

Framework for identification of ACAP conservation priorities

AC5 Doc 15



Purpose

- Achieve and maintain favourable conservation status
- Limited resources
- Complex problem with diverse solutions
- Need to prioritise work



Objective

“To prioritise effective actions that are most likely to reduce impacts that adversely influence the population status of ACAP-listed albatross and petrel species most at risk of extinction”



Objective

More simply:

- **actions** that are considered to make the
- **greatest difference** to the
- **most severe threats** to the
- **Most vulnerable** seabird populations.



Secondary objectives

- Identify priority research areas
- Examine all threats to a population or species
- Examine all ACAP species threatened by a particular fishery or alien species



Process

- Initial approach developed at AC4
- Intersessional work
 - Ad-hoc Priorities Working Group
 - Workshops
 - Endorsed by MOP
- Making the most of opportunities at AC5



How does it work?

- Quantitative assessment methodology
- 3 variables: vulnerability, threat, likelihood of success
- Score calculated for each management action
- Management actions grouped into priorities



Examples

- An example of a conservation action is the introduction of mitigation measures in a particular fishery to address threats to a particular seabird population
- There are 92 High Priority conservation 'line items' for at sea threats, however, only 36 are unique actions
- At-sea spreadsheet provides context



Emerging themes - species

- Emerging themes relate to at-sea threats. However, ask about land based threats
- Exact figures may change following peer review but emerging themes will not
- 20 species covering 24 populations require High Priority conservation actions (out of 29 ACAP species)
- 9 species require 5 or more high priority conservation actions, 2 species require 10 actions
- Other species and populations will also benefit



Emerging themes – population trends

- 13 populations that will benefit from High Priority conservation actions have an unknown population trend
- 7 populations are in steep declines
- 2 populations are in decline
- 1 population is stable and one is increasing



Emerging themes - fisheries

- High priority conservation actions span 13 countries' fishing waters and 8 RFMOs
- High priority conservation actions are not evenly spread: New Zealand has 15 species-fishery combinations and Peru has one
- CCSBT has 7 and SEAFO has one
- Two thirds of high priority conservation actions can be addressed by Parties to ACAP



Emerging themes - method

- High priority conservation actions span all methods
- Trawl fisheries drive the most number of conservation actions (42), followed by demersal longline (30) then pelagic longline (20)
- Likelihood of success affects pelagic longline



Emerging themes – risk assessment

- Two thirds of high-risk fishery interactions are pelagic longline
- Over half of high-risk fishery interactions are from RFMOs – CCSBT in particular
- Similar species are affected (good)



Applications

- Effective work plan – most urgent and important tasks
- Aligns workstreams – project funding, research, capacity building, RFMO engagement, reporting
- Highlights important gaps in knowledge



Applications - specifics

- Clear set of priority actions for ACAP Parties to collectively address
- Guidance on research priorities for mitigation, populations, fisheries and seabird distribution
- Guidance on prioritising AC Work programme and funding bids
- Progress on priority conservation actions and risk assessment scores can feed directly in to performance indicators and reporting requirements
- Provides information for engaging with RFMOs, particularly in the absence of ERAs
- Capacity building can be targeted towards high priority fisheries



Next steps

- Fisheries threats:
 - complete peer review of threat information
- Land based threats:
 - test weighting criteria and peer review results
- Whole framework:
 - Implement in work programme, funding proposals, reporting frameworks, capacity building etc.
 - Embed into ACAP database and agree review process
 - Enhance framework to allow species or threat cumulative impacts
 - If possible, combine at-sea and land-based prioritisation framework



Recommendations

- **note** progress achieved to date
- **agree** that the framework should guide the work of ACAP and Parties
- **agree** to complete the further work described in the next steps section of AC5 Doc 15

