development of additional, and potentially more complex integrated indicators in the future); (3) that the indicators should show long-term consistency, i.e. changes reflects improving or deteriorating status or level of knowledge and not of methodology; (4) indicators will be responsive within a suitable time-scale (potentially annual); (5) that a suite of indicators be developed that reflect the full portfolio of ACAP activities (relating to bycatch, status and trends, breeding sites, capacity building etc.), and that measure levels of monitoring, management efforts, status and outcomes.

Bearing the above considerations in mind, the STWG recommended the following four potential indicators for measuring the effectiveness of ACAP:

- (1) Proportion of populations (island groups) where numbers have been counted within the last a) 10 years and b) 20 years [reflecting large-scale censuses],
- (2) Proportion of populations (island groups) where the trend is known from annual monitoring of whole islands or study plots within the last a) 10 years and b) 20 years [reflecting annual monitoring of population size],
- (3) Total number of ongoing annual monitoring studies (whole island or study colony) of a) population size and b) demography (mark-recapture studies),
- (4) Proportion of populations (islands groups) where the trend is increasing, decreasing, stable or unknown within the last a) 10 years and b) 20 years.

(note: the above text relating to 7.3 has been included in AC5 Inf 16 and shall be discussed at AC5 - Agenda Item 14)

8. REVIEW PROGRESS REPORTS FOR ACAP FUNDED PROGRAMS (AND OTHER RELEVANT REPORTS) RELATING TO STATUS AND TRENDS

8.1 Review report on implementation of the Waved albatross Action Plan (AC5 Doc 20)

STWG members reviewed the actions undertaken and the degree of implementation of the Waved Albatross Action Plan developed by Ecuador and Peru in collaboration with ACAP during 2007 and 2008. The WG focused on the progress made in actions related with population monitoring and some research on the biology of the species and also revised measures planned for implementation in future years.

The responsible group of the project formulated and initiated a monitoring program for the Waved albatross population in two nesting sites (Isla Española and Isla La Plata). Preliminary studies included analyses of survival, reproduction, and population size, and exploration of methods for a statistically robust survey of populations. A banding program in Isla La Plata has also been initiated.

STWG considered that the responsible group should encourage a reevaluation of the project priorities and identify mechanisms for the undertaking of the complex actions to assist in achieving the aims of the Action Plan. The STWG considered the possibility of the formation of a recovery team with the participation of Parties and Range States primarily engaged with the implementation of the Plan of Action which could be one way to assist.

9. REVIEW OF TERMS OF REFERENCE

The current terms of reference for the STWG (Annex 4) were reviewed to ensure that they remain relevant to the aims of the STWG and the work plan. The group considered that they were still current and comprehensive and no changes to the terms of reference were recommended for consideration by the AC.

10. STATUS AND TRENDS WORK PROGRAM

Considerable progress has been achieved since AC4. Annex 5 details the specific progress for each of the action items in the Status and Trends elements of the AC Work Program. This has been largely achieved via the significant contributions of the ACAP officials, particularly the ACAP Executive Secretary and Science Officer, and the Convenor of the Breeding Sites Working Group.

The progress and outstanding requirements of the STWG Work Plan 2010-2012 are provided in Annex 5.

In addition, the STWG identified the following tasks that need to be undertaken in order to continue to fulfill of the Terms of Reference and Work Plan of the Status and Trends Working Group, and the ACAP Action Plan:

