Eighth Meeting of the Advisory Committee

Punta del Este, Uruguay, 15 -19 September 2014

Report on Progress with the Implementation of the Agreement 2011-2014

Secretariat, Advisory Committee Officials

SUMMARY

This report has been compiled pursuant to Article X (j) and in fulfilment of Articles VII (1)(c) and IX (6)(d) of the Agreement. The information contained within Part 1 of this report has been obtained by the Secretariat from Parties pursuant to Article VII (1) (c) and Article VIII (10). Part 2 contains information provided by Parties to the Advisory Committee (AC) on an annual basis to assist it with its work. A key function of the Advisory Committee (AC) is to report to the Meeting of the Parties (MoP) on the implementation of the Agreement. This document contains information that the Secretariat and AC Officials consider relevant to informing Parties on progress with implementing the Agreement.

RECOMMENDATION

The advisory Committee is requested to review the information contained in this document and agree on the components that would be of most use to MoP5 in determining progress with implementation of the Agreement.

OBJECTIVE

The key objectives for reporting on the implementation of the Agreement are to: (1) provide information regarding the assessment of progress towards the objectives of the Agreement; (2) gather information on lessons learned, including successes and failures, in order to conduct albatross and petrel conservation in the most efficient and effective manner; (3) identify further research and conservation actions to be carried out; and (4) provide a resource of material on albatross and petrel conservation.

METHODS

This report has been prepared in accordance with the revised process agreed to at MoP3 using the electronic reporting system developed in 2010-11. The information provided by Parties, Range States and others is detailed in full in Information Papers submitted to AC8 (AC8 Inf 03 to AC8 Inf 16). A summary of this information has been prepared by the Secretariat and is presented below for the consideration of the Advisory Committee in addressing the above-mentioned objectives.

The report also includes information provided by Parties and others to the Advisory Committee to enable it to meet its reporting requirements under item 5.1 of the Agreement's Action Plan. This information forms the second component of the report and will provide the basis for the Advisory Committee's report to MoP on progress made with implementation of the Agreement, as required under Article IX(6)(d). Part 2 was prepared jointly by the Advisory Committee's Officials and the Secretariat.

1. PART 1 – SUMMARY OF REPORTS ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AGREEMENT

Implementation reports were received from eleven Parties. In addition, one Range State provided a report on actions they had taken relevant to the Agreement's work. The reports received followed the reporting format prescribed in Annex 8 of the record of the Third Meeting of the ACAP Advisory Committee (AC3), and covered the period April 2011 to March 2014, as well as earlier information where relevant. Not all respondents reported against every reporting item. A summary of the information received is provided below.

1.1. Overview of implementation of Agreement and Action Plan

1.1.1. Has action been taken to implement the decisions of previous MoPs?

Those who responded to this question indicated that all decisions taken by MoP have been implemented. Specific examples of action taken include:

Argentina – Yes. Actions taken are specifically referred to in the answers to following questions.

Australia – Yes. Decisions and actions arising from previous MoPs have been fully implemented, including domestic treaty ratification actions for amendments to Annex 1 and to give effect to the provisions of the Headquarters Agreement.

Brazil – Yes. The Brazilian Government requires the use of mitigation measures as a permit criterion for leased fishing vessels in Brazilian waters. A review of research needs and priorities for bycatch research and mitigation development were incorporated in the NPOA-Seabirds Brazil after its revision in 2012. The NPOA also requires the implementation of conservation strategies for particular species or groups of species of albatrosses and petrels. Implementation of the Action Plan is monitored annually and its effectiveness every three years. For several years there has been a strong partnership

between seabird conservation projects and the National Observers Program of the Brazilian Ministry of Fisheries/MPA (PROBORDO) in order to promote training for observers to collect quality data on seabird interactions with longline fleets, as part of the strategy to develop capacity building. Discussions to improve seabird data collection from observer programmes in South America are still in progress, even though the PROBORDO is on hold since 2012.

A partnership has been established between Projeto Albatroz and BirdLife International to develop the Albatross Task Force project in Brazil, with the aim of introducing mitigation measures in the Brazilian longline fleet through the education of fishers. The "Itaipava fishery" has been identified as an important cause of mortality for seabirds, including endangered species such as Yellow-nosed Albatross *Thallassarche chlororhynchos* and Spectacled Petrel *Procellaria conspicillata*. In addition a study of fishing methods, fleet, fishing grounds, and seabird species interactions are being carried out on ports and by onboard observers. A review of the efficacy of seabird bycatch mitigation measures used in the fisheries that they manage either directly or indirectly, was also undertaken. Funds and the means to provide technical assistance to further develop conservation and management research in the scientifically least developed countries are still needed.

Chile – Yes. Action has been taken on all of the recommendations in MoP4 Doc 11 endorsed by Parties at MoP4 (para 7.1.17 of MoP4 Report). Specific actions taken were: a) approved funding for the science support position; b) approved the AC budget; c) incidental catch data for trawl and gill net fisheries have been provided; d) efforts taken to improve observer coverage of trawl and gillnet fisheries; e) have maintained in operation a working group on seabirds, funded by the Department of Fisheries f) undertaken evaluations of the effectiveness of measures based on the work of ATF in Chile; g) during 2014 a monitoring programme on the effects of artisanal fisheries on the marine ecosystem, including seabirds, was undertaken; h) where possible, will continue to conduct population census every ten years of the principal albatross colonies; i) & j) at this time, there isn't a programme to monitor demographic parameters of these populations. Efforts will continue to maintain a census at least once every ten years; k) high priority at-sea conservation threats were addressed as per MoP4 Doc 11, however sampling programmes suggest that pelagic longline fisheries are not a high priority threat. In fact, using the approach taken in the prioritisation framework it has been established that trawl fisheries should be regarded as a priority threat; l) a monitoring programme is currently being conducted at Albatross Islet and it is intended to conduct a programme at Diego Ramirez; m) the ACAP database has been updated in accordance with Chile's report provided to AC8; n) No activities of this type are currently being undertaken. Threats identified to date are minor. The Department of Fisheries is working with the Department of the Environment to protect Albatross Islet, which is found in Admiralty Sound.

Ecuador – Yes. Work on the conservation of the Waved Albatross is ongoing according to the Plan of Action.

New Zealand – Yes. In relation to at-sea conservation priorities identified at MOP4 (MOP4 Doc17 Annex 1, Appendix 2), New Zealand has updated the requirements for

the deployment of mandatory bycatch reduction measures in the pelagic trawl and pelagic longline fisheries. In trawl fisheries, vessels > 28 m in length have been required to deploy one of three devices intended to reduce seabird bycatch since 2006. These regulations were updated in 2010. Regulations relating to the deployment of seabird bycatch reduction measures in pelagic longline fisheries (including WCPFC and CCSBT fisheries) have been updated several times in recent years. The most recent update requires the implementation of WCPFC measures. In relation to land-based conservation priorities identified at MOP4 (MOP4 Doc17 Annex 1, Appendix 1), New Zealand has continued preparatory investigations to enable the eradication of pigs from Auckland Island, including the identification and registration of a suitable poison. Securing sufficient funding for an eradication programme remains a challenge and possible partners are being sought.

South Africa – Yes. South Africa has contributed its annual subscription to the agreement, supported the objectives of the agreement at relevant RFMOs, continued monitoring of its albatross and petrel population, adopted a national plan of action to reduce seabird by-catch and implemented best practice guidelines for by-catch mitigation in its fisheries.

Spain – Yes. The Regional Government of the Balearic Islands has carried out procedures to eradicate rodents (*Rattus rattus, Mus musculus* and *Oryctolagus cuniculus*) in Sa Dragonera Island. This uninhabited island has an estimated population of 400 breeding pairs of Balearic shearwater. A biosecurity protocol has also been established in order to keep these introduced mammals from re-infesting in the island. The Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Environment has adopted the Order AAA/658/2014 (April 22nd), which regulates surface longline fishery designed to catch highly migratory species. Article 19 states it is mandatory to adopt a set of actions in order to avoid the capture of seabirds and sea turtles as well as to keep a record of all incidental catches.

United Kingdom (UK) – Yes. In order to meet the obligations of ACAP in a co-ordinated and effective manner, the UK and its South Atlantic Overseas Territories (SAOTs) have funded an ACAP co-ordination project, including the establishment of a co-ordinator post, for the UK and its SAOTs since March 2008. The ACAP co-ordination project was developed to ensure coherence of action between the UK's Overseas Territories (OT), to assist with the planning and implementation of ACAP-related work (particularly in the territories with limited internal capacity), to take responsibility for reporting requirements, and to lead on critical seabird bycatch mitigation work, both within OT waters, and importantly, in international fisheries fora. The ACAP co-ordination project has been successful to date, and has contributed significantly towards a unified and effective approach to implementing ACAP in the South Atlantic, as well as leading to better co-operation with other key countries in pursuing cross-boundary conservation issues. ACAP action plans have been developed for each of the SAOTs (refer to item 1.2.3 below). These identify the range of requirements to be met under ACAP, prioritise these, and recommend how best to implement them. A co-ordinated strategy to reduce seabird bycatch in external fisheries has been developed and progressed.

1.1.2. Is action for national implementation planned to occur in the next three years?

Respondents reported a wide range of actions being proposed to implement the Agreement and its Action Plan over the next three years. Actions being proposed follow:

Argentina – Yes. The Pampa Azul initiative and the first stage of the Project for Strengthening the Management and Protection of Marine Biodiversity in Key Ecological Areas and the Application of Ecosystem Approach to Fishing (EEP) have recently been approved. The actions will be coordinated with both projects, in line with the coordination of Plan of Action within ACAP framework. Pampa Azul is a strategic initiative of the Argentinian Government, with research to be carried out in Argentinian waters. This initiative in based on work from the last 10 years and creates interdisciplinary scientific campaigns, using traditional platforms such as: oceanographic vessels and remotely operated underwater vehicles; the technological development of remote sensors and other methods of environmental monitoring; preparation and protection of resources using automatic in situ and satellite data records; and developments in the capacity to generate and maintain continuous and public database records. The EEP, which was executed by the Department of Environmental and Sustainable Development (SAyDS) aims to identify areas of ecological and biological importance in Argentinian waters to enable the adoption of management tools (such as protected areas for example) and the application of an eco-systemic approach to fishing in an area and/or pilot fishery yet to be determined (end of 2014). This project is planned to commence mid-2015. Areas of importance to albatrosses and petrels will be taken into account with the identification of key areas, as well current Plans of Action will be integrated with the eco-systemic approach. This is expected to take four years. In respect to protected areas, work on these will continue in the production of the "Management Plan of the Islas de los Estados" of the Argentine National Park – Parque Interjurisdiccional Marino Costero Patagonia Austral (PIMCPA) and work will soon begin in a recently created protected area in the Burdwood/Namuncura Bank.

Australia – Yes. A range of actions continues to be taken or is planned to implement the key provisions of the Action Plan. These include: implementing threat abatement plans, particularly for the incidental catch (or bycatch) of seabirds during oceanic longline fishing operations; implementing recovery actions for all albatross and giant-petrel species occurring in Australia; monitoring the status of breeding populations; reducing fisheries bycatch of ACAP-listed species through mandating use of mitigation measures and conducting further mitigation research and innovation.

Brazil – Yes. Actions to implement the Agreement and the decisions of MoP will be taken through Brazil's implementation of its revised NPOA Seabirds

Chile – Yes. Funds have been provided for Chile's Seabird Working Group for 2014-15. Efforts are being maintained to observe incidental bycatch in specific fisheries as noted in Chile's AC8 report, with other fisheries being gradually incorporated. Chile's NPOA seabirds will be adapted to include other fisheries (trawl and purse seine). Sanctions have been formalized for non-use of required mitigation measures in longline fisheries. In 2015, mitigation measures for longline and trawl fisheries will be adopted in accordance with SPRFMO requirements.

Ecuador – Yes.

New Zealand – Yes. New Zealand (NZ) has an ongoing conservation and research programme involving ACAP-listed albatrosses and petrels. Examples of actions to be implemented in the next three years are provided in a range of web-based documents on the implementation and review of the NPOA-Seabirds, assessment of the risk from commercial fisheries to NZ seabird populations, observer coverage at sea to improve the understanding of seabird bycatch, continuing population monitoring programmes on species of likely higher risk due to fisheries impacts, research into at-sea distributions of several ACAP species, continuing research on mitigation approaches in trawl and longline fisheries, and removing mice from Antipodes Island (refer to AC8 Inf 09 for web links).

Spain – Yes. In the years to come, Spain will have to implement the actions stated in Annex 1 of the Action Plan in order to decrease the number of seabird by-catch in fishing gears COM (2012) 665 final, which constitutes the new framework of order concerning these issues in the European Union. In the same respect, it is expected that the Conservation Strategy concerning the Balearic shearwater protection, will be reviewed and updated so that it complies with the international European Commission's Action Plan for the Balearic shearwater (2011).

UK – Yes. ACAP action plans have been developed and formally adopted for each OT to ensure that actions necessary to meet effectively the obligations of ACAP are identified and prioritised. The first audit and review of these plans began in 2011. Detailed information regarding planned activities for the next three years can be obtained from the actual plans, refer http://www.jncc.gov.uk/default.aspx?page=4374 . Work will be focussed in the following areas: - Management of threats at breeding sites - Monitoring the status and trends of populations - Analysis of foraging ranges of ACAP species, and spatial and temporal overlap with fisheries - Reducing seabird bycatch, both within the jurisdictional waters of the OTs, but also internationally, by working, with partners, towards improving the effectiveness of RFMOs (Regional Fisheries Management Organisations) - Further development and implementation of seabird bycatch mitigation - Improving education and awareness of seabird conservation issues - Robust data management - Sourcing funding for the implementation of albatross and petrel conservation projects. The UK ACAP co-ordination project was funded for an initial three year period, from March 2008 to March 2011. Additional funding was provided until September 2014. Recently secured funding will now extend the project to September 2016.

1.2. Species conservation

1.2.1. Has the Party provided any exemptions to prohibitions on the taking or harmful interference with albatrosses and petrels?

