	Seventh Meeting of the Advisory Committee
	La Rochelle, France, 6 - 10 May 2013
	Parties' AC Reports
	Secretariat

Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels

RECOMMENDATIONS

The AC is requested to:

1. Provide feedback on the proposed NGO reporting approach, and approve its use for AC8 if it is deemed satisfactory, and

2. Continue to provide feedback and suggestions for improvements on the online reporting system to the Secretariat.

Informes de las Partes al CA

RECOMENDACIONES

Se le solicita al CA que:

1. Emita su opinión sobre el método para la presentación de informes por parte de las ONG, y apruebe su uso para la CA8 si se lo considera satisfactorio, y

2. Continúe proporcionado comentarios y sugerencias para mejorar el sistema en línea de presentación de informes a la Secretaría.

Rapports du CC des Parties

RECOMMANDATIONS

Le Comité consultatif est appelé à :

1. Commenter la proposition des ONG concernant le système de notification et à avaliser ce système pour CC8 s'il est jugé satisfaisant, et

2. Continuer à émettre des avis et des suggestions afin d'améliorer le système de notification en ligne au Secrétariat.

---

1. PARTY AND RANGE STATE REPORTS

All ACAP Parties and cooperating Range States were invited to update information on breeding sites, fisheries and funding relevant to their jurisdiction on 5 December 2012. The AC reports were due on 25 February 2013, allowing just under 12 weeks for completion.

Eleven Parties and one cooperating Range State have initiated their reports by the due date. However, due to some technical difficulties with the database which coincided with the reports' submission date, delays were experienced with data being able to be entered by several Parties. We thank everyone for their understanding and patience while these issues were being resolved. **Table 1** summarises the current status of reporting, although the reports remain open for Argentina, Brazil, Ecuador and Spain to allow for any outstanding data submission.

As requested at AC6, some amendments were made to the reporting system in 2013. Information on disputed and Antarctic sites is now able to be added through a single Party report if relevant, fishery forms are now available to be accessed independently of the AC reporting schedule, and information entered in the previous round of reporting is displayed in Section D for reference.

Table 1. AC7 Reports status.

Party or Range State	Breeding Sites: Section B	Fisheries: Section C	Funding: Section D		
			Research funded	Research funding received	Capacity building funded
Argentina	updated	updated	Yes	No	AUD 27,926 AUD 6,788
Australia	updated	updated	119,040	36,000	2,500
Brazil	NA	updated	R$ 329,318 R$ 182,464 R$ 24,885	No	No
Chile	updated	updated	No	No	Yes
Ecuador	updated	not updated	No	No	No
France	updated	updated	Yes	€ 200,000	No
New Zealand	updated	updated	NZD 1,500,000	No	No
South Africa	updated	updated	AUD 100,000	No	No
Spain	not updated	updated	€ 52,867	No	No
United Kingdom	updated	updated	£1, 604,033	£20,000	£137,000
Uruguay	NA	not updated	No	No	No
USA	updated	updated	USD 175,000	No	Yes

2. NGO REPORTS

As discussed at AC6, NGO reporting does not fit into the Party AC Report format. An alternative solution was explored intersessionally with the assistance of BirdLife International and is presented here for consideration.

The proposed process is as follows:

1. Secretariat advises Parties/NGOs that AC/MoP reports are open for editing, allowing 3 months completion time.

2. NGOs contact relevant Parties to advise them of fishery data they would like to contribute and arrange to provide this data to the Parties. NGOs might also request to view some/all of the Parties' breeding sites to determine if they could contribute any information.

3. If Parties agree for NGOs to view breeding sites, they contact the Secretariat with a list of sites to enable this option in the database. The request can be for all the sites within a particular jurisdiction to be visible to the requesting NGOs, or only specific sites and species.

4. NGOs can then contact the site custodians directly via an email link in the database with any comments or information they might have.

5. Parties provide a pdf extract from their AC Report of the fisheries or sites for which a NGO has contributed information, either prior to, or on submission of the Party's report, or request the Secretariat to do so.

It should be noted that:

1. NGOs cannot directly amend data for any site or fishery via the database, only request Parties to do so, or with the agreement of the Party concerned.

2. Parties are not obliged to incorporate any NGO data into their jurisdiction's report.

3. NGOs may submit data on non-Party fisheries or breeding sites if authorised to do so.

4. The MoP report remains unchanged, but some questions which do not apply to NGOs will remain unanswered in the MoP report submitted by NGOs.

Any further suggestions for improvements, questions or comments on the forms are welcome, both at AC7 and intersessionally.