| Status and trends | | | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|------------------------|--|
| | Task/Topic | Responsible group | Timeframe | Action Detail |
| | Resolve part-site monitoring data to assist with generation of database queries and revision of analyses of status and trends | STWG, BSWG convenor and Secretariat | Before AC6 | Science officer to facilitate modification of database and STWG and BSWG convenor to work with Science officer to ensure appropriate generation of queries. |
| | Analyse ACAP population database to determine those that meet threshold criteria based upon proportions of global population size | STWG and Secretariat | Before AC6 | Following 2010 provision of population data to the database to provide analyses of locations of ACAP populations that meet various threshold criteria. |
| | Assist Secretariat and AC with provision of information on the agreed indicators and national reporting queries | STWG and Secretariat | Before AC6 | Following 2010 data provision and database update, provide the Secretariat and AC with information as required to progress the agreed indicator and national reporting parameters that are relevant to status and trends |
| | Revise species assessments with updated conservation status and population numbers as required | STWG and Secretariat | Before AC6 and ongoing | Assist in updating species assessments with recent changes to conservation status and population numbers |
| | Work with BirdLife International to ensure population data consistent and accurate | STWG Convenor , Secretariat and BirdLife International | Before AC6 | Liaise with BLI to ensure consistent and accurate data |
| | Add data portal improvements relating to ongoing population monitoring and mark-recapture studies | STWG Convenor and Secretariat | 2010 | Science Officer to facilitate modification of database to include entry of ongoing status of monitoring and mark-recapture studies. |

STWG recommends that the tasks detailed in this report be considered for incorporation into the AC Work Programme.

11. RECOMENDATIONS

- I. Complete Spanish translations of Species assessments and progress translations into French, with priority to species breeding in French territories.
- II. Revise the species assessments with real time updates of population parameters as they become available and 2 two yearly comprehensive revisions of content as required.
- III. Parties with outstanding status and trends data (Argentina, Chile, Ecuador, New Zealand) submit data as soon as possible to enable accurate and comprehensive analyses.
- IV. Add age-at-first-breeding to the ACAP database and request Parties provide this information for species that breed in their jurisdiction.
- V. STWG undertake a comprehensive analysis of data gaps following a renewed call for data to be submitted to ACAP. This will enable identification of populations that could be prioritised for establishment of required monitoring programs and also vital to monitoring the effectiveness of management actions and the work of the Agreement.
- VI. Parties to continue the long term ACAP species monitoring programs where they occur, and for Parties also to prioritise, and implement where required, regional programs to increase current knowledge of population size, trend and demographic parameters of ACAP species.
- VII. Accept the updates and modifications to the work plan that guides future work of the STWG.

12. REPORTING TO THE AC5

The STWG discussed the requirement of preparing a report for the AC5 and members committed to assist in preparation of the report in a timely manner.

13. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The STWG discussed the representation of the participants at the meeting and agreed that some key members and observers who had previously attended STWG meetings were absent on this occasion. It was recognised that the concurrent scheduling of working group meetings resulted in conflicts for some members, particularly for members of small delegations and observers who had interest and expertise across several WG disciplines. Whilst it was also recognised that it was not desirable to extend the duration of AC and WG meetings, and that a small, targeted and focussed WG was extremely efficient and effective in achieving their goals, it was also important that representation at the WG meetings was adequate. The STWG agreed that this issue could be further considered by the Secretariat and the AC.

14. CLOSING REMARKS - ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Convenor of the STWG thanked the Members and Observers for their valuable contributions at the meeting and in developing the report. The STWG also gratefully acknowledged those members who provide updated information in a timely manner. Thanks were conveyed to other convenors and ACAP officials who have assisted the work of the WG during the inter-sessional period, and especially to the ACAP Science Officer, Dr. Wieslawa Misiak, for her diligence and commitment to assisting the work of the working group and to the convenor of the BSWG. The group thanked the Convenor for her work in progressing the aims and work plan of the Working Group.