Only two exemptions were reported – one by an ACAP Party, France and the other by a participating non-Party, the USA. France reported that permission was given to capture 10 individuals over two years of the species Balearic shearwater to CNRS Chize under

the European program, Future of the Atlantic Marine Environment (FAME), coordinated in France by the LPO (the BirdLife partner in France).

The USA reported that its Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) issued three scientific collecting permits and three other permits to airport facilities for the purpose of human safety. The scientific permits allowed the collection of eggs, with one also authorizing the take of two adults. The permits to airport facilities allowed the collection of eggs to discourage birds from being near the airstrips. There has been no need to take adults.

1.2.2. Has any use or trade in albatrosses or petrels occurred?

New Zealand - Yes. Seabirds landed dead on commercial fishing vessels carrying Government fisheries observers are retained for necropsy. The carcasses of these birds are subsequently made available (free of charge) to museums and to New Zealand'd indigenous Maori people (iwi) for traditional uses. From 1 August 2010 to 31 March 2013, 279 bycaught seabirds were given to iwi and 26 were provided to museums.

1.2.3. Has the Party implemented any new single or multi-species conservation strategies / Action Plans?

Argentina – The Federal Environment Council (COFEMA) has implemented the National Program for the Conservation of Southern Giant Petrels (Resolution 259/2013). This Program contains institutional information, species characteristics, population status and trends, distributions and a list of actions to be achieved by various relevant institutions. The Program addresses the protection of breeding grounds and is complementary to the Plan of Action for Reducing Interaction of Seabirds with Fisheries (PAN AVES) implemented in 2010. The planning team for the Inter-jurisdictional Marine Park for the Austral Patagonian Coast (PIMCPA) designed and proposed the previously mentioned preliminary zoning which still must to be approved by the Management Commission. Each zone includes /protected zones and operational zones. The islands Isla Gran Robredo and Isla Arce, where the Southern Giant Petrel nests, are zoned as protected. Activities are to be limited to those connected to monitoring, scientific study and to management measures which are essential to the conservation of resources and the maintenance of the natural processes in ecosystems, or to the conditions that shape a cultural unit and its surroundings. Scientific study will be restricted to low-level impact projects except for duly warranted cases. In these, and in other islands, the Protected Zones in adjacent waters have been expanded to include as much as one thousand nautical miles of coastline. During 2012 a follow-up workshop to PAN AVES was held, in which the progress of the actions specified in the plan were analysed. Priorities were established, which were shaped by the Technical Advisory Group – consisting of one coordinator for each objective of the Plan, one representative of the Department of Environmental and Sustainable Development (SAyDS) and one representative of the Department of Fishing and Aquaculture.

Australia – Yes. Australia adopted a revised second national recovery plan for albatrosses and giant petrels in 2011. The plan covers 19 species of albatross and two giant petrel species and applies to the period 2011-2016. It sets out the key conservation actions necessary to monitor the status of Australia's breeding populations, to reduce at-

sea and on-land threats within Australia's jurisdiction, to educate fishers and others and to encourage increased international conservation efforts.

Brazil – Yes. The National Plan of Action to Reduce the Incidental Capture of Seabirds was revised in 2012 (refer also to 1.1.1 above). Recently a detailed analysis was conducted by the Instituto Chico Mendes de Conservação da Biodiversidade (ICMBio) of the actions taken and the results achieved under the NPOA Seabirds.

Ecuador – Yes. The Plan of Action for the conservation of the Waved Albatross was implemented.

New Zealand – Yes. A new National Plan of Action – Seabirds (http://www.mpi.govt.nz/Default.aspx?TabId=126&id=1760) was produced in 2013. This applies to all ACAP-listed species occurring in New Zealand, and includes a series of objectives relating to seabird conservation and management. There is a five-year timeframe for the implementation of this Plan.

South Africa – Yes. Adopted a policy on the management of seals, seabirds and shorebirds in 2007 and a national plan action for the reduction of by-catch in fisheries in 2008.

Spain – Yes. The Strategy for the conservation of the Balearic shearwater in Spain, approved in 2005, is still in force.

United Kingdom – Yes. The following action plans have been developed.
TRISTAN DA CUNHA: A revised Biodiversity Action Plan for Tristan da Cunha has been completed. The Gough and Inaccessible Island World Heritage Site Management Plan has been revised and adopted. The annexes, including management policies and prescription guidelines are yet to be adopted or published online. A draft management plan for Nightingale Island is in production. A marine incident plan for Tristan is currently being developed particularly to deal with oiled wildlife, building on the experience after the MS Oliva wreck in 2011.
SOUTH GEORGIA (ISLAS GEORGIAS DEL SUR)[1]: The ACAP implementation plan is currently under revision.
FALKLAND ISLANDS (ISLAS MALVINAS)[1]: The ACAP implementation plan was updated and adopted by Falkland Islands Government (FIG)[1] in September 2013. This is an update of the implementation plan published in 2010. A Species Action Plan for Southern Rockhopper Penguins has been produced and adopted by FIG in 2014. The plan includes actions of relevance for Black-browed Albatross, including with regard to fire risk in mixed species colonies which include Black-browed Albatross; avian pox and unknown disease outbreaks in mixed colonies; and annual and five-year census work covering multiple species including ACAP species. Falklands Conservation[1] have begun work on a Darwin-funded Biodiversity Action Planning project. This aims to provide a

[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".*

more effective means of managing biodiversity actions and a system of prioritisation that helps decision makers to allocate funding to the most essential and cost effective actions in the Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1]. It is also hoped that this project will provide an electronic hosting system and an Action Plan template, so that actions are more easily accessible, clearly defined and performance measures are achievable. A workshop will be held in June 2014. This project should have a positive impact upon ACAP implementation plans, as it will be possible to streamline actions, resulting in a better understanding of what actions have been achieved against targets.

PARTICIPATING NON-PARTY

USA – Yes. A five-year status review has been initiated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for the Short-tailed Albatross to ensure that the species has the appropriate level of protection under the Endangered Species Act. The review will include an assessment to determine if its population status has changed since the time of the species' listing, or since its last status review to determine if it should be classified differently. The best available scientific evidence and commercial data regarding the species will be gathered as well as new information and assessments of ongoing conservation efforts.

1.2.4. Has the Party taken any emergency measures involving albatrosses or petrels?

Brazil – Yes. The Ministry of Fisheries and Aquaculture and the Ministry of Environment signed and published a law to enforce the use of mitigation measures to reduce seabird bycatch in longline fisheries (refer also to 1.2.6 below).

United Kingdom – Yes. TRISTAN DA CUNHA During a 2011 incident, when the bulk carrier (65,000 mt soya) MS Oliva hit Nightingale Island, there was a large international oil-spill recovery effort to mitigate the risks to bird and marine life. It is thought that only one albatross was found oiled.

1.2.5. Has the Party conducted any re-establishment schemes?

New Zealand – Yes. The first translocation https://www.facebook.com/chathamtaikotrust of the Chatham albatross occurred in early 2014. This ACAP-listed species is classified as Vulnerable by the IUCN. The Chatham albatross is currently restricted to a single breeding site (The Pyramid) in the Chatham Islands. Chicks were transferred to a new site on main Chatham Island and hand-fed until they had all fledged on May 9 2014. Additional transfers of chicks are planned for 2015 and 2016.

PARTICIPATING NON-PARTY

USA – Yes. A site on James Campbell National Wildlife Refuge (NWR) is being prepared for establishment for an albatross breeding colony. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has begun to implement an action identified in the Comprehensive Conservation Plan for James Campbell NWR on Oahu to establish an albatross breeding site. The coastal habitat has been restored to native vegetation and a predator-proof fence is proposed to protect the nesting albatrosses. One source of founders of this new colony would be Laysan albatross eggs from the egg swap program at Pacific Missile Range

Facility (PMRF) on Kauai where eggs are removed from albatrosses nesting near the airport in order to reduce bird air strike hazard. The chicks from these eggs would be hand reared at James Campbell NWR and allowed to fledge from the colony site.

1.2.6. Has the Party introduced any new legal or policy instruments for species protection of albatrosses and petrels?

Argentina – Yes. Resolution COFEMA 259/2013. Approval of the National Program for the Conservation of the Southern Giant Petrel (indicated in section 2.3) Act 26875. Creation of the protected area in Burdwood Bank (indicated in section 3.3) Protection of the marine environment, maritime dispositions and orders under Argentinian Naval Prefecture (indicated in section 1.4.2)

Australia – Yes. Refer to information provided at 1.2.3 concerning the national recovery plan.

Brazil – Yes. On 15 April 2011 a new law was published (refer to 1.2.4 above) to enforce the use of light torilines and the use of 60g of weight no more than two metres from the hook for all pelagic longline vessels fishing south of 20^{o}S. The law also requires vessels to carry replacement torilines and to provide accommodation for observers, when requested by fishing authorities.

Chile – Yes. In December 2013, an article (No 1(c)), was included in the General Fisheries and Aquaculture Act between the lines of the Political Fisheries and the adoption of conservation measures, the use of a precautionary approach to minimize the bycatch of birds, mammals and reptiles in fisheries in Chile.

New Zealand – Yes. Refer to information provided at 1.2.3 concerning a new National Plan of Action. This will be implemented through to 2018.

Peru – Yes. Recently a classification and categorization list of legally protected threatened wildlife species has been approved (Supreme Decree No. 004-2014-MINAGRI). This regulation includes 13 species of albatrosses and petrels listed in the First Annex of the Agreement, maintaining the prohibition of the hunting, capture, possession, sale, the transport or exportation for commercial intent of all specimens, products and/or sub-products.

South Africa – Yes. Declaration of the Prince Edward Islands Marine Protected Area in 2013.

United Kingdom – Yes.
SOUTH GEORGIA (ISLAS GEORGIAS DEL SUR)[1]: The Wildlife and Protected Areas Ordinance came into force in 2011 and provides comprehensive protection to all wildlife in the Territory. Section 6 of the Ordinance gives specific protection to wild birds and mammals and makes it an offence to interfere in any way with a wild bird (including capturing, killing, handling, damaging breeding sites, taking eggs, or disturbance of breeding or moulting birds).
FALKLAND ISLANDS (ISLAS MALVINAS)[1]: The National Plan of Action for reducing incidental catch of seabirds in trawl fisheries in the Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1]

(NPOA-S Trawl) was due for revision in 2013. This work will now be conducted in 2014. The National Plan of Action for reducing incidental catch of seabirds in longline fisheries of the Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1] (NPOA-S Longline) was originally published in 2004, and has now been revised. The revision was adopted by Falkland Islands Government[1] and was published in December 2011.

PARTICIPATING NON-PARTY

USA – Yes. National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on July 17, 2012 to promote the conservation of migratory birds. This NMFS–FWS MOU encompasses all relevant seabird-related NMFS activities and identifies specific areas of collaboration and cooperation with FWS, including seabird bycatch reduction, habitat conservation, information sharing and coordination, and international policy. The MOU also aims to strengthen conservation of migratory birds and their habitat and reduce adverse impacts on migratory birds through enhanced collaboration between NMFS and the FWS. NMFS published final fishing regulations for the Marianas Trench, Pacific Remote Islands, and Rose Atoll Marine National Monuments, which were established by President George W. Bush just before he left office in January 2009. Consistent with President Bush's proclamations, the regulations prohibit commercial fishing within the monuments, but allow recreational and non-commercial fishing under certain guidelines. The rule took effect on July 3, 2013.

1.2.7. Has the Party implemented any legal or policy instruments for environmental impact assessments?

Argentina – Yes. Regulations reported in 2011 remain in force.

Australia – No new legal or policy instruments. An environmental impact statement was prepared prior to the commencement of the Macquarie Island Pest Eradication Project (MIPEP), aimed at eradicating rabbits, rats and mice. The project was reviewed in 2012 to address the unexpectedly high mortalities of non-target species – including ACAP-listed species. Eradication of the feral species at this location was completed in early 2014.

Brazil – Yes. The National Program of Observers on Board (PROBORDO) was established in 2006, which requires the collection of data on the incidental capture of seabirds. This data is available to assist future studies on the level of seabird bycatch, as well as for use in environmental impact assessments. Observer coverage under PROBORDO is currently suspended due to legal and operational matters, but lifting of its suspension is expected shortly.

Chile – Yes. On 26 January, 2010 Law 20,417 was passed for environmental institutions creating the following super structure on matters of conservation, biodiversity and protected areas: a) The Ministry of Environment (MM.AA) b) Assessment Service Environmental (SEA) c) Superintendent of the Environment d) Environmental Tribunals e) Biodiversity and Protected Areas Service, and f) Council Ministers for Sustainability.

Ecuador – Yes. The Environmental Management Act and the Unified Text of the Environmental Legislation are the legal instruments that implement the evaluations of environmental impact.

New Zealand – Yes. The Exclusive Economic Zone and Continental Shelf (Environmental Effects) Act 2012 http://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2012/0072/latest/DLM4670826.html was introduced to "promote the sustainable management of the natural resources of the exclusive economic zone and the continental shelf". This Act includes a detailed consenting regime that is intended to manage the environmental impacts of activities undertaken in New Zealand's offshore waters. Assessing environmental impacts includes evaluating the impacts of proposed activities on seabirds where birds may interact or overlap in space and time with the proposed activity.

South Africa – Yes. An environmental impact assessment (EIA) was implemented prior to the construction of a new base at Marion Island.

Spain – Yes. Recently, the Law 21/2013 for environmental assessment, dated December 9th, has been passed. This Law transposes the Directive 2011/92/EU on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment into our legal system.

PARTICIPATING NON-PARTY

USA – Yes. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is drafting new guidelines for offshore energy developers to reduce or eliminate the effect of new developments on birds. These new guidelines follow a collaborative stressor management approach through which parties can identify each stressor associated with a project, and its potential effects on birds.

1.2.8. Does the Party have any species it would like to submit for addition to Annex 1?

Ecuador – Yes. The Galapagos Petrel, (*Pterodroma phaeopygia*).

