

 <p data-bbox="215 533 454 571">Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels</p>	<p data-bbox="643 241 1404 280" style="text-align: center;">Seventh Meeting of the Advisory Committee</p> <p data-bbox="817 297 1404 336" style="text-align: center;"><i>La Rochelle, France, 6 - 10 May 2013</i></p> <p data-bbox="512 412 1377 454" style="text-align: center;">Agreement's Strategy to Engage New Parties</p> <p data-bbox="769 542 1123 580" style="text-align: center;"><i>AC Chair, Secretariat</i></p>
---	--

SUMMARY

The Report of the Depositary (AC7 Doc 07) reveals that there have been no new accessions to the Agreement since 9 October 2008. In the intervening period four new species have been added to the Agreement's Annex 1, which has increased the number of countries that are now breeding range States. The development of the prioritisation database has provided a tool to rapidly identify fisheries and hence Range States that have relevance to the Agreement's work. A strategy is presented to engage these non-Party Ranges States in the Agreement's work, with a view to their ultimate accession to the Agreement.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Advisory Committee is requested to:

1. Review and endorse the proposed strategy to engage new Parties.
2. Take appropriate steps to implement the strategy.

1. BACKGROUND

With the listing of the three Northern Hemisphere albatross species in 2009 (MoP3 [Resolution 3.1](#)) and the Balearic Shearwater in 2012 (MoP4 [Resolution 4.1](#)), the list of States holding breeding sites for ACAP species and the number of range States to the Agreement increased substantially. Moreover, the exercise for the development of the Agreement's prioritisation framework ([MoP4 Doc 17](#)) identified a number of non-Party Range States with fisheries posing a threat to albatross and petrel species listed in Annex 1, both in domestic and international waters. Despite the significant increase in the relevance of the Agreement's work to many countries, since 2009 there have been no new accessions of Parties to the Agreement.

In recent years the Secretariat, Parties and Advisory Committee Officials, have engaged with various agencies of non-Party Range States, primarily through engagement at meetings of Regional Fisheries Management Organisations. However there has not been a defined strategy within ACAP to make an optimal use of these opportunities to engage these States in the Agreement's work.

It is noted that item 7.5 of the Agreement's Action Plan states that "The Parties shall, either individually or through the Secretariat, draw the attention of any state which is not a Party to this Agreement to any activity undertaken by its nationals or vessels which affects the implementation of the Action Plan".

During the last Meeting of the Parties (MoP4), the Parties and observers discussed the merits of prioritising the countries which they and the Executive Secretary should approach, or enter into dialogue with, to encourage their accession to the Agreement. MoP4 decided to request the advice of the Advisory Committee on which non-Parties were of highest priority for engagement (see [MoP4 Final Report](#) para 6.1.15).

2. STATES HOLDING BREEDING SITES AND RELEVANT FISHERIES

Documents (e.g. species assessments) and tools (prioritisation database) developed during recent years by the Agreement hold information needed for the analysis requested by MoP. These tools have been used to identify those States that are not currently Parties to the Agreement that are considered to have the most relevance to our work (Tables 1 and 2). It is worth highlighting that, for high seas fisheries, the prioritisation framework operates primarily at a RFMO scale, so no national fisheries for any State were identified within a particular RFMO. Consequently, further work might be required to identify relevant States and economies that have significant fisheries within a particular RFMO management area.

Table 1. List of non-Party States with breeding sites for species listed in the Agreement's Annex 1.

State	Species (conservation status)	# breeding sites	Abundance (# pairs)	proportion of global population
Mexico	Laysan albatross (NT)	4	524	<1%
	Black-footed albatross (VU)	2(0?)	(0?)	(0?)
USA	Laysan albatross	14	591,000	>99%
	Black-footed albatross	11	68,000	96%
	Short-tailed albatross (VU)	2	1	<1%
Japan	Short-tailed albatross	2	538	91%
	Black-footed albatross	3	3,038	4%
	Laysan albatross	2	20	<1%

Table 2. List of fisheries from non-Party States identified as priority for conservation actions by the prioritisation framework (see [MoP4 Doc 17](#)).

Country and fishery	Species population
Angola Demersal trawl	Atlantic Yellow-nosed Albatross Gough Island Atlantic Yellow-nosed Albatross Tristan da Cunha
Angola Pelagic LL	Atlantic Yellow-nosed Albatross Gough Island Atlantic Yellow-nosed Albatross Tristan da Cunha Tristan Albatross Gough Island
Namibia Demersal LL	Atlantic Yellow-nosed Albatross Gough Island Atlantic Yellow-nosed Albatross Tristan da Cunha Black browed Albatross South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur) ¹ Shy Albatross Pedra Branca Tristan Albatross Gough Island
Namibia Demersal trawl	Atlantic Yellow-nosed Albatross Gough Island Atlantic Yellow-nosed Albatross Tristan da Cunha
Namibia Pelagic LL	Atlantic Yellow-nosed Albatross Gough Island Atlantic Yellow-nosed Albatross Tristan da Cunha Shy Albatross Pedra Branca
Namibia Pelagic trawl	Atlantic Yellow-nosed Albatross Gough Island Atlantic Yellow-nosed Albatross Tristan da Cunha Shy Albatross Pedra Branca

3. PROPOSED ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY

In view of the relatively low number of non-Party Range States identified by the above review, it is proposed that all of them be targeted under the proposed engagement strategy. The elements of this strategy would be:

1. Preparation of a briefing document that outlines the objective of the Agreement and how it works; identifies the relevance of the Agreement to the conservation needs of the State concerned; and sets out the steps necessary to join the Agreement.
2. Preparation of a demarche that could be used as a template by Parties to approach the non-Party Range States.
3. Establishment of a time-line for advancing the accession of non-Party Range States, including the identification of tasks and the departments/organisations responsible for pursuing them.
4. Development of a review mechanism to identify progress, or lack of progress, and to make recommendations on further actions to be taken.
5. Appointment of officials to co-ordinate the engagement strategy within ACAP Parties, as well as an official to act in the position of overall Coordinator of the Strategy.

¹ “A dispute exists between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland concerning sovereignty over the Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas), South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands (Islas Georgias del Sur e Islas Sandwich del Sur) and the surrounding maritime areas.”