ANNEX 1: MEMBERSHIP OF THE STATUS AND TRENDS WORKING GROUP - 2010

Updated 10 April 2010.

| | Working Group members (*National Coordinators)(# Convenor) |
|--|--|
| Argentina | Flavio Quintana* <fquintana@wcs.org> Nestor Coria <ncoria@dna.gov.ar> |
| Australia | Mike Double <Mike.Double@aad.gov.au> Rosemary Gales # <Rosemary.Gales@dpipwe.tas.gov.au> |
| Chile | Marcelo Garcia Alvarado <mgarcia@subpesca.cl> |
| Ecuador | Gabrielle Montoya <gmontoya@ambiente.gov.ec> |
| France | Henri Weimerskirch* <henriw@cebc.cnrs.fr> Martine Bigan <martine.bigan@ecologie.gouv.fr> |
| New Zealand | TBA |
| Norway | Oystein Storkersen <Oystein.Storkersen@dirnat.no> |
| South Africa | John Cooper* <John.Cooper@uct.ac.za> Robert Crawford <crawford@deat.gov.za> |
| United Kingdom | Richard Phillips* <raphil@bas.ac.uk> Anton Wolfaardt <anton.wolfaardt@jncc.gov.uk> |
| Brazil | TBA |
| Peru | Elisa Goya <egoya@imarpe.gob.pe> |
| Spain | Maria Sagrario Moset Martinez <smosetma@mapya.es> |
| Canada | Ken Morgan <MorganK@pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca> |
| United States of America | Maura Naughton maura_naughton@fws.gov Eleanora Babij eleanora_babij@fws.gov |
| BirdLife International | Stuart Butchart <Stuart.Butchart@birdlife.org> John Croxall <John.Croxall@birdlife.org> |
| Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research | TBA |

ANNEX 2: Tables 1 to 5

| Table 1. Summary of Status of ACAP Albatross and Petrel species - 2010 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| | | Population decline | Restricted breeding range | Limited population size | Decline in habitat | Endemic to single country | Country endemic | No of island groups | No of sites | Annual breeding pairs | Breeding Frequency | Current population trend |
| CRITICALLY ENDANGERED | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Amsterdam albatross | * | * | * | | * | France | 1 | 1 | 30 | B | stable |
| 2 | Waved albatross | * | * | | * | * | Ecuador | 2 | 2 | 9,608 | A | declining |
| 3 | Tristan albatross | * | * | | | * | United Kingdom | 1 | 1 | 1,763 | B | declining |
| ENDANGERED | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Northern royal albatross | * | * | | * | * | New Zealand | 3 | 6 | 5,823 | B | unknown |
| 5 | Black-browed albatross | * | | | | | | 14 | 66 | 593,002 | A | declining |
| 6 | Atlantic yellow-nosed albatross | * | * | | | * | United Kingdom | 2 | 6 | 34,050 | A | declining |
| 7 | Indian yellow-nosed albatross | * | | | | | | 4 | 6 | 39,315 | A | declining |
| 8 | Black-footed albatross | | | | | | | 4 | 13 | 60,878 | A | increasing |
| 9 | Sooty albatross | * | | | | | | 6 | 15 | 13,260 | B | declining |
| VULNERABLE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Wandering albatross | * | | | | | | 5 | 30 | 8,034 | B | declining |
| 11 | Antipodean albatross | ? | * | | | * | New Zealand | 3 | 5 | 8,273 | B | declining |
| 12 | Southern royal albatross | | * | | | * | New Zealand | 2 | 4 | 7,886 | B | stable |
| 13 | Salvin's albatross | | * | | | * | New Zealand | 3 | 4 | 31,953 | A | unknown |
| 14 | Campbell albatross | | * | | | * | New Zealand | 1 | 2 | 22,093 | A | unknown |
| 15 | Grey-headed albatross | * | | | | | | 8 | 29 | 97,552 | B | declining |
| 16 | Chatham albatross | | * | | * | * | New Zealand | 1 | 1 | 5,407 | A | stable |
| 17 | Short-tailed albatross | | * | * | * | | | 2 | 2 | 470 | A | increasing |
| 18 | White-chinned petrel | * | | | | | | 8 | 76 | 1,161,620 | A | declining |
| 19 | Spectacled petrel | | * | | | * | United Kingdom | 1 | 1 | 10,090 | A | increasing |
| 20 | Black petrel | | * | | | * | New Zealand | 1 | 2 | 1,458 | A | stable? |
| 21 | Westland petrel | | * | | | * | New Zealand | 1 | 1 | 4,000 | A | stable? |
| NEAR-THREATENED | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 22 | Buller's albatross | | * | | | * | New Zealand | 4 | 10 | 30,460 | A | increasing? |
| 23 | White-capped albatross | ? | * | | | * | New Zealand | 3 | 5 | 97,113 | ? | unknown |
| 24 | Shy albatross | ? | * | | | * | Australia | 1 | 3 | 12,595 | A | stable? |
| 25 | Light-mantled albatross | ? | | | | | | 9 | 71 | 15,449 | B | unknown |
| 26 | Laysan albatross | | | | | | | 5 | 17 | 591,247 | A | stable |
| 27 | Grey petrel | ? | | | | | | 9 | 17 | 79,720 | A | unknown |
| LEAST CONCERN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | Southern giant petrel | | | | | | | 27 | 121 | 50,200 | A | increasing |
| 29 | Northern giant petrel | | | | | | | 9 | 51 | 11,889 | A | increasing |
| Conservation Status based upon information presented in AC5 Doc 34 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Last revised 18 April 2010 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table 2: Status of population monitoring for ACAP species as determined from information in the ACAP Species Database (as at April 2010)