Chile – Yes. Chile is working with the support of other partners and institutions, on the inclusion of the Pink-footed Shearwater (*Puffinus creatopus*) in Annex 1 of the ACAP.

PARTICIPATING NON-PARTY

USA – No. The United States is not submitting any species for addition to Annex 1. However, in light of the continuing re-affirmation of predictions for significant and irrevocable sea level rise due to anthropogenic climate change the United States suggests revisiting the scoring scheme for the inclusion of new species in Annex I (Cooper J. and B. Baker, 2007. AC3 Doc 18) to allow the identification of species that breed in 2 or more countries and stand to lose the entirety of their known breeding area in worst case projections of sea level rise in the next 200 years. Two species that were identified in the original analysis because of high scores due to their conservation status are Phoenix Petrel (*Pterodroma alba*) and Polynesian Storm Petrel (*Nesofregetta fuliginosa*). These species would score even higher if this sea level criterion were

applied. Another species that had a lower ranking due to growing population size and current protection, the Bonin Petrel (*Pterodroma hypoleuca*) should also be evaluated in this light because of opportunities for international partnerships to restore higher elevation colonies in Japan.

1.2.9. Are there any other conservation projects for ACAP species not already mentioned?

Argentina - Yes. Refer to information provided in 1.2.3.

Australia – Yes. Refer to information provided at 1.2.7.

Brazil – Yes. Projeto Albatroz, working in collaboration with BirdLife's Albatross Task Force, undertakes research addressing the interaction of seabirds with fisheries, including the quantification of seabird mortalities arising from fishing activities. It also develops educational and awareness programmes for fishers and the public, and supports Government implementation of ACAP and Brazil's NPOA-Seabirds and related policies.

New Zealand – Yes. Estimates of the captures of seabird species in commercial fisheries are conducted annually (and made publicly available (https://data.dragonfly.co.nz/psc/). Estimates of cryptic mortality were used in the risk assessment (https://fs.fish.govt.nz/Doc/23121/AEBR_109_2596_PRO2010-02, %20Obj.%201,%20MS4,%20RR2,1.pdf.ashx) exploring the likelihood of commercial fishing affecting seabirds at the population level. Work investigating the population status of ACAP-listed species and bycatch reduction methods relevant to these species is ongoing. Population studies include Salvin's Albatross, White-capped Albatross, Gibson's Albatross and Black Petrel. Mitigation work includes refining the design of bird bafflers used on trawl vessels > 28 m in length, continuing development of the Kellian line-setter, testing novel line-weighting approaches in surface longline fisheries, and characterising the risk poorly-known sectors of the commercial fishing fleet represent to seabirds. Population modelling studies are to be conducted to update fully quantitative population models to assess population trend and key demographic rates for several ACAP-listed species given that new demographic data are now available. Population modelling is underway for southern Buller's Albatross and Black Petrel. A global seabird risk assessment is planned as the existing level-2 risk assessment only addresses risk arising from commercial fisheries within the New Zealand Exclusive Zone (EEZ).

PARTICIPATING NON-PARTY

USA – Yes. A research and management program at Johnston Atoll (former North Pacific albatross breeding site) to eradicate the Yellow Crazy Ant (*Anoplolepis gracilipes*) has implications for all seabird colonies in tropical and subtropical areas because of the extremely detrimental effect this ant species has on all island species but especially ground-nesting seabirds. A project to eradicate two species of introduced rodents at Wake Atoll (breeding site for Laysan and Black-footed Albatross) was implemented in 2012 by the U.S. Air Force with assistance from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Island Conservation. The effort has proven to be partially successful with the apparent eradication of one of the two *Rattus* species present – (*Rattus tanezumi*). The other

species present (*R. exulans*) survived the eradication attempt. Research about possible causes for the failure to kill all the Polynesian rats is ongoing and another attempt to eliminate all rodents from Wake may happen at a future date

1.3. Habitat conservation

1.3.1. Has the Party introduced any legal or policy instruments or actions to implement protection and management of breeding sites, including habitat restoration?

Argentina – Yes. The National Program for the Conservation of the Southern Giant Petrel referred to in section 1.2.3 addresses the protection of breeding sites of this species. The preliminarily zoning of PIMCPA supplied in section 1.2.3 has progressed. The Province of Tierra del Fuego, Antarctica and Islands of the South Atlantic began work on designing the "Reserve Management Plan for the Province of the Isla de los Estados". In the first phase an internal workshop was created with the aim to introduce the situation and to create a working group shaped by different areas of Department of Environmental and Sustainable Development (SAyDS) of the above-mentioned province relevant to the topic.

Australia – Yes. Refer to comments at 1.2.7. The State Government of Tasmania has also prescribed landings at Albatross Island – a major breeding site for the endemic shy albatross.

Ecuador – Yes. The Action Plan of the Machalilla Park is currently being revised.

New Zealand – Yes. A mouse eradication project will commence on Antipodes Island in 2015. The creation of a Conservation Park has been proposed for parts of Great Barrier Island by the New Zealand Government. Government consultation on the formal proposal for this Park closed in early 2014. The outcome of consultation is unknown as yet. Great Barrier Island is the main breeding site of the Black Petrel.

South Africa - In 2004 enacted the National Environmental Management: Protected Areas Act which regulates access to special nature reserves. (The Prince Edward Islands were proclaimed a special nature reserve in 1995).

UK – Yes. A number of actions that have been taken including:
The Darwin project 'Developing knowledge to eradicate house mice from UK OT islands' (DKEHMUO) related to the impacts of House Mice on Gough (Tristan da Cunha), Steeple Jason (Falkland Islands/Islas Malvinas)[1] and South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1] is complete, with a draft final project report produced in March 2014. This project did not however investigate the impact upon any ACAP species on Steeple Jason.
TRISTAN DA CUNHA: An Operational Plan for Gough Island for the eradication of House Mice has been revised and updated as part of the 'DKEHMUO' project. An OTEP project on invasive plant control at the ACAP breeding sites of Gough, Inaccessible and Nightingale is nearing completion. This project has included practical control work at all sites, as well as a review of the current *Sagina procumbens* control programme on Gough, and ongoing control of introduced New Zealand flax on Nightingale and Inaccessible.

SOUTH GEORGIA (ISLAS GEORGIAS DEL SUR)[1]: Biosecurity policy covering all elements of operations in South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1] including tourism and logistics is reviewed and updated annually. The Wildlife and Protected Areas Ordinance has been enacted (see 1.2.6). The SGSSI (IGSISS)[1] reindeer eradication project has completed its main phase of operations. The 2,000-strong herd of reindeer in the Busen area has been completely eradicated using a combination of herding and ground shooting. In the Barff Peninsula area, ground shooters were used to eradicate more than 4,500 animals. Only a few reindeer now remain in this area and they will be eradicated in the coming months (2014/15). The South Georgia Heritage Trust (SGHT)[1] Rodent Eradication Project is also drawing to a conclusion with bait now dropped on two thirds of the infested area of the island. The Trial Phase took place in March – April 2011. All indications are that the trial was successful, proving that the methodology of using helicopters to spread bait across areas with invasive rodents was an effective eradication strategy on South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]. Phase 2 (February – June 2013) covered the affected areas west of Cumberland Bay out to the western tip of the Island. More than 55,000ha of land were treated in the largest operation of its kind ever undertaken. A yacht-based monitoring trip investigating the success of the previous year's fieldwork was undertaken in March - April 2014, finding no evidence of surviving rats or mice in the Phase 2 areas. SGHT[1] plan to return in February - May 2015 with a field team and three helicopters to complete the baiting of the remaining portion of the island, from the Barff Peninsula to Drygalski Fjord. Successful completion of this Final Phase would mean that South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1] would be free of rats and mice for the first time in well over 100 years, with major benefits for the native petrel populations such as White-chinned Petrels. GSGSSI[1] have a monitoring programme in place to track the resulting seabird recovery. As part of the 'DKEHMUO' project mouse bait acceptance trials were undertaken and the results are now published in scientific reports; and knowledge on the ecology of mice and of breeding seabirds present on South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1] has been increased.
FALKLAND ISLANDS (ISLAS MALVINAS)[1]: As part of the Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1] Rat Eradication Project baiting exercises have been conducted on several small islands. Two feasibility study documents have been produced in the last year, for the key ACAP sites of Steeple

1.3.2. Has the Party implemented any sustainable management measures for marine living resources which provide food for albatrosses and petrels?

Argentina – Yes. The Federal Fishery Council (CFP) is a fishing authority established by the Federal Fishing Act 24.922. It is responsible for the promotion of the marine fishing by procuring the maximum level of development compatible with the rational use of marine living resources. It also promotes the effective protection of national interests relating to fishing and publicising the sustainability of fishery activity, encouraging the long-term conservation of resources, and favouring the development of appropriate environmental industrial processes that promote the securing of maximum value added and the best Argentinian workforce employment, such as indicated in the first Article. Therefore, The CFP issues Resolutions, which set out measures for the sustainable management of fisheries in concordance with the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries. For some species a system of administration through individual transferable quotas (Argentine Hake – *Merluccius hubbsi*, Patagonian Grenadier – *Macruronus*

magellanicus, the Patagonian Toothfish – *Dissostichus eleginoides*, Southern Blue Whiting – *Micromesistius australis*) As for squid fisheries (*Illex argentinus*), mixed costal fisheries (fish group from the Bonaerense coast), prawn fisheries (*Pleoticus muelleri*) and others, exist basic resolutions that establish the principal management measures (fishing areas, fishing prohibited zones, power limitations, compulsory usage of selective gears etc.)

Australia – Yes. Australia's fisheries are managed according to ecosystem-based management principles which seek to ensure that maximum sustainable yields for target species are not exceeded and that there is adequate escapement of target species to maintain ecosystem relationships, including with dependent and associated species, such as seabirds.

New Zealand – Yes. Refer to information provided at 1.2.7.

Spain – Yes. The management measures for the marine living resources that have been implemented by Spain are determined by the European Union's Common Fisheries Policy, that are considered necessary to reduce the effects of fishing activities in the marine ecosystems (including seabirds), gradually enforcing an ecosystem-based approach to fisheries management.

UK – Yes. The following actions have been taken:
TRISTAN DA CUNHA: The Tristan da Cunha Fishery Limits Ordinance, 1983 (as amended in 1991, 1992, 1997 and 2001) defines the fishery limits of Tristan da Cunha as 200 nautical miles around each of the islands, and makes provision for the regulation of fishing activities within these limits. Since 2009 there has been no licenses granted for vessels (longline) to fish for Bluenose. The number of licences for tuna longline vessels is not limited, as these vessels only stay in the area for a short period whilst they are following the tuna through Tristan's EEZ. The longline vessels may not fish within 50 nautical miles of Tristan da Cunha, Nightingale, Inaccessible or Gough islands.
SOUTH GEORGIA (ISLAS GEORGIAS DEL SUR)[1]: Fisheries in South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1] waters adopt CCAMLR measures as a minimum standard. The South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1] fishery for Patagonian Toothfish was certified by the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) as a well-managed and sustainable fishery in 2004, as was the Mackerel Icefish fishery in 2010. Since 2008 GSGSSI (GIGSISS)[1] have employed, through the British Antarctic Survey (BAS), a higher predator scientist based at King Edward Point (KEP). This post monitors the foraging ecology of higher predators, especially in the eastern component of Subarea 48.3 thus complementing the work conducted by BAS in the western area. This work will contribute to the informed management of fisheries in the area. The South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands [Islas Georgias del Sur e Islas Sandwich del Sur] Marine Protected Area[1] provides seasonal and spatial protection for prey species as set out in 1.3.3.
FALKLAND ISLANDS (ISLAS MALVINAS)[1]: The conservation of sustainable fishery resources through effective management is a primary objective for FIG[1]. Fishing activities in and around the Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1] are thus strictly regulated and managed. Whilst the needs of ACAP listed species are not specifically taken into account, the Fisheries (Conservation and Management) Ordinance 2005 has as a key objective that exploitation of fisheries resources and related activities are conducted in a manner consistent with the need to have regard for the impact of fishing activities on

non-target species and the long term sustainability of the marine environment. Falkland Islands Conservation Zones are rich fishing grounds particularly for two squid species, *Illex argentinus* and *Loligo gahi*, and a number of finfish species. Daily reporting allows for real time assessment of the two squid species using depletion models, and pre-recruit surveys are conducted prior to each *Loligo* season. If conservation targets are not met for *Illex* and *Loligo* then an early closure of the fisheries results. Finfish species are monitored on a daily basis, assessed annually and recommended catch limits are set in order to maintain stocks. In 2007 the Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1] fishery for Patagonian Toothfish entered pre-assessment for MSC certification. Following a hiatus in the process the fishery entered full assessment in August 2012. On 2nd April 2014 it received MSC certification as a sustainable fishery.

PARTICIPATING NON-PARTY

USA – Yes. The Bering Strait/Aleutian Island Fishery Management Plan (FMP) and the Gulf of Alaska FMP continues to include management objectives to protect the integrity of the food web through limits on harvest of forage species, as reported for the MoP4 report.

1.3.3. Has the Party implemented any management or protection of important marine areas for albatrosses and petrels?

Argentina – Yes. Many areas throughout Argentina prohibit fishing in line with a framework of fishery management measures established for different species. Some of these bans areas can be modified throughout the year. For example, the protected area Burdwood Bank has been created through Act 26875. This is an underwater plateau that ranges between 50 and 200 metres in depth, and is surrounded by a drop-off of more than 3,000 metres in depth. The aims in creating this zone are to conserve an area of high environmental sensitivity of importance for the protection and sustainable management of the sea floor, facilitating scientific research based on the application of eco-systemic approaches to fishing and the mitigation of the effects of global warming. The area constitutes a feeding zone for top food chain-end predators such as the Black-browed Albatross, Grey-headed Albatross, Wandering Albatross and the Northern and Southern Giant Petrels. The zoning includes a central, buffer and transition zones. Additionally the above mentioned Act creates an Administrative Council consisting of separate government bodies for management.

