

 <p>Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Tenth Meeting of the Advisory Committee</b> <i>Wellington, New Zealand, 11 – 15 September 2017</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Performance Indicators on Capacity Building</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Chile, New Zealand,</i></b> <b><i>Secretariat</i></b></p>
---	---

### SUMMARY

This paper presents an updated version of performance indicators on capacity building following the State – Pressure – Response approach for the consideration of the Advisory Committee and to be submitted as interim indicators for the consideration of MoP6. In developing the proposed indicators, and following the approach described in **AC8 Doc 23 Rev 1** and **MoP5 Doc 28**, consideration was given to Article IV of the Agreement text. This Article refers to capacity building in two paragraphs, the first concerning the administration of the Agreement and the second the responsibilities of the Parties.

### RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Advisory Committee analyse the merit of the proposed performance indicators on capacity building following the State – Pressure – Response approach to be submitted as interim indicators for the consideration of the Sixth Meeting of the Parties.

## 1. BACKGROUND

During AC7 and AC8 discussions were held about developing indicators on capacity building ([AC7 Doc 23](#) and [AC8 Doc 23 Rev 1](#)). The Advisory Committee recommended that the indicators should be developed following the State – Pressure – Response approach already considered for the development of other land-based and at-sea indicators. The Fourth Meeting of the Parties approved use and further development of performance indicators concerning bycatch, breeding sites, and status and trends ([MoP4 Report](#), item 7.7), and noted that further intersessional work on developing performance indicators on capacity building was occurring ([MoP5 Doc 28](#)).

This paper presents an updated version of performance indicators on capacity building following the State – Pressure – Response approach for the consideration of the Advisory Committee and to be submitted as interim indicators for the consideration of the Sixth Meeting of the Parties.

## 2. PROPOSED INDICATORS

In developing the proposed indicators, and following the approach described in [AC8 Doc 23 Rev 1](#), and [MoP5 Doc 28](#), consideration was given to Article IV of the Agreement text, which refers to capacity building. In Article IV, two different, related responsibilities are included in two paragraphs, the first concerning the administration of the Agreement and the second the responsibilities of the Parties.

In selecting a particular indicator, consideration should be given to the answer to the fundamental questions raised by the indicator. For example, the Guide to the Development and Use of Indicators of National Biodiversity under the Convention on Biological Diversity describes the meaning of each key question. The purpose of each question is to indicate to users what you want to discuss about the topic. Other questions help to define the purpose of indicators, such as (1) who is the target audience? (2) to what extent is a given indicator able to answer key questions, and (3) what a change in the value of the indicator is showing? Each of these questions has been considered in the development of the indicators presented in this document.

Unlike the “hard” indicators (e.g. survival rates, population trends, and bycatch rates) capacity building indicators may demonstrate the short-term benefits of being part of the Agreement, measured in this case through capacity building. Because in some countries management changes occur every four years (or less), it is desirable to have short-term indicators that highlight the direct benefits of being part of the Agreement. Moreover, the information provided by the indicator may encourage Range States to be part of the Agreement.

### 2.1. INDICATOR ON CAPACITY BUILDING - RESPONSE

#### *AGREEMENT ARTICLE IV - Capacity Building*

1. *“Effective implementation of this Agreement requires assistance to be provided to some Range States, including through research, training or monitoring for implementation of conservation measures for albatrosses and petrels and their habitats, for the management of those habitats as well as for the establishment or improvement of scientific and administrative institutions for the implementation of this Agreement”.*

#### **Indicator 1. Number of meetings, workshops, trainings and other events where ACAP has assisted technically or financially to build capacities among Parties.**

For further use of this indicator, the nature and attendance levels at each event could be included, as well as some indication to allow the categorisation of participants. A mechanism to gather information about the effectiveness of a given event could include the use of review forms for participants to provide feedback on the value of the meeting, and other inputs.

**Key question addressed by this indicator**

What technical and financial assistance has been provided to the Parties (and Range States) to build capacities to facilitate the objective of the Agreement?

**Target audience**

Governmental agencies of ACAP Parties and Range States.

**2.2. INDICATOR ON CAPACITY BUILDING - STATE**

*AGREEMENT ARTICLE IV - Capacity Building*

2. *“The Parties shall give priority to capacity building, through funding, training, information and institutional support, for the implementation of the Agreement”.*

**Indicator 2. Evolution in the number and range of meetings, workshops, trainings and other capacity building events since the Party ratified the Agreement.**

It is important to consider that indicators alone will not enable performance evaluation, as these only indicate the behaviour of a variable, subject to comparative measurement against certain benchmarks. For this indicator it is suggested, as a first analysis, to estimate relevant actions concerning albatrosses and petrels during the three years pre-ratification by each country of the Agreement. This would establish a baseline for comparative reference for successive three-year periods post-ratification.

**Key question addressed by this indicator**

Since the ratification of the Agreement, which actions and/or processes have been carried out concerning capacity building?

**Target audience**

Parties to the Agreement (environment and fishery management agencies, and NGOs)

**3. RECOMMENDATION**

These preliminary indicators are proposed for discussion by the Advisory Committee during AC10. Members are invited to analyse the feasibility of these indicators with a view to their submission as interim indicators for the consideration of the Sixth Meeting of the Parties.