Table 2: Status of population monitoring for ACAP species as determined from information in the ACAP Species Database (as at April 2010)

| | Jurisdiction of endemic species | No of sites | No of sites (unknown, n) | No of sites (unknown, %) | Population estimate | most recent year of pop estimate | sites monitored annually since 2000 (n) | sites monitored annually since 2000 (%) | counted in their entirety since 2005 (n) | counted in their entirety since 2005 (%) | counted in their entirety since 2000 (n) | counted in their entirety since 2000 (%) | number of sites population trend (2000+) | % of sites population trend (2000+) |
|--|---------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|-------------------------------------|
| <i>Amsterdam albatross</i> | France | 1 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 2009 | 1 | 100 | 1 | 100 | 1 | 100 | 1 | 100 |
| <i>Antipodean albatross</i> | NZ | 5 | 0 | 0 | 8,273 | 2009 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 40 | 2 | 40 | 2 | 40 |
| <i>Atlantic yellow-nosed albatross</i> | UK | 6 | 0 | 0 | 34,050 | 2007 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16.7 | 2 | 33.3 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>Black petrel</i> | NZ | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1,458 | 2007 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>Black-browed albatross</i> | | 66 | 3 | 4.5 | 593,002 | 2009 | 1 | 1.5 | 17 | 25.8 | 56 | 84.8 | 3 | 4.5 |
| <i>Black-footed albatross</i> | | 13 | 0 | 0 | 60,878 | 2009 | 3 | 23.1 | 8 | 61.5 | 11 | 84.6 | 3 | 23.1 |
| <i>Buller's albatross</i> | NZ | 10 | 3 | 30 | 30,460 | 2008 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 50 |
| <i>Campbell albatross</i> | NZ | 2 | 1 | 50 | 22,093 | 1998 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>Chatham albatross</i> | NZ | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5,407 | 2009 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 100 | 1 | 100 | 1 | 100 |
| <i>Grey petrel</i> | | 17 | 9 | 53 | 79,720 | 2009 | 1 | 5.9 | 2 | 11.8 | 5 | 29.4 | 1 | 5.6 |
| <i>Grey-headed albatross</i> | | 29 | 0 | 0 | 97,552 | 2009 | 2 | 6.9 | 3 | 10.3 | 22 | 75.9 | 3 | 10.3 |
| <i>Indian yellow-nosed albatross</i> | | 6 | 0 | 0 | 39,315 | 2009 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 50 | 3 | 50 | 1 | 16.7 |
| <i>Laysan albatross</i> | | 17 | 0 | 0 | 591,247 | 2009 | 3 | 17.6 | 9 | 52.9 | 14 | 82.4 | 4 | 23.5 |
| <i>Light-mantled albatross</i> | | 71 | 56 | 78.9 | 15,449 | 2010 | 3 | 4.2 | 4 | 5.6 | 4 | 5.6 | 2 | 2.8 |
| <i>Northern giant petrel</i> | | 51 | 9 | 17.6 | 11,889 | 2010 | 2 | 3.9 | 4 | 7.8 | 6 | 11.8 | 3 | 5.6 |
| <i>Northern royal albatross</i> | NZ | 6 | 2 | 33.3 | 5,823 | 2009 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 33.3 | 3 | 50 | 1 | 16.7 |
| <i>Salvin's albatross</i> | NZ | 4 | 0 | 0 | 31,953 | 2009 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 50 | 2 | 50 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>Short-tailed albatross</i> | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 470 | 2009 | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 | 2 | 100 | 1 | 50 |
| <i>Shy albatross</i> | Aust | 3 | 0 | 0 | 12,595 | 2009 | 2 | 66.7 | 2 | 66.7 | 2 | 66.7 | 2 | 66.7 |
| <i>Sooty albatross</i> | | 15 | 0 | 0 | 13,260 | 2010 | 2 | 13.3 | 4 | 26.7 | 7 | 46.7 | 3 | 20 |
| <i>Southern giant petrel</i> | | 121 | 27 | 24.2 | 50,200 | 2010 | 3 | 2.5 | 39 | 32.2 | 49 | 40.5 | 12 | 9.9 |
| <i>Southern royal albatross</i> | NZ | 4 | 0 | 0 | 7,886 | 2008 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 2 | 50 | 2 | 50 |
| <i>Spectacled petrel</i> | UK | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10,090 | 2005 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 100 | 1 | 100 | 1 | 100 |
| <i>Tristan albatross</i> | UK | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1,763 | 2008 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 100 | 1 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>Wandering albatross</i> | | 30 | 2 | 6.7 | 8,034 | 2010 | 4 | 13.3 | 8 | 26.7 | 19 | 63.3 | 4 | 13.3 |
| <i>Waved albatross</i> | Ecuador | 2 | 1 | 50 | 9,608 | 2001 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 |
| <i>Westland petrel</i> | NZ | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4,000 | 2008 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 100 | 1 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>White-capped albatross</i> | NZ | 5 | 0 | 0 | 97,113 | 2009 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 80 | 4 | 80 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>White-chinned petrel</i> | | 76 | 60 | 78.9 | 1,161,620 | 2007 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 14.5 | 13 | 17.1 | 1 | 1.3 |