Through Resolution SDSyA 1076/2011 in the Province of Tierra del Fuego, a plan of management for the Atlantic Coast Reserve was approved. This Reserve is considered to be the home to the Southern Giant Petrel species (*Macronectes giganteus*), given that the adult birds roam the coastal waters of the Reserve in search of food during the breeding and non-breeding seasons. Preliminary zoning of the PIMCPA has progressed as reported in section 2.3.

Australia – The Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Amendment (Heard Island and McDonald Islands) Proclamation 2014 amended the boundary of the Heard Island and McDonald Islands Marine Reserve, covering an approximate area of

65 000 km^2, to add an additional area of about 6200 km^2 to the Reserve on the basis of its high conservation value.

Brazil – Yes. The Reserva Biológica Marinha do Arvoredo - REBIO Arvoredo located in Southern Brazil (Santa Catarina State) is a marine protected area where all fishing is prohibited. A marine birds monitoring program has been implemented to assess the abundance of albatrosses and petrels within REBIO boundaries. Other marine protected areas are under consideration, as well as additional conservation measures within existing marine protected areas.

Ecuador – Yes. The protection of the Wave Albatross is currently being strengthened in the Galapagos National Park as well as in the Machalilla National Park, where ongoing monitoring programmes covering nesting sites are being implemented.

New Zealand – Yes. New marine reserves have been created around the Antipodes, Bounty and Campbell islands. These islands are all important breeding areas for ACAP-listed species.

South Africa – Yes. Declaration of the Prince Edward Islands Marine Protected Area in 2013

UK – Yes. SOUTH GEORGIA (ISLAS GEORGIAS DEL SUR)[1]: In February 2012 GSGSSI[1] announced the creation of a large, sustainably managed Marine Protected Area (MPA) that encompasses the SGSSI [IGSISS] Maritime Zone[1] north of 60 degrees. This initial designation enshrined in law much of the existing protection and created a 1.07 million km2 MPA. Extensive no-take zones (IUCN Category) were created around South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1], Clerke Rocks, Shag and Black Rocks and the South Sandwich Islands (Islas Sandwich del Sur)[1], totaling 20,431 km2, to avoid competition between fisheries and land-based foragers. Following the initial designation a scientific workshop was convened to determine if further protection was necessary and a range of additional temporal and spatial protections were implemented to further safeguard marine and land-based predators. Additional protection included a seasonal closure of the krill fishery and a 12 nm pelagic closed area around the South Sandwich Islands (Islas Sandwich del Sur)[1]. A revised MPA Order came into force on June 13th 2013.

Spain – Yes. Spain is currently processing a ministerial decree with the purpose of designating 39 Zones of Special Protection Area for Seabirds (ZEPA in Spanish) in Spain's jurisdictional waters, including 22 important bird areas for the conservation of the Balearic shearwater (marine extensions to existing seabird breeding colonies, areas of concentration in the sea and key areas of migration).

PARTICIPATING NON-PARTY

USA – Yes. A multi-agency planning process has begun to develop a Monument Management Plan (MMP) for the Marianas Trench Marine National Monument. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration are working together in the development of the MMP in cooperation with the Secretary of Defense, the U.S. Coast Guard, and the Government of the Commonwealth of the

Northern Marianas Islands (http://www.fws.gov/marianastrenchmarinemonument/planning.html). The northernmost boundary of the Monument is ~500 kilometers from a newly discovered breeding site of the Short-tailed Albatross in the Ogasawara Islands of Japan.

1.4. Management of human activities

1.4.1. Has the Party completed any new environmental impact assessments related to albatrosses and petrels?

Argentina – An evaluation of ecological risks from demersal longline and trawling fisheries that operate along the sea-shelf and seabed are being developed by the Marine and Costal Research Institute (CONICET) and the National University of Mar del Plata. Preliminary results from this exercise identify high risks posed from specific fleets to specific species and in which areas these risks exist. The Black-browed Albatross and the White-chinned Petrel have been shown to be main and major sea birds species affected by fishing operations.

Australia – Yes. Refer to 1.2.7.

New Zealand – Yes. Refer to 1.2.3. The prioritisation of activities in the new NPOA-Seabirds is supported by an assessment of the risk New Zealand commercial fisheries represent to seabird populations

South Africa – Yes. An EIA was implemented prior to the construction of the new base at Marion Island

United Kingdom – Yes. SOUTH GEORGIA (ISLAS GEORGIAS DEL SUR)[1]: The Environmental Impact Assessment for Phase II and III of the SGHT[1] Rodent Eradication Project has been overseen by GSGSSI (GIGSISS)[1]. GSGSSI (GIGSISS)[1] conducted its own Environmental Impact Assessment for the eradication of reindeer that was reviewed by an independent panel of experts.

PARTICIPATING NON-PARTY

USA – Yes. The United States Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) has produced a report entitled “Aerial Seabird and Marine Mammal Surveys off Northern California, Oregon, and Washington, 2011-2012.” This report summarizes new and previously collected data on seabird occurrence using boat-based and aerial surveys in order to assess and avoid impacts of future offshore energy development of the West Coast of the United States. BOEM is working with the U.S. Geological Survey – Western Ecological Research Center (USGS-WERC) to document habitat affinities and at-sea ranging behaviors for several petrel species nesting in the Main Hawaiian Islands to assess risks from offshore renewable energy projects to seabirds.

1.4.2. Has the Party implemented any new measures to minimise discharge of pollutants and marine debris (MARPOL)?

Argentina – Yes. The Resolutions of the Marine Environment Protection Committee (MEPC) of the International Maritime Organisation (IMO) have been adopted, integrated into national judicial technical framework under Disposition 2/2012 as part of the Board of Environmental Protection of Argentinian Naval Prefecture. The Maritime Bylaw 1/2014 has been approved through the passing of Regulations for the Discharge of Debris and Other Materials in National Waters. This bylaw allowed the creation of the Maritime Bylaw N 6-80 in accordance with the directives approved by advisory meetings of the Contracting Parties of the London agreement, in amended version, which provides regulations for the evaluation of debris and other materials for discharge in waters to be considered.

The Maritime Bylaw 4/2014 has been approved. In this document directives were also approved for the preparation of emergency planes for:

- Companies responsible for systems for the large scale handling of harmful and potentially dangerous substances.
- Companies responsible for ports which deal with the transportation of dangerous goods and harmful substances
- Procedures on board vessel in instances of contamination by large-scale transportation of harmful or potentially dangerous substances.

Brazil – Yes. A signatory to MARPOL Convention.

Chile – Yes. Chile is a party to Marpol and in this context makes strong efforts to implement the measures made in the agreement. Recently, Marpol made two amendments to its Annexes V and VI, which Chile is implementing. Regarding Annex VI, which is related to atmospheric pollution, an amendment has been made which requires that all vessels must have energy efficiency plans. Since 2013, domestic ships (including fishing) must have such a plan. Regarding Annex V, pollution by garbage from ships, the amendment states that no waste can be disposed of at sea and access to be provided to appropriate discharge receptacles in ports. The installation of these receptacles in Chilean ports is in the process of implementation. The Chilean Navy ensures compliance with MARPOL measures, and works through a certification process to corroborate that vessels implement and adopt designs complying with MARPOL standards. Additionally, the Navy performs random audits of targeted vessels for evidence of noncompliance, and to verify that ships have Marpol certification and comply with its requirements. The penalties for non-compliance are contained in the Navigation Law.

New Zealand – Yes. The discharge of many forms of garbage into the water became illegal http://www.maritimenz.govt.nz/Publications-and-forms/Safe-Clean-Seas/Issue-42-11.asp in January 2013, with the incorporation of Annex V of MARPOL into New Zealand law. The prohibition on garbage discharge includes, but is not limited to, ropes, fishing gear, dunnage, plastics, oils, paper, metal, and glass.

South Africa – Yes. Discharge by South African vessels is regulated by MARPOL.

UK – Yes. SOUTH GEORGIA (ISLAS GEORGIAS DEL SUR)[1]: Following on from a consultation process GSGSSI[1] are in the process of finalising a policy on the use of heavy fuel oils within its territorial waters.

1.4.3. Has the Party introduced any new measures to minimise the disturbance to albatrosses and petrels in marine and terrestrial habitats?

Argentina - Yes. Refer to Measures detailed above in 3.1, 3.3 and 4.2.

Australia – Yes. Refer to 1.3.1 re the prescription of landings at Albatross Island, Tasmania.

Brazil – Yes. In addition to protections offered under Brazil's NPOA Seabirds, there are other laws, such as the Official List of Brazilian Fauna Species in Risk of Extinction, which includes six albatross and two petrel species listed under Annex 1 of ACAP. There is also the Environmental Crimes Law (Lei de Crimes Ambientais) Act no. 9.605 / 1998, which establishes sanctions against illegal environmental activities against endangered species such albatrosses and petrels.

New Zealand – Yes. Refer to information provided at 1.3.2.

South Africa – Yes. The Prince Edward Islands have been zoned and permits are required to enter different zones. Helicopter flights are restricted to specific paths.

UK – Yes. SOUTH GEORGIA (ISLAS GEORGIAS DEL SUR)[1]: Site visitor management plans are updated and reviewed as necessary. GSGSSI (GIGSISS)[1] briefs International Association of Antarctic Tour Operators (IAATO) members each year at their annual conference to ensure that expedition leaders have the most up to date information about visitor management and disturbance to nesting birds is minimised.
FALKLAND ISLANDS (ISLAS MALVINAS)[1]: There is concern over disturbance to the breeding Southern Giant Petrel population on Sea Lion Island, both from humans (tourists) and Elephant Seals. The Sea Lion Island Management Group plan to carry out practical management work before the start of the next breeding season (September 2014) in order to prevent the complete loss of the breeding colony.

1.5. Research programmes

1.5.1. Does the Party have any ongoing research programmes relating to the conservation of albatrosses and petrels not already reported on?

Eight Parties and one participating non-Party reported on a large range of ongoing research programmes not reported elsewhere in this report. Details can be found in the respective implementation reports, tabled as AC8 Information Papers.

1.5.2. Does the Party have any additional national institutions (authorities or research centres), or NGOs involved in albatross and petrel conservation?

Ten Parties and one participating non-Party provided information on the national institutions and NGOs involved in albatross and petrel conservation. Details of those organisations can be found in the respective implementation reports, tabled as AC8 Information Papers.

1.6. Education and public awareness

1.6.1. Has the Party conducted training or provided information for user audiences (e.g. scientists, fishers, etc)?

Ten Parties and one participating non-Party provided information on an extensive range of training programmes, workshops and educational material provided for fishers, industry representatives, observers, fisheries managers and scientists. Details can be found in the respective implementation reports, tabled as AC8 Information Papers.

1.6.2. Has the Party conducted training or provided information to the general public?

Ten Parties and one participating non-Party provided information on an extensive range of training programmes, public campaigns, workshops, games and educational material provided for the general public. Details can be found in the respective implementation reports, tabled as AC8 Information Papers.

1.7. Other

Does the Party have any new information to report on research into observed impacts, or mitigation of, climate change on albatrosses and petrels

Argentina – Yes. Data is currently being analysed for the project "Trophic ecology of seabirds in Antarctica and Sub-Antarctic and its relation to climate change," conducted by Dr. Andrea Raya Rey CADIC CONICET.

Chile - An interdisciplinary group is currently being established by the scientific committee to assess the effect of change climate.

UK – Yes. SOUTH GEORGIA (ISLAS GEORGIAS DEL SUR)[1]: The Natural Environment Research Council (NERC) have funded a 3.5 year project that began in January 2013, which is examining the effects of fisheries and environmental (climatic) change on the demography of the globally threatened Wandering, Grey-headed and Black-browed albatrosses at South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1].

PARTICIPATING NON-PARTY

USA – Yes. Detailed models of sea level rise and wave driven inundation of the islands with the two largest albatross colonies in the North Pacific are described in Storlazzi et al. 2013. Storlazzi, C.D., Berkowitz, P., Reynolds, M.H., and Logan, J.B., 2013, Forecasting the impact of storm waves and sea-level rise on Midway Atoll and Laysan Island within the Papahanaumokuakea Marine National Monument—a comparison of

passive versus dynamic inundation models: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2013–1069, 78 p. (Available at http://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2013/1069/.)

1.8. Additional Comments

Chile - Chile is a Party to both CCAMLR and SPRFMO, both regional fisheries organizations that have adopted bycatch mitigation measures for seabirds. Chile has supported the adoption of these measures and implemented national legislation to make these measures mandatory on national ships, with consequent penalties for default. Particularly in SPRFMO, which only came into force in the year 2012, Chile wants to support the adoption of measures to avoid and minimize the capture of seabirds in marine area in the South Pacific and for this, requests technical assistance from ACAP.

United Kingdom - TRISTAN DA CUNHA: RSPB are working on a marine project at Tristan da Cunha with the objective of identifying sensitive marine sites that are important for fisheries or biodiversity. This project is funded by Darwin Plus, and began in 2013. It is not directly related to ACAP work, but may result in the designation of marine protected areas in the future, which may lead to positive outcomes for albatross and petrel species which use those waters.

PARTICIPATING NON-PARTY

USA – Yes. The United States is preparing a report on the implementation of the National Plan of Action for Reducing Incidental Catch of Seabirds in Longline Fisheries, to be completed by the summer of 2014.

2. PART 2 - REPORT ON ITEMS IN SECTION 5.1 OF THE ACTION PLAN

2.1. Assessment and review of the status of populations of albatrosses and petrels (item 5.1.a).

2.1.1. Current Conservation Status

With the addition of the Balearic shearwater *Puffinus mauretanicus*, there are currently 30 seabird species listed by ACAP in Annex 1 of the Agreement. Of these, 20 (67%) are classified at risk of extinction, a stark contrast to the overall rate of 12% for the 9,799 bird species worldwide. Of the 22 species of albatrosses listed by ACAP, three are listed as *Critically Endangered*, five are *Endangered*, seven are *Vulnerable* and seven are *Near Threatened*. Of the eight petrel species, one is currently listed as *Critically Endangered*, four as *Vulnerable,* one as *Near Threatened* and two species as *Least Concern* (Table 1).

