



Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels

Sixth Meeting of Advisory Committee

Guayaquil, Ecuador, 29 August – 2 September 2011

Developing Indicators to Measure the Success of ACAP

BirdLife International

'This paper is presented for consideration by ACAP and may contain unpublished data, analyses, and/or conclusions subject to change.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.'

Developing Indicators to Measure the Success of ACAP

At AC5, mainly based on consideration of AC5 Inf. 16 Rev 1, the Advisory Committee concluded (paragraph 14.2):

- a. that indicator categories should, as far as possible, conform with the "State, Pressure Response" (SPR) system¹, while recognising that some important indicators would relate to monitoring the progressive acquisition of relevant data to enable the development of SPR indicators;
- b. that some basic indicators (see Annex 15) identified by the working groups, which were readily achievable with data that ACAP already holds, could be adopted immediately and, where necessary, incorporated into the revised national reporting template;
- c. that some other indicators identified by the working groups require further development intersessionally.

A small ad-hoc group was formed, comprising the Working Group Convenors and members from UK, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, the USA, BirdLife and any others who wished to join (paragraph 14.2d).

The topic of potential indicators of capacity in relation to commitments to ACAP was also added to the work of the ad-hoc group (paragraphs 14.3 and 14.4).

Since the initial communication to the ad-hoc group of 6 August 2010, and responses from BirdLife (13 August) and Australia (27 August), the work of the group has apparently not progressed.

As the BirdLife member of the ad-hoc group will now be overseas and offline until 20 June, only 10 days before the deadline for submission of papers to the Advisory Committee for consideration at AC6, BirdLife would like now to offer its comments and recommendations in relation to some of the desirable next steps to advance this topic, as set out below.

AC5 Inf. 16 Rev. 1 summarised the latest thinking of the ACAP Working Groups on the potential indicators most desirable and/or readily available. The essence of this can be summarised as follows:

¹ The OECD Pressure-State-Response (PSR) model provides a mechanism to monitor the impact of human activities on the environment. **State** refers to the condition of the environment (e.g. changes in pollutant levels, habitat diversity, livestock production, etc.). **Pressures** refer to the human activities that are exerting environment change (such as pollution, land use change, or increased demand for livestock products). **Responses** refer to policies or activities intended to prevent or mitigate the pressures and/or environmental and socio-economic damage that occurred as a result of the original pressures.

Breeding sites

State:

1. Sites with aliens, etc.

Pressure:

1. Number/proportion of categorical threats

Response:

1. Eradication actions
2. Protected Area status
3. Management plan status and implementation
4. Biosecurity protocol status (and, by implication, implementation)

It was noted that many data relevant to these indicators are already available.

Population status and trends

State:

1. Population data availability
2. Population trend data availability
3. Annual population monitoring studies
4. Categorical trends

It was noted that many data relevant to these indicators are already available.

Recommendation: BirdLife would suggest considering adding Survival rates (e.g. proportion monitored where adult and/or juvenile survival rates are increasing, decreasing, stable within an appropriate timespan) as these provide an important complement to overall population trend and are known to be sensitive to pressures such as bycatch rates.

Bycatch

State:

1. Data availability for at-sea range definition
2. Feeding habitat status
3. Prey status

It was noted that ACAP had currently no data relevant to 2 and 3 and that data on 1 would require extraction from the Global Procellariform Tracking Database.

Pressure:

1. Availability of bycatch data
2. Bycatch rates and levels

It was noted that ACAP does not currently have data available to develop these.

Recommendation: BirdLife suggests that Availability of bycatch data should be regarded as a State indicator, consistent with the treatment of analogous data for population status and trends.

Response:

1. Implementation of (seabird) bycatch mitigation within EEZs
2. RFMO interactions involving ACAP and its Parties

Recommendation: BirdLife suggests adding an indicator to reflect research and development for effective seabird bycatch mitigation measures.

General recommendations

1. For the indicators listed above relevant to breeding sites and population status and trends, to request the Secretariat and WG Convenors: a) to indicate for which of the above we might have available, for review and discussion at AC6, at least approximate indicator values, even as just as baselines. (We believe it would be valuable to bring forward data, however imperfect, on as many indicators as possible.); b) for those indicators for which data will be unavailable at AC6, to indicate the prospect and likely timescale of obtaining relevant data (This element could derive from discussion in the WG meetings at AC6).
2. In relation to data on indicators relevant to bycatch, to request: a) BirdLife to advise on time and other resources necessary to develop a time series of data relevant to availability of at-sea range information; b) the SBWG, on the basis of data on bycatch rates and levels available in national reports to ACAP and in the published literature, particularly the in press review of global longline bycatch data (AC6 Inf. XX), to commence assessment of which data might be regarded as acceptable baselines for historical and future comparisons; c) the SBWG to assess the current situation with regard to establishing at least baselines for potential indicators of implementation of bycatch mitigation and , including based on the latest national reports to ACAP, of interaction with RFMOs, by ACAP and its Parties.

Capacity indicators

BirdLife recommends that these should relate as closely as possible to resources made available for conservation, rather than administrative, capacity.

BirdLife believes that it is essential to have some measure of the resources (and change over time) being contributed to enable the implementation of ACAP. Any such measures will be imperfect but at least such indicators relate directly to commitment to implementing ACAP, whereas many of the other proposed response indicators are only in part influenced by ACAP activities.

There are many well-known difficulties with resource and capacity indicators. However, at the meeting of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) COP-10 in October 2010, indicators of "Resource mobilization in support of the achievement of the Convention's ... objectives" were adopted by all CBD Parties (which includes all current ACAP Parties). Several of these have relevance as potential ACAP resource/capacity indicators. In particular, we would note:

- (1) Aggregated financial flows, in the amount and where relevant percentage, of biodiversity-related funding, per annum, for achieving the Convention's three objectives, in a manner that avoids double counting, both in total and in, *inter alia*, the following categories:
 - (a) Official Development Assistance;
 - (b) Domestic budgets at all levels;
 - (c) Private sector;
 - (d) Non-governmental organizations, foundations, and academia;
 - (e) International financial institutions;
 - (f) United Nations organizations, funds and programmes;
 - (g) Non-ODA public funding;
 - (h) South-South cooperation initiatives;
 - (i) Technical cooperation;
- (3) Amount of domestic financial support, per annum, in respect of those domestic activities which are intended to achieve the objectives of this Convention;
- (9) Amount and number of South-South and North-South technical cooperation and capacity-building initiatives that support biodiversity;
- (11) Amount of financial resources from all sources from developed countries to developing countries to contribute to achieving the Convention's objectives;

Of these, (3) and (11) seem particularly appropriate, especially when viewed in the context of indicator (1), which is the headline aggregated indicator, subdivided into relevant categories, of which at least (b), (c), (d) and (e) have existing or potential direct relevance to ACAP.

Recommendation

Further discussion on this should take place during the AC6 meeting.