Table 3 - Extent of demographic information for ACAP species

| | Jurisdiction of endemic species | No of sites | Number sites - Adult survival | Number sites - Adult survival (2000+) | Number sites - Juv survival | Number sites - productivity |
|--|---------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <i>Amsterdam albatross</i> | France | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| <i>Antipodean albatross</i> | NZ | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| <i>Atlantic yellow-nosed albatross</i> | UK | 6 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| <i>Black petrel</i> | NZ | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| <i>Black-browed albatross</i> | | 66 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 6 |
| <i>Black-footed albatross</i> | | 13 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| <i>Buller's albatross</i> | NZ | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| <i>Campbell albatross</i> | NZ | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| <i>Chatham albatross</i> | NZ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>Grey petrel</i> | | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| <i>Grey-headed albatross</i> | | 29 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| <i>Indian yellow-nosed albatross</i> | | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| <i>Layson albatross</i> | | 17 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 5 |
| <i>Light-mantled albatross</i> | | 71 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| <i>Northern giant petrel</i> | | 51 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| <i>Northern royal albatross</i> | NZ | 6 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| <i>Salvin's albatross</i> | NZ | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>Short-tailed albatross</i> | | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| <i>Shy albatross</i> | Aust | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| <i>Sooty albatross</i> | | 15 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| <i>Southern giant petrel</i> | | 121 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 12 |
| <i>Southern royal albatross</i> | NZ | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| <i>Spectacled petrel</i> | UK | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>Tristan albatross</i> | UK | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| <i>Wandering albatross</i> | | 30 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 6 |
| <i>Waved albatross</i> | Ecuador | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| <i>Westland petrel</i> | NZ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| <i>White-capped albatross</i> | NZ | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| <i>White-chinned petrel</i> | | 76 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |

| Table 4. Number of ACAP species for each breeding location jurisdiction indicating extent of information for population size and demographic data | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|--------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | No. populations with demographic data | | |
| Jurisdiction | No. species | No. endemics | No. populations | No. population size unknown n | No. population size unknown (%) | adult survival | juvenile survival | productivity |
| Antarctic | 1 | 0 | 47 | 16 | 34 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| Argentina | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Australia | 8 | 1 | 17 | 3 | 17.6 | 4 | 3 | 8 |
| Chile | 3 | 0 | 35 | 5 | 14.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Disputed | 9 | 0 | 228 | 89 | 39 | 5 | 3 | 11 |
| Ecuador | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 50 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| France | 12 | 1 | 88 | 21 | 23.9 | 8 | 6 | 9 |
| Japan | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Mexico | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| New Zealand | 16 | 10 | 84 | 34 | 40.5 | 12 | 7 | 16 |
| South Africa | 9 | 0 | 17 | 4 | 23.5 | 4 | 1 | 6 |
| United Kingdom | 6 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| USA | 2 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |

Table 5: Current population and demographic monitoring for island groups where ACAP species breed.

| Jurisdiction | Island Group | ACAP species per region | Current species with annual population counts | Current ongoing demographic monitoring |
|--------------|---|-------------------------|---|--|
| Antarctic | Anvers Island | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Antarctic | Biscoe Islands | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Antarctic | Danco Coast | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Antarctic | Elephant Island | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Antarctic | Frazier Islands | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Antarctic | Hawker Island | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Antarctic | Marguerite Bay | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Antarctic | Pointe Geologie | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Antarctic | Powell Island | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Antarctic | Rookery Islands | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Antarctic | South Orkney Islands | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Antarctic | South Shetland Islands | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Antarctic | Sterneck Island | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Argentina | Isla de los Estados | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Argentina | North Patagonia | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Australia | Macquarie | 7 | 7 | 3 |
| Australia | Tasmania | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Australia | Heard and McDonald Islands | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Chile | Diego de Almagro | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Chile | Isla Noir | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Chile | Islas Diego Ramirez | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Chile | Islas Ildefonso | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Chile | Islote Albatros | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Chile | Islote Leonard | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Chile | Islotes Evangelistas | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Chile | Straits of Magellan | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Disputed | Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas) | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Disputed | Senkaku Retto of southern Ryukyu Islands | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Disputed | South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur) | 7 | 6 | 5 |
| Disputed | South Sandwich Islands (Islas Sandwich del Sur) | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Ecuador | Galapagos | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Ecuador | Isla de La Plata | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| France | Amsterdam and St Paul | 4 | 2 | 3 |
| France | Crozet | 11 | 5 | 4 |
| France | Kerguelen | 10 | 2 | 3 |
| Japan | Izu Shoto | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Japan | Ogasawara (Bonin) Islands | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Mexico | Isla Guadalupe | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Mexico | Islas Revillagigedos | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Mexico | Rocas Alijos | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| New Zealand | Antipodes Islands | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| New Zealand | Auckland Islands | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| New Zealand | Bounty Island | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| New Zealand | Campbell Islands | 9 | 0 | 0 |
| New Zealand | Chatham Island | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| New Zealand | New Zealand | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| New Zealand | Solander Islands | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| New Zealand | The Snares | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| New Zealand | Three Kings | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| South Africa | Prince Edward Islands | 8 | 5 | 2 |
| UK | Gough | 5 | 3 | 2 |
| UK | Tristan | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| US | Hawaii | 2 | 2 | 2 |

Indicates no monitoring studies in region

ANNEX 3: RULES FOR ACCESS AND USE OF STATUS AND TRENDS, AND BREEDING SITES DATA SUBMITTED TO, AND MAINTAINED BY, ACAP

The following revised Rules for Access and Use of data submitted to, and maintained by, ACAP pertaining to population status and trends, and breeding sites management and threats, were adopted by the fourth meeting of the Advisory Committee in August 2008.