2.1.2. Changes in Status and Trends since MoP4

Since MoP4 (2012), there have been changes in the status of ACAP species reflecting the addition of the Balearic Shearwater and reviews by BirdLife International, the listing authority for the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN). These species are Black-browed and Black-footed albatross (downlisted to Near Threatened), and Grey-headed albatross (uplisted to Endangered).

2.1.3. Status of knowledge relating to population size and trends

Since MoP4 substantial progress was made in determining the population trend of ACAP species over the last twenty years (since early 1990s). This period was considered appropriate to reflect the trend of these long lived species, some of which breed only every two years, and which may show high annual variation in breeding numbers.

Eleven ACAP species (37%) are currently showing overall population declines. For three species, the trend over the last 20 years is unknown. Seven species appear to have been stable over that time period, with a further nine species increasing. The confidence of the assigned trend in Table 1 reflects both the accuracy and extent of the population data.

A series of species assessments have been developed to describe succinctly the state of knowledge of each of the ACAP species and these are available on the ACAP website in the three languages of the Agreement.

This text to be completed following PaCSWG2.

Table 1. *2014 Summary of Status of ACAP Albatross and Petrel species*

IUCN Status 2014[1]	Common name	Number of sites (ACAP)[2]	Single Country Endemic	Annual breeding pairs (ACAP)[3]	Population Trend 1993-2013[4]	Trend Confidence
CR	Amsterdam Albatross	1	France	30	↑	High
CR	Balearic Shearwater	5	Spain	3,193	↓	Medium
CR	Tristan Albatross	1	UK	1,699	↓	High
CR	Waved Albatross	1	Ecuador	9,615	↓	Low
EN	Atlantic yellow-nosed Albatross	6	UK	33,650	↔	Low
EN	Grey-headed Albatross	29		94,580	↓	Medium
EN	Indian yellow-nosed Albatross	6		39,320	↓	Medium
EN	Northern royal Albatross	5	NZ	5,832	?	-
EN	Sooty Albatross	15		13,674	↓	Very Low
VU	Antipodean Albatross	6	NZ	8,274	↓	Medium
VU	Black Petrel	2	NZ	881	↓	Medium
VU	Campbell Albatross	2	NZ	22,093	?	-
VU	Chatham Albatross	1	NZ	5,245	↔	Medium
VU	Salvin's Albatross	12	NZ	42.219	↔	Very Low
VU	Short-tailed Albatross	2		472	↑	High
VU	Southern royal Albatross	4	NZ	7,873	↔	Medium
VU	Spectacled Petrel	1	UK	14,400	↑	High
VU	Wandering Albatross	28		8,246	↓	High
VU	Westland Petrel	1	NZ	4,000	↔	Low
VU	White-chinned Petrel	73		1,057,930	↓	Very Low
NT	Black-browed Albatross	65		672,411	↑	High
NT	Black-footed Albatross	13		68,962	↑	High
NT	Buller's Albatross	10	NZ	29,948	↑	Low
NT	Grey Petrel	17		79,588	↓	Very Low
NT	Laysan Albatross	17		650,561	↔	High
NT	Light-mantled Albatross	71		13, 955?	↔	Low
NT	Shy Albatross	3	Australia	12,535	↑	Medium
NT	White-capped Albatross	5	NZ	74,870	?	-
LC	Northern giant Petrel	50		10,856	↑	Medium
LC	Southern giant Petrel	119		47,160	↑	Medium

[1] ***IUCN Status:*** *CR =Critically Endangered, EN = Endangered, VU = Vulnerable, NT = Near Threatened, LC = Least Concern.* IUCN 2014. *IUCN Red List of Threatened Species*. <www.iucnredlist.org>.
[2] ***Site:*** *usually an entire, distinct island or islet, or section of a large island*
[3] ACAP database. <data.acap.aq>. April 2013.
[4] ***ACAP Trend:*** *↑ increasing, ↓declining, ↔ stable, ? unknown*

2.2. Identification of internationally important breeding sites (item 5.1.b)

The ACAP database lists 194 sites that hold more than 1% of the global population of each ACAP species where population numbers are known (ANNEX 1). Most ACAP species breed at relatively few sites; for 13 of the 30 species, there are only 1-3 sites that hold internationally important numbers (i.e. >1% of the global population).

It should be recognised that (i) census data are unavailable for approximately a third of breeding sites, particularly those of the White-chinned Petrel and the Light-mantled

Albatross, and (ii) some counts are of low reliability or were collected a decade or more ago. Filling these gaps and obtaining updated population estimates should be considered a priority. There are also some inconsistencies in the scale at which breeding sites were defined by Parties when the ACAP database was set up, such that large islands may be entered as a single site, or split.

2.3. Reviews to characterise the foraging range and migration routes and patterns of populations of albatrosses and petrels (item 5.1.c).

Considerable progress has been made on the enhancement and development of BirdLife International's *Global Procellariform Tracking Database*.

Key gaps in the tracking data for albatross and petrels have been identified and ACAP Parties encouraged to submit new data sets as part of the on-going work of the Agreement.

Species Assessments for all 30 species include distribution maps as well as maps showing satellite-transmitter and other tracking data for breeding and non-breeding birds where available. These maps have been prepared by BirdLife International based on information in the Global Procellariiform Tracking Database.

This text to be completed following PaCSWG2.

2.4. Identification and assessment of known and suspected threats affecting albatrosses and petrels (item 5.1.d)

2.4.1. Threats at breeding sites

ACAP has adopted a system for standardising the listing of threats to breeding sites adapted from criteria produced initially by IUCN and the Conservation Measures Partnership. Each threat is assessed according to the Scope (proportion of population affected) and Severity (intensity), that when combined provide an indication of the magnitude of the threat. These consider not only current impact, but also the anticipated impact over the next decade, assuming the continuation of current conditions and trends. A breakdown of the proportion of sites, and of the global population that are subjected to threats that meet these criteria are listed below (Table 2). The vast majority of these relate to introduced mammals or disease and are described in section 5.1h) below. The remainder involve natural disasters.

Table 2. *Percentage of sites and populations affected by land threats – only species affected listed. (to be updated)*

Species	No of sites	% sites - Natural disaster	% sites - Habitat loss or destruction by alien species	% sites - Increased competition with native species	% sites - Parasite or Pathogen	% sites - Predation by alien species	% population - Natural disaster	% population - Habitat loss or destruction by alien species	% population - Increased competition with native species	% population - Parasite or Pathogen	% population - Predation by alien species	% sites by Threat - all	% population by Threat - all
Antipodean albatross	6	0	0	0	0	16.7	0	0	0	0	1	16.7	1
Tristan albatross	1	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	100	100	100
Southern royal albatross	4	0	0	0	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	25	0
Wandering albatross	35	0	0	0	0	5.7	0	0	0	0	28.8	5.7	28.8
Southern Giant Petrel	136	0.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.7	0
Short-tailed albatross	2	50	0	0	0	0	91.7	0	0	0	0	50	91.7
Laysan albatross	17	35.3	0	0	0	17.6	99.7	0	0	0	0.1	52.9	99.8
Waved albatross	3	0	0	0	33.3	0	0	0	0	99.9	0	33.3	99.9
Black-footed albatross	15	46.7	0	0	0	6.7	98.2	0	0	0	0	53.3	98.2
Sooty Albatross	15	0	0	0	6.7	6.7	0	0	0	3.3	12.1	13.3	15.4
Light-mantled Albatross	72	1.4	1.4	0	0	0	0	13.3	0	0	0	2.8	13.3
White-chinned Petrel	74	0	6.8	0	0	18.9	0	17.8	0	0	37.8	18.9	37.8
Grey petrel	17	0	17.6	0	0	35.3	0	4.6	0	0	27.9	35.3	27.9
Balearic Shearwater	5	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	100	100	100
Indian yellow-nosed albatross	6	0	0	0	16.7	0	0	0	0	68.7	0	16.7	68.7
Shy albatross	3	0	0	33.3	33.3	0	0	0	2.3	66.8	0	66.7	69.2
Grey-headed albatross	29	0	3.4	0	0	0	0	0.1	0	0	0	3.4	0.1
Black-browed albatross	65	1.5	1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.1	0
White-capped albatross	5	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	5.6	20	5.6

Green <1%; Orange 1-33%; Red >33%

2.4.2. Threats at sea

Albatrosses and petrels face many threats at sea including ingestion of marine debris including fishing hooks discarded in fish offal, entanglement in lost fishing gear and other marine debris, contamination from pollutants and over-fishing of prey species. However, direct interactions with fishing operations have been identified by ACAP and others as a major threat causing widespread declines in populations throughout the world. All ACAP listed species are at risk from this threat. Since MoP4 much of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group's work has focussed on reviewing best practice mitigation advice for industrial fishing gear types, principally demersal and pelagic longline, and trawl gear, as well collection of fisheries bycatch data, and engagement with RFMOs, particularly the tuna RFMO's.

The data underlying a prioritisation framework for at-sea threats has also been reviewed since MoP4. The framework provides a robust basis for decision-making to set, monitor and report on progress against priority conservation actions for ACAP listed species.

This text to be completed following SBWG6.

2.5. Identification of methods by which these threats may be avoided or mitigated (item 5.1.e)

2.5.1. Threats at breeding sites

A new best practice document "Guidelines for translocations of albatrosses and burrow-nesting petrels and shearwaters" has been finalised since MoP4. Translocation of albatrosses and petrels should be considered as a conservation tool when populations can be enhanced by moving birds back to sites where they have previously occurred as part of an ecological restoration or as part of an assisted colonization of a new site in response to emerging threats at existing colonies. Two other resources, Eradication Guidelines and Biosecurity Guidelines have also been updated.

2.5.2. Threats at sea

Based on reviews of mitigation developed for pelagic longline, demersal longline and trawl gear types, the SBWG has updated advice on current best scientific approaches to mitigating bycatch in these gear types to assist RFMOs and ACAP parties in managing bycatch in their fisheries. The advice, including descriptions of measures, current knowledge, implementation guidance and research needs is available on the ACAP website and is suitable for dissemination to relevant fisheries managers. RFMOs and Parties have been encouraged to use the materials to guide the development of policy and practice within the fisheries under their jurisdiction

2.6. Review and updating of data on the mortality of albatrosses and petrels in fisheries (item 5.1.f).

A web-based reporting system has been progressively developed for the capture and use of fisheries and bycatch data from Parties and collaborating Range States. Currently, the data are provided at the level of the entire fishery or fleet, a temporal and spatial resolution which

is too coarse to enable useful assessments of seabird bycatch levels and trends. For many fisheries, the bycatch and fisheries data submitted by Parties are also incomplete, hampering the possibility of conducting even a low level assessment of bycatch levels and trends of ACAP-listed species. Spatial and temporal stratification of the reported data has been recommended (i.e. to report bycatch and fishing effort for each 5x5 degree square and year quarter), to provide a more accurate and meaningful estimates of the number of seabirds killed each year.

ANNEX 2 summarises bycatch data provided by Parties and collaborating Range States for the latest year available.

This text to be completed following SBWG6.

2.7. Review of data on the distribution and seasonality of effort in fisheries which affect albatrosses and petrels (item 5.1.g)

See 2.6 above and ANNEX 2.

This text to be completed following SBWG6.

2.8. Reviews of the status at breeding sites of introduced animals, plants and disease-causing organisms known or believed to be detrimental to albatrosses and petrels (item 5.1.h).

Habitat destruction and predation by introduced mammals are listed far more frequently than any other processes as threats to breeding sites of ACAP species. Those affecting the most breeding sites (site-species combinations) were predation by feral cat *Felis catus,* black rat *Rattus rattus* and brown rat *R. norvegicus*, and habitat destruction by reindeer *Rangifer tarandus* (Table 3). All other threats affected only a few sites, although were severe in some cases (Medium or High according to the agreed threat criteria), which included the effects of avian cholera at Amsterdam Island (Table 4). The species affected at the most breeding sites were the burrow-nesting White-chinned Petrel *P. aequinoctialis*, and Balearic Shearwater *Puffinus mauretanicus,* mainly because of predation or habitat destruction by introduced mammals. In interpreting the tables below and the conclusions, it should be noted that: (1) threats only include those that are documented and known or likely to cause a population decline in <10 years, (2) values in the tables are the number of breeding sites, equivalent to each species-site combination *i.e.* two species breeding in the same area constitute two breeding sites, (3) although most islands are listed as one site, a small number have been subdivided into separate sites, and (4) no attempt has been made to consider the number of birds or the percentage of the global population at each site.

Table 3. *Number of breeding sites of ACAP species affected by threats of different magnitude (Low to Very high).*

Nature of Threat	Threat subcategory	Threat Species	Number of breeding sites affected:				
			Low	Medium	High	Very High	All
Contamination	Toxins - man made	-	1				**1**
Habitat loss or destruction	Habitat destruction by alien species	Reindeer	6				**6**
	Increased competition with native species	Australasian gannet			1		**1**
	Vegetation encroachment		3				**3**
Human disturbance	Military action			2			**2**
	Recreation/tourism		1	2			**3**
Light pollution	Collision injury or grounding		3				**3**
Parasite or pathogen	Pathogen	Avian pox virus	1				**1**
		Avian cholera	1	1			**2**
Predation by alien species	Predation by alien species	Dog		1			**1**
		Cat	12	2	2		**16**
		Pig	4				**4**
		House mouse	1	1			**2**
		Polynesian rat	1				**1**
		Norwegian rat	7				**7**
		Black (ship) rat	13				**13**
Stress by alien species	Nest desertion	Black (ship) rat			1		**1**
All			**54**	**9**	**4**	**0**	**67**

Table 4. *Breeding sites of ACAP species affected by threats of Medium or High magnitude*

Nature of Threat	Threat subcategory	Threat Species	Breeding sites affected:	
			Medium	High
Habitat loss or destruction	Increased competition with native species	Australasian gannet		Pedra Branca - Shy albatross
Human disturbance	Military action		Kaula – Laysan albatross Kaula – Black-footed albatross	
	Recreation/ tourism		Ibiza – Balearic shearwater Isla de la Plata – Waved albatross	
Parasite or pathogen	Pathogen	Avian cholera	Falaise d'Entrecasteaux (Amsterdam) - Indian yellow-nosed albatross	
Predation by alien species	Predation by alien species	Dog	O'ahu – Laysan albatross	
		Cat	Isla Guadalupe – Laysan albatross O'ahu – Laysan albatross	Formentera – Balearic shearwater Menorca – Balearic shearwater
		House mouse	Gough Island – Tristan albatross	
Stress by alien species	Nest desertion	Black (ship) rat		Isla de la Plata – Waved albatross

There have been three whole island eradications since MoP4 (ANNEX 3). The successful eradication of rabbits, mice and black rats from Macquarie Island has been confirmed in April 2014. Feasibility plans have also been produced for a number of other sites, and in some cases planning is well advanced and eradications are scheduled for the next few years (ANNEX 3)**.**

A review of parasites, pathogens and diseases in ACAP species has also been updated since MoP4.

2.9. Reviews of the nature of, coverage by, and effectiveness of, protection arrangements for albatrosses and petrels (item 5.1.i).

All species in all jurisdictions are now covered by management plans, including NPOAs for incidental bycatch, Threat Abatement Plans, Conservation Strategies, Conservation Action Plans, Recovery Plans and Site Management Plans. However, Parties will need to provide advice as to the effectiveness of those protection arrangements, prior to MoP4.

2.10. Reviews of recent and current research on albatrosses and petrels with relevance to their conservation status (item 5.1.j)

See 1.5 above and relevant papers tabled at in SBWG6 and PaCWG2.

This review is ongoing through all Working Groups and the Secretariat, who produce Species Assessments, Action Plans and Best Practice Guidelines. The following documents have been completed to date*:*

- Biosecurity and quarantine guidelines for ACAP breeding sites
- Census guidelines to assist with the development and implementation of plans to census ACAP species
- Guidelines for eradication of introduced mammals from breeding sites of ACAP-listed seabirds
- 30 Species Assessments

The Secretariat maintains a bibliographic reference database of relevant literature which supports the compilation and updating of these documents.

2.11. List of authorities, research centres, scientists and non-government organisations concerned with albatrosses and petrels (item 5.1.k).

The ACAP website provides a comprehensive list of links to various centres, institutions, organisations and websites concerned with albatrosses and petrels.

2.12. Directory of legislation concerning albatrosses and petrels (item 5.1.l)

The ACAP database now holds information on legislation relevant to species listed on Annex 1 and their breeding sites.

2.13. Reviews of education and information programmes aimed at conserving albatrosses and petrels (item 5.1.m)

Parties reported on a range of programmes being undertaken, including education, training and outreach. Collaboration between Governmental agencies and NGOs was evident in most of cases. The main targets were observer programmes (training for the identification of species and observation protocols), fishermen and the public in general. See details of these programmes in section 1.6 above.

2.14. Review of current taxonomy in relation to albatrosses and petrels (item 5.1.n).

The TWG recommended no changes to the current ACAP taxonomic approach.

2.15. Identified gaps in information as part of the above reviews, with a view to addressing these in future priorities (item 5.2).

To be updated following SBWG6 and PaCSWG2

The following gaps in the information provided were identified:

- Census data are unavailable for approximately a third of breeding sites and some counts are of low reliability or were collected a decade or more ago.
- Gaps in the tracking data for albatross and petrels have been identified and ACAP Parties are encouraged to submit new data sets as part of the on-going work of the Agreement.
- Scarcity of information on seabird mortality in a large number of fisheries…
- Lack of understanding of the magnitude and dynamics of seabird mortality in artisanal fisheries…

ANNEX 1. IBA sites where the population exceeds 1, 2, 5 and 10% of the global total for that species.

Jurisdiction	Island Group	Species	site	pairs	When	1 %	2 %	5 %	10 %
Antarctic	Elephant Island	*Macronectes giganteus*	Elephant Island	845	1972	Y	N	N	N
Antarctic	Palmer Archipelago	*Macronectes giganteus*	Anvers Island	582	1987 2010 1999	Y	N	N	N
Antarctic	South Orkney Islands	*Macronectes giganteus*	Laurie Island	624	2006 2011	Y	N	N	N
Antarctic	South Orkney Islands	*Macronectes giganteus*	Powell Island	613	1983	Y	N	N	N
Antarctic	South Orkney Islands	*Macronectes giganteus*	Signy Island	1093	1985	Y	Y	N	N
Antarctic	South Shetland Islands	*Macronectes giganteus*	King George Island	1728	1967 2014 1985 1999 1990	Y	Y	N	N
Antarctic	South Shetland Islands	*Macronectes giganteus*	Nelson Island	877	2014 1994 1985 2010	Y	N	N	N
Antarctic	South Shetland Islands	*Macronectes giganteus*	Penguin Island	634	2000	Y	N	N	N
Argentina	Isla de los Estados	*Macronectes giganteus*	Isla Observatorio	500	2004	Y	N	N	N
Argentina	North Patagonia	*Macronectes giganteus*	Isla Gran Robredo	1700	2005	Y	Y	N	N
Australia	Heard and McDonald Islands	*Macronectes giganteus*	Heard Island	3500	2004	Y	Y	Y	N
Australia	Heard and McDonald Islands	*Phoebetria palpebrata*	Heard Island	350	1954	Y	Y	N	N
Australia	Macquarie Island	*Macronectes giganteus*	Macquarie Island	1788	2014	Y	Y	N	N
Australia	Macquarie Island	*Macronectes halli*	Macquarie Island	1487	2014	Y	Y	Y	Y
Australia	Macquarie Island	*Phoebetria palpebrata*	Macquarie Island	2136	2014	Y	Y	Y	Y
Australia	Tasmania	*Thalassarche cauta*	Albatross Island (AU)	4552	2014	Y	Y	Y	Y
Australia	Tasmania	*Thalassarche cauta*	Pedra Branca	159	2014	Y	Y	N	N
Australia	Tasmania	*Thalassarche cauta*	The Mewstone	2100	2014	Y	Y	Y	Y
Chile	Diego de Almagro	*Thalassarche melanophris*	Isla Diego de Almagro	15594	2002	Y	Y	N	N
Chile	Isla Noir	*Macronectes giganteus*	Isla Noir	1000	2005	Y	Y	N	N
Chile	Islas Diego Ramirez	*Thalassarche chrysostoma*	Isla Bartolome	10880	2003	Y	Y	Y	Y
Chile	Islas Diego Ramirez	*Thalassarche melanophris*	Isla Bartolome	43928	2003	Y	Y	Y	N
Chile	Islas Diego Ramirez	*Thalassarche chrysostoma*	Isla Gonzalo	4413	2012	Y	Y	N	N
Chile	Islas Diego Ramirez	*Thalassarche melanophris*	Isla Gonzalo	8706	2012	Y	N	N	N

Jurisdiction	Island Group	Species	site	pairs	When	1 %	2 %	5 %	10 %
Chile	Islas Ildefonso	*Thalassarche melanophris*	Isla Grande	32640	2012	Y	Y	N	N
Chile	Islas Ildefonso	*Thalassarche melanophris*	Isla Norte	14059	2013	Y	Y	N	N
Chile	Islas Ildefonso	*Thalassarche melanophris*	Isla Sur	6912	2013	Y	N	N	N
Disputed	Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1]	*Macronectes giganteus*	Barren Island	1504	2005	Y	Y	N	N
Disputed	Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1]	*Thalassarche melanophris*	Beauchene Island	105777	2011	Y	Y	Y	Y
Disputed	Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1]	*Thalassarche melanophris*	Bird Island (Falklands/Malvinas)	15719	2011	Y	Y	N	N
Disputed	Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1]	*Macronectes giganteus*	George	602	2005	Y	N	N	N
Disputed	Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1]	*Macronectes giganteus*	Golden Knob (Elephant Cays)	1019	2005	Y	Y	N	N
Disputed	Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1]	*Macronectes giganteus*	Governor (Beaver)	723	2005	Y	N	N	N
Disputed	Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1]	*Macronectes giganteus*	Grand Jason	762	2005	Y	N	N	N
Disputed	Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1]	*Thalassarche melanophris*	Grand Jason	89489	2011	Y	Y	Y	Y
Disputed	Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1]	*Thalassarche melanophris*	New Island	13343	2011	Y	N	N	N
Disputed	Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1]	*Thalassarche melanophris*	North Island	26812	2011	Y	Y	N	N
Disputed	Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1]	*Macronectes giganteus*	Penn (Beaver)	1543	2005	Y	Y	N	N
Disputed	Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1]	*Macronectes giganteus*	Sandy Cay (Elephant Cays)	10936	2005	Y	Y	Y	Y
Disputed	Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1]	*Thalassarche melanophris*	Saunders Island	16722	2011	Y	Y	N	N
Disputed	Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1]	*Macronectes giganteus*	Steeple Jason	1841	2012	Y	Y	N	N
Disputed	Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1]	*Thalassarche melanophris*	Steeple Jason	183135	2011	Y	Y	Y	Y

[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".*

Jurisdiction	Island Group	Species	site	pairs	When	1 %	2 %	5 %	10 %
Disputed	Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)[1]	*Thalassarche melanophris*	West Point Island	16495	2011	Y	Y	N	N
Disputed	Senkaku Retto of southern Ryukyu Islands	*Phoebastria albatrus*	Minami-kojima	52	2002	Y	Y	Y	N
Disputed	South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]	*Diomedea exulans*	Albatross Island (SGSSI (IGSISS))	144	2014	Y	N	N	N
Disputed	South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]	*Diomedea exulans*	Annenkov Island	193	2004	Y	Y	N	N
Disputed	South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]	*Thalassarche melanophris*	Annenkov Island	9398	2004	Y	N	N	N
Disputed	South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]	*Macronectes giganteus*	Barff	543	1987	Y	N	N	N
Disputed	South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]	*Procellaria aequinoctialis*	Barff	119594	2007	Y	Y	Y	Y
Disputed	South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]	*Diomedea exulans*	Bird Island (SGSSI (IGSISS))	859	2014	Y	Y	Y	Y
Disputed	South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]	*Macronectes giganteus*	Bird Island (SGSSI (IGSISS))	521	1996	Y	N	N	N
Disputed	South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]	*Macronectes halli*	Bird Island (SGSSI (IGSISS))	2062	1996	Y	Y	Y	Y
Disputed	South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]	*Thalassarche chrysostoma*	Bird Island (SGSSI (IGSISS))	5120	2004	Y	Y	Y	N
Disputed	South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]	*Thalassarche melanophris*	Bird Island (SGSSI (IGSISS))	8264	2004	Y	N	N	N
Disputed	South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]	*Thalassarche melanophris*	Cooper Island	10606	2004	Y	N	N	N
Disputed	South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]	*Thalassarche chrysostoma*	Hall Island	2686	2004	Y	Y	N	N
Disputed	South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]	*Thalassarche chrysostoma*	Main Island	5177	2004	Y	Y	Y	N
Disputed	South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]	*Thalassarche melanophris*	Main Island	14559	2004	Y	Y	N	N
Disputed	South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]	*Diomedea exulans*	Northwest	114	2004	Y	N	N	N
Disputed	South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]	*Macronectes giganteus*	Northwest	703	1987	Y	N	N	N
Disputed	South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]	*Macronectes halli*	Northwest	516	1981	Y	Y	N	N
Disputed	South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]	*Procellaria aequinoctialis*	Northwest	146545	2007	Y	Y	Y	Y
Disputed	South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]	*Macronectes halli*	Nunez	324	1987	Y	Y	N	N

Jurisdiction	Island Group	Species	site	pairs	When	1 %	2 %	5 %	10 %
Disputed	South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]	*Procellaria aequinoctialis*	Nunez	193838	2007	Y	Y	Y	Y
Disputed	South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]	*Thalassarche chrysostoma*	Paryadin Peninsula north	6721	2004	Y	Y	Y	N
Disputed	South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]	*Thalassarche chrysostoma*	Paryadin Peninsula south	22058	2004	Y	Y	Y	Y
Disputed	South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]	*Macronectes halli*	Saddle Island	192	1987	Y	N	N	N
Disputed	South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]	*Procellaria aequinoctialis*	Salisbury	16365	2007	Y	N	N	N
Disputed	South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]	*Thalassarche chrysostoma*	Sorn & Bernt coast	1625	2004	Y	N	N	N
Disputed	South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]	*Macronectes giganteus*	South Coast	574	1987	Y	N	N	N
Disputed	South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]	*Macronectes halli*	South Coast	165	1987	Y	N	N	N
Disputed	South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]	*Procellaria aequinoctialis*	Southeast	43355	2007	Y	Y	N	N
Disputed	South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]	*Procellaria aequinoctialis*	Stromness and Cumberland	64361	2007	Y	Y	Y	N
Disputed	South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]	*Thalassarche chrysostoma*	Trinity Island	3309	2004	Y	Y	N	N
Disputed	South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]	*Thalassarche melanophris*	Trinity Island	13960	2004	Y	Y	N	N
Disputed	South Sandwich Islands (Islas Sandwich del Sur)[1]	*Macronectes giganteus*	Candlemas Island	1818	2011	Y	Y	N	N
Ecuador	Galapagos	*Phoebastria irrorata*	Isla Espanola	9607	2001	Y	Y	Y	Y
France	Amsterdam and St Paul	*Thalassarche carteri*	Falaise d'Entrecasteaux	27000	2006	Y	Y	Y	Y
France	Amsterdam and St Paul	*Phoebetria fusca*	Ile Amsterdam	394	2012	Y	Y	N	N
France	Amsterdam and St Paul	*Diomedea amsterdamensis*	Plateau des tourbieres	31	2013	Y	Y	Y	Y
France	Crozet	*Diomedea exulans*	Ile aux Cochons	1060	1981	Y	Y	Y	Y
France	Crozet	*Macronectes giganteus*	Ile aux Cochons	575	1982	Y	N	N	N
France	Crozet	*Macronectes halli*	Ile aux Cochons	275	1976	Y	Y	N	N
France	Crozet	*Phoebetria fusca*	Ile aux Cochons	450	1976	Y	Y	N	N
France	Crozet	*Diomedea exulans*	Ile de la Possession	371	2014	Y	Y	N	N
France	Crozet	*Macronectes halli*	Ile de la Possession	474	2014	Y	Y	N	N
France	Crozet	*Phoebetria palpebrata*	Ile de la Possession	1019	2014	Y	Y	Y	N