It is recognised that:

1. All status and trends, and breeding sites data submitted to, and maintained by, the ACAP Secretariat, shall be available to ACAP officials (Secretariat, Advisory Committee Chair, Advisory Committee Vice-chair, Working Group conveners and vice-conveners) for analysis and preparation of documents for the Agreement.
2. Inclusion of data, analyses or results from data held by the ACAP Secretariat into working papers, information papers, reports and any other documents tabled at meetings of the Advisory Committee or Working Groups, or circulated inter-sessionally to members of the Secretariat, ACAP officials, Working Group members or invited experts does not constitute publication.
3. Data included in any published reports or scientific papers outside ACAP will be considered to be in the public domain and so may be included in databases maintained by the ACAP Secretariat, and may be released by the ACAP Secretariat to other parties on request without the need to obtain permission from the data holders (owners/originators). Release to other parties will include making the data available through the ACAP web portal.
4. Unless indicated otherwise by the relevant member of the Breeding Sites Working Group, all data, analyses or results concerning breeding site threats and management may be released by the ACAP Secretariat to other parties on request without the need to obtain permission from the data holders. Release to other parties will include making the data available through the ACAP web portal. Other parties will be advised of the source of the original data and will be asked to consult the original data holder (including on assignation of authorship) before proceeding with publication of documents describing analyses and interpretation of these data.
5. Unless indicated otherwise by the relevant member of the Status and Trends Working Group, the most recent count from each breeding site, summary statistics (mean, statistical errors, range) of population trend, productivity, survival rates and breeding frequency, and trend graphs generated for ACAP Species Assessments may be released by the ACAP Secretariat to other parties on request without the need to obtain permission from the data holders. Release to parties will include making the data available through the ACAP web portal. Other parties will be advised of the source of the original data and will be asked to cite the data contributor and, if required, to consult the original data contributor for further information before proceeding with publication of documents describing analyses and interpretation of these data.
6. No data user shall hold ACAP or the original data provider(s) liable for errors in the data. While every effort has been made to ensure the integrity and quality of the database, ACAP (or whoever maintains the database) cannot guarantee the accuracy of the datasets contained herein.
7. The following statement shall be placed on the cover page of working papers, information papers, reports and any other documents tabled at meetings of the Advisory Committee or Working Groups, or circulated inter-sessionally to members of the Secretariat, ACAP officials, Working Group members or invited experts:

'This paper is presented for consideration by ACAP and may contain unpublished data, analyses, and/or conclusions subject to change. Data in this paper shall not be cited or used for purposes other than the work of the ACAP Secretariat, ACAP Advisory Committee or their subsidiary Working Groups without the permission of the original data holders.'

ANNEX 4: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE STATUS AND TRENDS WORKING GROUP

The Terms of Reference for the Status and Trends Working group were most recently revised in 2008 at AC4.

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 Status and Trends of albatross and petrel species covered by the Agreement.

The aims of the Status and Trends Working Group are:

- to oversee the collation of the most up to date information on population numbers and demography of each species of albatross and petrel listed on Annex 1 of the ACAP Agreement. The information will be sought from Parties and Signatories to ACAP who are Breeding Range States for (i.e. are home to breeding populations of) the ACAP listed species.
- to contribute towards production and review of comprehensive assessments of the status and trends of each species.
- to identify key gaps in the knowledge of the conservation status of each species.
- to work with other working groups in identifying specific albatross and petrel populations that may require priority conservation actions.