Jurisdiction	Island Group	Species	site	pairs	When	1 %	2 %	5 %	10 %
France	Crozet	*Diomedea exulans*	Ile de l'Est	329	1982	Y	Y	N	N
France	Crozet	*Macronectes halli*	Ile de l'Est	190	1981	Y	N	N	N
France	Crozet	*Phoebetria fusca*	Ile de l'Est	1300	1984	Y	Y	Y	Y
France	Crozet	*Phoebetria palpebrata*	Ile de l'Est	900	1984	Y	Y	Y	N
France	Crozet	*Procellaria aequinoctialis*	Ile de l'Est	33144.5	2004	Y	Y	N	N
France	Crozet	*Procellaria cinerea*	Ile de l'Est	5500	1982	Y	Y	Y	N
France	Crozet	*Thalassarche chrysostoma*	Ile de l'Est	3750	1982	Y	Y	N	N
France	Crozet	*Diomedea exulans*	Ile des Apotres	120	1982	Y	N	N	N
France	Crozet	*Macronectes halli*	Ile des Apotres	150	1981	Y	N	N	N
France	Crozet	*Thalassarche carteri*	Ile des Apotres	1230	1984	Y	Y	N	N
France	Crozet	*Macronectes halli*	Ile des Pingouins	165	1981	Y	N	N	N
France	Crozet	*Phoebetria fusca*	Ile des Pingouins	250	1984	Y	Y	N	N
France	Crozet	*Thalassarche carteri*	Ile des Pingouins	5800	1984	Y	Y	Y	Y
France	Crozet	*Thalassarche chrysostoma*	Ile des Pingouins	2000	1982	Y	Y	N	N
France	Kerguelen	*Macronectes halli*	Baie Larose	125	1987	Y	N	N	N
France	Kerguelen	*Diomedea exulans*	Courbet Peninsula	356	2014	Y	Y	N	N
France	Kerguelen	*Macronectes halli*	Courbet Peninsula	750	1987	Y	Y	Y	N
France	Kerguelen	*Macronectes halli*	Golfe du Morbihan	150	1987	Y	N	N	N
France	Kerguelen	*Procellaria cinerea*	Golfe du Morbihan	3400	2006	Y	Y	N	N
France	Kerguelen	*Thalassarche chrysostoma*	Iles Nuageuses	7860	1985	Y	Y	Y	N
France	Kerguelen	*Diomedea exulans*	Rallier du Baty Peninsula	750	1987	Y	Y	Y	N
France	Kerguelen	*Macronectes halli*	Rallier du Baty Peninsula	550	1987	Y	Y	Y	N
Japan	Izu Shoto	*Phoebastria albatrus*	Torishima	609	2014	Y	Y	Y	Y
Japan	Izu Shoto	*Phoebastria nigripes*	Torishima	2060	2013	Y	Y	N	N
Japan	Ogasawara (Bonin) Islands	*Phoebastria nigripes*	Nakodojima	967	2006	Y	N	N	N
New Zealand	Antipodes Islands	*Diomedea antipodensis*	Antipodes Island	3320	2013	Y	Y	Y	Y
New Zealand	Antipodes Islands	*Macronectes halli*	Antipodes Island	233	2001	Y	Y	N	N
New Zealand	Antipodes Islands	*Phoebetria palpebrata*	Antipodes Island	250	1995	Y	N	N	N
New Zealand	Antipodes Islands	*Procellaria aequinoctialis*	Antipodes Island	58725	2011	Y	Y	Y	N

Jurisdiction	Island Group	Species	site	pairs	When	1 %	2 %	5 %	10 %
New Zealand	Antipodes Islands	*Procellaria cinerea*	Antipodes Island	48960	2010	Y	Y	Y	Y
New Zealand	Auckland Islands	*Diomedea antipodensis*	Adams Island	3277	2009	Y	Y	Y	Y
New Zealand	Auckland Islands	*Phoebetria palpebrata*	Adams Island	5000	1973	Y	Y	Y	Y
New Zealand	Auckland Islands	*Diomedea antipodensis*	Auckland Island	72	1997	Y	N	N	N
New Zealand	Auckland Islands	*Thalassarche steadi*	Auckland Island	5592	2013	Y	Y	Y	N
New Zealand	Auckland Islands	*Diomedea antipodensis*	Disappointment Island	352	1997	Y	Y	Y	N
New Zealand	Auckland Islands	*Procellaria aequinoctialis*	Disappointment Island	100000	1988	Y	Y	Y	N
New Zealand	Auckland Islands	*Thalassarche steadi*	Disappointment Island	94727	2013	Y	Y	Y	Y
New Zealand	Bounty Islands	*Thalassarche salvini*	Depot Island	13737	2013	Y	Y	Y	Y
New Zealand	Bounty Islands	*Thalassarche salvini*	Funnel Island	5182	2013	Y	Y	Y	Y
New Zealand	Bounty Islands	*Thalassarche salvini*	Molly Cap	3258	2013	Y	Y	Y	N
New Zealand	Bounty Islands	*Thalassarche salvini*	Penguin Island (NZ)	1044	2013	Y	Y	N	N
New Zealand	Bounty Islands	*Thalassarche salvini*	Proclamation Island	4880	2013	Y	Y	Y	Y
New Zealand	Bounty Islands	*Thalassarche salvini*	Ruatara Island	5012	2013	Y	Y	Y	Y
New Zealand	Bounty Islands	*Thalassarche salvini*	Spider Island	3446	2013	Y	Y	Y	N
New Zealand	Bounty Islands	*Thalassarche salvini*	Tunnel Island	3435	2013	Y	Y	Y	N
New Zealand	Campbell Islands	*Diomedea epomophora*	Campbell Island	7855	2008	Y	Y	Y	Y
New Zealand	Campbell Islands	*Macronectes halli*	Campbell Island	234	1997	Y	Y	N	N
New Zealand	Campbell Islands	*Phoebetria palpebrata*	Campbell Island	1600	1996	Y	Y	Y	N
New Zealand	Campbell Islands	*Thalassarche chrysostoma*	Campbell Island	8611	2012	Y	Y	Y	N
New Zealand	Campbell Islands	*Thalassarche impavida*	Campbell Island	21648	2012	Y	Y	Y	Y
New Zealand	Chatham Island	*Diomedea sanfordi*	The Big Sister	1893	2010	Y	Y	Y	Y
New Zealand	Chatham Island	*Macronectes halli*	The Big Sister	336	1976	Y	Y	N	N
New Zealand	Chatham Island	*Thalassarche bulleri*	The Big Sister	1500	1971	Y	Y	Y	N
New Zealand	Chatham Island	*Diomedea sanfordi*	The Forty-fours	2692	2010	Y	Y	Y	Y
New Zealand	Chatham Island	*Macronectes halli*	The Forty-fours	1000	2005	Y	Y	Y	N
New Zealand	Chatham Island	*Thalassarche bulleri*	The Forty-fours	14185	2010	Y	Y	Y	Y
New Zealand	Chatham Island	*Diomedea sanfordi*	The Little (Middle) Sister	1159	2010	Y	Y	Y	Y
New Zealand	Chatham Island	*Thalassarche bulleri*	The Little (Middle) Sister	650	1996	Y	Y	N	N
New Zealand	Chatham Island	*Thalassarche eremita*	The Pyramid	5245	2011	Y	Y	Y	Y

Jurisdiction	Island Group	Species	site	pairs	When	1 %	2 %	5 %	10 %
New Zealand	New Zealand	*Procellaria parkinsoni*	Great Barrier Island	1477	2013	Y	Y	Y	Y
New Zealand	New Zealand	*Procellaria parkinsoni*	Little Barrier Island	100	1998	Y	Y	Y	N
New Zealand	New Zealand	*Procellaria westlandica*	Punakaiki	2827	2011	Y	Y	Y	Y
New Zealand	Solander Islands	*Thalassarche bulleri*	Great Solander Island	4579	2002	Y	Y	Y	Y
New Zealand	Solander Islands	*Thalassarche bulleri*	Little Solander Island	333	2002	Y	N	N	N
New Zealand	The Snares	*Thalassarche bulleri*	Broughton Island	518	1997	Y	N	N	N
New Zealand	The Snares	*Thalassarche bulleri*	North-East Island	7898	2002	Y	Y	Y	Y
New Zealand	The Snares	*Thalassarche salvini*	Toru Islet	829	2011	Y	Y	N	N
South Africa	Prince Edward Islands	*Diomedea exulans*	Marion Island	2050	2014	Y	Y	Y	Y
South Africa	Prince Edward Islands	*Macronectes giganteus*	Marion Island	1583	2014	Y	Y	N	N
South Africa	Prince Edward Islands	*Macronectes halli*	Marion Island	443	2014	Y	Y	N	N
South Africa	Prince Edward Islands	*Phoebetria fusca*	Marion Island	1469	2014	Y	Y	Y	Y
South Africa	Prince Edward Islands	*Phoebetria palpebrata*	Marion Island	316	2014	Y	N	N	N
South Africa	Prince Edward Islands	*Procellaria aequinoctialis*	Marion Island	24000	2009	Y	Y	N	N
South Africa	Prince Edward Islands	*Thalassarche chrysostoma*	Marion Island	8807	2014	Y	Y	Y	N
South Africa	Prince Edward Islands	*Diomedea exulans*	Prince Edward Island	1800	2009	Y	Y	Y	Y
South Africa	Prince Edward Islands	*Macronectes giganteus*	Prince Edward Island	723	2009	Y	N	N	N
South Africa	Prince Edward Islands	*Macronectes halli*	Prince Edward Island	180	1991	Y	N	N	N
South Africa	Prince Edward Islands	*Phoebetria fusca*	Prince Edward Island	1210	2009	Y	Y	Y	N
South Africa	Prince Edward Islands	*Thalassarche carteri*	Prince Edward Island	5234	2009	Y	Y	Y	Y
South Africa	Prince Edward Islands	*Thalassarche chrysostoma*	Prince Edward Island	1506	2009	Y	N	N	N
Spain	Balearic Archipelago	*Puffinus mauretanicus*	Cabrera	449	2008	Y	Y	Y	Y
Spain	Balearic Archipelago	*Puffinus mauretanicus*	Formentera	745	2012	Y	Y	Y	Y
Spain	Balearic Archipelago	*Puffinus mauretanicus*	Ibiza	685	2013	Y	Y	Y	Y
Spain	Balearic Archipelago	*Puffinus mauretanicus*	Mallorca	900	2009	Y	Y	Y	Y
Spain	Balearic Archipelago	*Puffinus mauretanicus*	Menorca	405	2009	Y	Y	Y	Y
United Kingdom	Gough	*Diomedea dabbenena*	Gough Island	1650	2014	Y	Y	Y	Y
United Kingdom	Gough	*Phoebetria fusca*	Gough Island	3750	2011	Y	Y	Y	Y
United Kingdom	Gough	*Procellaria cinerea*	Gough Island	17500	2001	Y	Y	Y	Y
United Kingdom	Gough	*Thalassarche chlororhynchos*	Gough Island	5300	2011	Y	Y	Y	Y

Jurisdiction	Island Group	Species	site	pairs	When	1 %	2 %	5 %	10 %
United Kingdom	Tristan da Cunha	*Phoebetria fusca*	Inaccessible Island	501	2000	Y	Y	N	N
United Kingdom	Tristan da Cunha	*Procellaria conspicillata*	Inaccessible Island	14400	2010	Y	Y	Y	Y
United Kingdom	Tristan da Cunha	*Thalassarche chlororhynchos*	Inaccessible Island	1100	1983	Y	Y	N	N
United Kingdom	Tristan da Cunha	*Phoebetria fusca*	Nightingale	150	1974	Y	N	N	N
United Kingdom	Tristan da Cunha	*Thalassarche chlororhynchos*	Nightingale	4000	2007	Y	Y	Y	Y
United Kingdom	Tristan da Cunha	*Phoebetria fusca*	Tristan da Cunha	2500	1974	Y	Y	Y	Y
United Kingdom	Tristan da Cunha	*Thalassarche chlororhynchos*	Tristan da Cunha	23000	1974	Y	Y	Y	Y
USA	Hawaii	*Phoebastria nigripes*	French Frigate Shoals	4944	2011	Y	Y	Y	N
USA	Hawaii	*Phoebastria immutabilis*	Kure Atoll	24366	2014	Y	Y	N	N
USA	Hawaii	*Phoebastria nigripes*	Kure Atoll	2854	2014	Y	Y	N	N
USA	Hawaii	*Phoebastria immutabilis*	Laysan Island	134835	2012	Y	Y	Y	Y
USA	Hawaii	*Phoebastria nigripes*	Laysan Island	24565	2012	Y	Y	Y	Y
USA	Hawaii	*Phoebastria immutabilis*	Lisianski Island	26500	1982	Y	Y	N	N
USA	Hawaii	*Phoebastria nigripes*	Lisianski Island	2126	2006	Y	Y	N	N
USA	Hawaii	*Phoebastria immutabilis*	Midway Atoll	412776	2014	Y	Y	Y	Y
USA	Hawaii	*Phoebastria nigripes*	Midway Atoll	22525	2014	Y	Y	Y	Y
USA	Hawaii	*Phoebastria immutabilis*	Pearl and Hermes Reef	6900	2003	Y	N	N	N
USA	Hawaii	*Phoebastria nigripes*	Pearl and Hermes Reef	6116	2003	Y	Y	Y	N

ANNEX 2. Bycatch data for latest fishing year available, as reported by Parties and collaborating Range States.

	Fishery	Year	Annual Effort	Effort Unit	% obsrvd	Observed bycatch rate	Observed bycatch rate unit (birds/)	total birds caught (annual)	estimated/ observed	ID'ed Albatrosses caught	ID'ed ACAP Petrels caught
Argentina	Congeladores - Merluza de Cola, Polaca y Merluza Negra	2012				0.0949	sets hauled	13	Observed	11	0
	Congeladores - *Merluza hubbsi*	2010				0.2105	sets hauled	36	Observed	31	2
	Congeladores - Palangreros	2012				0.065	1000 hooks	15	Observed	15	0
	Congeladores - Tangoneros	2012				0.0059	sets hauled	10	Observed	1	0
	Costeros - Flota Amarilla de Rawson	2012				0.0232	sets hauled	15	Observed	0	0
	Costeros - Pelagicas - Red De Media Agua	2012				1	1000 hooks	18	Observed	2	0
	Fresqueros Altura - *Merluza hubbsi*	2012				0.0401	sets hauled	14	Observed	6	0
Australia	Eastern Tuna and Billfish	2013	6 756 421	hooks set	6.3	0	1000 hooks	0	Observed	0	0
	Gillnet, Hook & Trap - longline sector	2013	4 893 667	hooks set	13.1	0.0687	1000 hooks	44	Observed	3	9
	Great Australian Bight Trawl Sector	2013	4 391	tows	0	-	tows	0	Observed	-	-
	Heard Island & McDonald Islands - Longline	2013	6 729 650	hooks set	100	0.0001	1000 hooks	1	Observed	0	0
	Heard Island and McDonald Islands - Trawl	2013	708	tows	100	0.0028	tows	2	Observed	1	0
	Macquarie Island - Longline	2013	1 327 410	hooks set	100	0	1000 hooks	0	Observed	0	0
	Macquarie Island - Trawl	2013	174	tows	100	0	tows	0	Observed	0	0
	South-East Trawl including Victorian Inshore Trawl	2013	22 607	tows	3.4	0.0618	tows	47	Reported caught (by fisher/other)	15	0
	Western Tuna and Billfish	2013	609 995	hooks set	0	-	1000 hooks	0	Observed	-	-
Brazil	Monkfish gillnet	2012	256	hauls	-	0.0039	Netting fishing observed (each c. 45 m)	210	Observed	0	0
	Pelagic Longline Fishery - Industrial fleet	2013	4 127 780	hooks set (reported from logbooks)	-	2.8119	1000 hooks	21	Observed	19	2
	Pelagic Longline Fishery - Foreign-owned fishing boats rented by Brazilian fishing enterprises	2011	3 481 796	observed hooks (estimated by avg. no. hooks and no. of observed sets)	-			623	Estimated from observer	198	143

	Fishery	Year	Annual Effort	Effort Unit	% obsrvd	Observed bycatch rate	Observed bycatch rate unit (birds/)	total birds caught (annual)	estimated/ observed	ID'ed Albatrosses caught	ID'ed ACAP Petrels caught
Canada	Commercial Pacific Halibut fishery (west coast of Canada)	2009	5 854	sets/tows	10.8	0.1889	set/tow	119		11	0
	Commercial Pacific Salmon gillnet fishery	2010	76 960	sets (estimated by avg. no. sets and no. of boats)	1.4	0.0567	set hauled	63		0	0
	Commercial Rockfish (west coast)	2009	4 749	sets/tows	10.3	0.191	set/tow	93		0	0
Chile	Pesquería de arrastre fabrica merluza del sur (*Merluccius australis*) y congrio dorado (*Genypterus blacodes*)	2013	2 964	horas de arrastre		1.2154	horas observadas	294	Estimated from observer	281	3
	Pesquería de arrastre fabrica Surimero	2013	1514.3	horas de arrastre		0.1961	horas de arrastre	1	Estimated from observer	1	0
	Pesquería de arrastre hielero de merluza del sur y congrio dorado	2013	2836.8	horas de arrastre		0.6504	horas de arrastre	16	Estimated from observer	11	4
	Gillnets Swordfish Fishery	2013	316	trips with caugth		0	trips	0	Estimated from observer	-	-
	Pelagic longline	2013	409 275	hooks set	43.1	0.0057	1000 hooks	1	Estimated from observer	1	0
	Pelagic longline	2013	531 618	hooks	65.6	0.0086	1000 hooks	-	Estimated from observer	2	1
	Pesquería merluza del sur (*Merluccius australis*), flota palangre industrial.	2013	7 812 059	hooks	1.2	0.0218	1000 hooks	2	Estimated from observer	0	0
	Tootfish's fishery, Bacalao de profundidad Industrial	2013	16 802 703	hooks set	2.6	0.0163	1000 hooks	0	Estimated from observer	4	0
Ecuador	Artisanal demersal longline fishery in Santa Rosa	2010	79	vessel days fishing	-	1.5	trip	27	Observed	19	8
France	Pêcherie palangrière Ã la Legine Australe	2012						220	Estimated from extrapolation controleur _ calendrier CCAMLR	-	-

	Fishery	Year	Annual Effort	Effort Unit	% obsrvd	Observed bycatch rate	Observed bycatch rate unit (birds/)	total birds caught (annual)	estimated/ observed	ID'ed Albatrosses caught	ID'ed ACAP Petrels caught
New Zealand	Deepwater trawl	2013	1 983	tows	9	0.0112	tows	2	Observed	1	0
	Demersal longline	2013	10 667	sets	1.2	0.016	sets hauled	2	Observed	0	0
	Inshore trawl	2013	37 188	tows	0.6	0.0047	tows	1	Observed	1	0
	Middle depth trawl	2013	20 945	tows	34.3	0.0805	tows	578	Observed	176	251
	Pelagic longline	2013	2 427	sets	9.6	0.1159	sets hauled	27	Observed	26	1
	Pelagic trawl	2013	2 056	tows	93.9	0.0275	tows	53	Observed	14	25
Peru	Cerco : Pesca industrial de cerco para anchoveta	2010						33	Estimated from observer	0	0
South Africa	Demersal Trawl OFFSHORE	2010	27 232	sets/tows	1	-	sets/tows	990	birds detected during audit scaled to total fishing effort	-	-
	Patagonian Toothfish Longline	2013	2 027 220	hooks	52.4	0.0011	1000 hooks	12	Observed	2	10
	Tuna / Swordfish Longline (South African vessels only)	2010				0.012	1000 hooks	19	Observed	8	1
	Tuna Longline Fishery - Joint Venture Vessels only	2013	3 155 156	hooks set	100	0.0697	1000 hooks	220	Observed	4	218
Spain	Pesquería dirigida a especies demersales y pelágicas en zonas ICES (VI, VII, VIII y IX)	2009	796	observed sets				1	Observed	-	-
	Palangre de superficie dirigido a pez espada (WCPFC)	2011	51 530	observed hooks				2	Observed	2	0
	Palangre de superficie dirigido a pez espada en océano Índico (IOTC)	2013	180 921	observed hooks				13	Observed	13	0
	Palangre De Superficie Pacífico (IATTC)	2013	132 304	observed hooks				0	Observed	-	-
	Pesquería de Palangre de fondo en el océano Antártico (CCAMLR)	2013	894 411	hooks				0	Observed	-	-
	Pesquería de arrastre de gran altura en Atlántico Sudoeste (ATSW-MALVINAS)	2013	987	observed sets				0	Observed	-	-

	Fishery	Year	Annual Effort	Effort Unit	% obsrvd	Observed bycatch rate	Observed bycatch rate unit (birds/)	total birds caught (annual)	estimated/ observed	ID'ed Albatrosses caught	ID'ed ACAP Petrels caught
United Kingdom	Bluenose/Bluefish (*Hyperoglyphe antarctica*) - Tristan da Cunha	2008	219 634	hooks set	35.6	0.5109	1000 hooks	40	Observed	0	0
	Demersal longline fishery for Patagonian toothfish (*Dissostichus eleginoides*) - Falkland Islands [Islas Malvinas][1]	2012	2 104 836	hooks hauled	4.1	0	1000 hooks	0	Observed	-	-
	Demersal longline fishery for Patagonian toothfish - South Georgia [Islas Georgias del Sur][1]	2013	10 377 303	hooks set	32.6	0.0003	1000 hooks	1	Observed	0	1
	Finfish demersal trawl fishery - Falkland Islands [Islas Malvinas][1]	2012	3 505	vessel days fishing	2.9	0.3137	fishing days	32	Observed	29	3
	Finfish pelagic trawl fishery - Falkland Islands [Islas Malvinas][1]	2012	3	vessel days fishing	100	0	fishing days	0	Observed	-	-
	Illex argentinus jig fishery - Falkland Islands [Islas Malvinas][1]	2012	7 634	vessel days fishing	1.1	0	fishing days	0	Observed	-	-
	Loligo gahi demersal trawl fishery - Falkland Islands [Islas Malvinas][1]	2012	1 956	vessel days fishing	2.1	0	fishing days	0	Observed	-	-
	Trawl fishery for Antarctic krill (South Georgia [Islas Georgias del Sur])[1]	2013	138	vessel days fishing	56.5	0	fishing days	0	Observed	-	-
	Trawl fishery targeting Icefish (*Champsocephalus gunnari*) in CCAMLR 48.3 (South Georgia [Islas Georgias del Sur])[1]	2013	153	tows	100	0.0131	tows	2	Observed	0	2
Uruguay	Palangre pelagico	2007						403		343	60
USA	Alaska demersal longline	2013						3352	Estimated from observer and landings data	386	0
	Alaska Demersal Groundfish Trawl	2013						464	Estimated from observer and landings data	0	0
	At-Sea Hake Trawl (Motherships & Catcher Processors; U.S. West Coast)	2009	1 872	hauls				0	Observed	0	0

	Fishery	Year	Annual Effort	Effort Unit	% obsrvd	Observed bycatch rate	Observed bycatch rate unit (birds/)	total birds caught (annual)	estimated/ observed	ID'ed Albatrosses caught	ID'ed ACAP Petrels caught
	Limited Entry Sablefish-endorsed Fixed Gear (U.S. West Coast)	2008	1 681	landings of target species (mt)				26	Observed	27	0
USA	Open Access Fixed Gear (U.S. West Coast)	2007	582	landings of target species (mt)				1	Observed	1	0
USA	Pacific halibut (Alaska)	2013						50	Estimated from observer and landings data	50	0
USA	Hawaii-based Pelagic Longline, Deep Set	2013				0.0114	1000 hooks	106	Observed	98	0
USA	Hawaii-based Pelagic Longline, Shallow Set	2013	1 000 084	hooks set	100	0.076	1000 hooks	76	Observed	74	0

[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".*

ANNEX 3. Islands where introduced vertebrates are currently present, or have been eradicated since 2004, or eradication is planned (Y) or not (N), with year of planned eradication in brackets.

Blank cells - alien not present.

Island	Jurisdiction	Cattle	Goat	deer	Sheep	Reindeer	European hare	cotton-tail rabbit	Rabbit	Pig	Brushtail possum	Dog	Cat	Common genet	Stoat	Ferret	Polynesian rat	Brown (Norwegian) rat	Black (ship) rat	Unspecified rats	House mouse
Isla de los Estados	Argentina		N	N														N			
Isla Observatorio	Argentina								N									N	N		
Macquarie Island	Australia								2014				2002						2014		2014
Barren	Disputed				N																
Bleaker Island	Disputed												2001					Y			
Burnt Islet	Disputed	N																			
Carcass	Disputed	N			N																
Dyke (Weddell)	Disputed	N			N													N			
East Falkland [1]	Disputed	N			N		N		N				N								N
George Island	Disputed	N			N																N
Governor	Disputed																	2008			
Harcourt Island	Disputed																	Y			
Keppel Island	Disputed												2007					N			
Lively Island	Disputed	N			N																
New Island	Disputed							N					N						N		N
Pebble Island	Disputed	N			N				N				N					N			
Penn	Disputed																	N			

[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".*

Island	Jurisdiction	Cattle	Goat	deer	Sheep	Reindeer	European hare	cotton-tail rabbit	Rabbit	Pig	Brushtail possum	Dog	Cat	Common genet	Stoat	Ferret	Polynesian rat	Brown (Norwegian) rat	Black (ship) rat	Unspecified rats	House mouse
Saddle Island	Disputed																	Y (2011)			
Saunders Island	Disputed	N			N		N						N					N			
Sea Lion	Disputed	2004			2009																
South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)[1]	Disputed					Y												Y (partial 2011)			Y
Speedwell Island	Disputed	N			N																
Steeple Jason	Disputed																				N
Swan Island	Disputed				N													N			
West (Cape Orford)	Disputed																	N			
West Falkland[1]	Disputed				N		N		N				N								N
West Point Island	Disputed				N													N			N
Isla de La Plata	Ecuador												2009								
Amsterdam	France	2010											N					N			
Howe Island	France								N												
Ile aux Cochons	France								N				N								
Ile de la Possession	France																		N		
Ile de l'Est	France								N												
Kerguelen (Grande Terre)	France					N			N				N						N		
Anejima	Japan																	N			
Anijima	Japan																		Y (2010)		
Imotojima	Japan																	N			
Magojima	Japan																			N	
Mukojima	Japan		2002																Y (2010)		
Nakodojima	Japan																		N		
Torishima	Japan																		N		
Isla Guadalupe	Mexico		2010									2007	N								
Antipodes Island	New Zealand																				N
Auckland Island	New Zealand									N			N								N

Island	Jurisdiction	Cattle	Goat	deer	Sheep	Reindeer	European hare	cotton-tail rabbit	Rabbit	Pig	Brushtail possum	Dog	Cat	Common genet	Stoat	Ferret	Polynesian rat	Brown (Norwegian) rat	Black (ship) rat	Unspecified rats	House mouse
Great Barrier Island	New Zealand									N		N	N				N		N		
Little Barrier Island	New Zealand																2004				
South Island	New Zealand	N	N								N	N	N		N	N		N			
Marion Island	South Africa																				N
Cabrera	Spain		N						N			N	Y	N					N		N
Formentera	Spain		N						N				N					N	N		N
Gough Island	United Kingdom																				Y
Inaccessible Island	United Kingdom		N																		
Tristan da Cunha	United Kingdom	N			N														N		N