ANNEX 5: COMPONENTS OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAM 2010-2012 THAT RELATE SPECIFICALLY TO THE STATUS AND TRENDS WORKING GROUP

| | Topic/Task | Responsible group | Timeframe | Action detail |
|------|--|---|---|--|
| 2.1 | Consider gaps in status and trends data submitted to ACAP and request any outstanding data (including from SCAR). Continue to update population data | STWG (Secretariat) | a) End 2009 b) 2010-2012 | a) All outstanding existing data to be incorporated into database. b) Parties to provide new population data |
| 2.2 | Incorporate all feedback received into the draft species assessments, and incorporate missing data | STWG Convenor (with species authors) (Secretariat) | 2010-2012 | Feedback from AC4 and incorporate data that are currently missing. All species assessments finalised. Complete |
| 2.3 | Provide advice to CEP regarding census methods for Antarctic southern giant petrels | STWG, (Secretariat) | End 2008 | CEP requested review and advice on census methods prior to their 2009 meeting |
| 2.4 | Supply data and validate ACAP database | STWG Convenor and members (with data holders) (Secretariat) | 2010-2012 | Liaise with Secretariat. Ongoing |
| 2.5 | Finalise Species Assessments for all ACAP species | Species Assessment Coordinating Group, STWG Convenor, (Secretariat) | End 2009 | This to include updating population trends with 2008 data and any new species added to Annex 1 |
| 2.6 | Translation of Species Assessments into Spanish and French | STWG (Secretariat) | 2010 (Spanish). French translations ongoing | Includes contributions in kind from Spanish and French speaking Parties. Spanish translations nearly complete, working to progress French translations |
| 2.7 | Reconsider selection of RFMOs whose boundaries are included on distribution maps in Species Assessments | SBWG STWG | 2010 | Further maps, if required, would need to be commissioned. Confer with SBWG to assess if required (noting \$\$ implications) . |
| 2.8 | Provide and consider annual reports to AC on STWG activities | STWG and AC | 2010-2012 | Ongoing |
| 4.16 | Identify and prioritise conservation measures required for each species and by each Party to the Agreement | WG Convenors and <i>ad-hoc</i> group, lead New Zealand | 2010-2012 | An analysis of threats, data/knowledge gaps and population trends will be reported. Ongoing. |

| | Topic/Task | Responsible group | Timeframe | Action detail |
|------|--|---|---------------------------------|--|
| 2.1 | Consider gaps in status and trends data submitted to ACAP and request any outstanding data (including from SCAR). Continue to update population data | STWG (Secretariat) | a) End 2009 b) 2010-2012 | a) All outstanding existing data to be incorporated into database. b) Parties to provide new population data |
| 2.2 | Incorporate all feedback received into the draft species assessments, and incorporate missing data | STWG Convenor (with species authors) (Secretariat) | 2010-2012 | Feedback from AC4 and incorporate data that are currently missing. All species assessments finalised. Complete |
| 2.3 | Provide advice to CEP regarding census methods for Antarctic southern giant petrels | STWG, (Secretariat) | End 2008 | CEP requested review and advice on census methods prior to their 2009 meeting |
| 2.4 | Supply data and validate ACAP database | STWG Convenor and members (with data holders) (Secretariat) | 2010-2012 | Liaise with Secretariat. Ongoing |
| 4.17 | Develop and harmonise conservation strategies for particular species or groups of species of albatrosses and petrels | WGs, AC (Secretariat) | 2010-2012 | Precise definition of what is needed difficult at this range |
| 6.1 | Identify and prioritise conservation measures required for each species and by each party to the Agreement | WG Convenors and <i>ad-hoc</i> group, lead New Zealand | 2010-2012 | An analysis of threats, data/knowledge gaps and population trends will be reported |
| 6.2 | Develop and harmonise conservation strategies for particular species or groups of species of albatrosses and petrels | WGs, AC (Secretariat) | 2010-2012 | Precise definition of what is needed difficult at this stage |

Grey entries are those that were completed during 2009