



CONTENTS

1. PURPOSE	1
2. MEMBERSHIP AND MEETING PARTICIPANTS	1
3. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA.....	1
4. PROGRESS REPORTS	2
4.1 Activities undertaken in inter-sessional period by PCSWG.....	2
4.2 Updates on ACAP Species Assessments	2
4.3 Updates on management of land-based threats	3
4.4 Implementation of Species Action Plans	5
5. POPULATION STATUS AND TRENDS	6
5.1 Data updates.....	6
5.2 Current population trends of ACAP species	7
5.3 Status and trends of ACAP species in relation to IUCN Red List category revisions	9
6. DATA GAPS.....	11
6.1 Identification of key gaps in population data.....	11
6.2 Identification of key gaps in tracking data.....	23
7. PRIORITISATION.....	25
7.1 Review high priority species or populations based on terrestrial threats	25
7.2 Review at-sea prioritisation process	25
7.3 Review ACAP Priority Populations for Conservation.....	25
8. ACAP PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	26
8.1 IUCN Red List indicator for ACAP species	26
8.2 Select the most useful indicators of population status and breeding site condition	27
9. BEST PRACTICE GUIDELINES AND OTHER ONLINE RESOURCES.....	27
9.1 Updates to existing guidelines (Eradications, and Guideline Census Methodologies for Surface Nesting Albatrosses and Petrels)	27
9.2 Review new translocation guidelines.....	28
9.3 Review of diseases in ACAP species.....	28
10. PLASTIC BAND COORDINATION.....	29
10.1 Consider progress	29

11. ACAP HOOK REMOVAL GUIDELINES.....	29
11.1 Review draft guidelines.....	29
11.2 Euthanasia options	29
12. PHOTO IDENTIFICATION GUIDE FOR BYCAUGHT SEABIRDS.....	30
12.1 Discussion of concept design	30
13. CONSIDERATION OF BYCATCH ASSESSMENTS.....	30
13.1 Review/update of CCAMLR seabird bycatch risk assessment	30
13.2 Bycatch reporting by Parties.....	31
13.3 Use of lethal experiments to test efficacy of mitigation devices	32
14. REVIEW ACAP-FUNDED PROGRAMMES	32
14.1 Review reports	32
14.2 Funding priorities for 2013	32
14.3 New model for prioritising/funding secondments	32
15. LISTING OF NEW SPECIES ON ANNEX 1	33
15.1 Consider criteria for selection of candidate species	33
15.2 Proposals to list new species on Annex 1	33
16. REVIEW AND INFORMATION	34
16.1 International Albatross and Petrel Conference (Aug 2012).....	34
16.2 Paper on conservation of ACAP species.....	34
16.3 Review online posting/circulation of WG documents.....	35
16.4 Current or recent research on ACAP species	35
17. FUTURE WORK PROGRAMME.....	35
18. REPORTING TO AC7	35
19. ANY OTHER BUSINESS	35
20. CLOSING REMARKS	36
21. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	36
ANNEX 1. LIST OF MEETING PARTICIPANTS AND NON-ATTENDING PCSWG MEMBERS.....	37
ANNEX 2. SPECIALISTS AND TIMEFRAME FOR REVIEW OF SPECIES ASSESSMENTS	39
ANNEX 3. LATEST POPULATION DATA UPDATES	40
ANNEX 4. DRAFT ADVISORY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2013-15	42
ANNEX 5. ARGENTINA STATEMENT	46
ANNEX 6. UNITED KINGDOM STATEMENT.....	47
ANNEX 7. ADDITIONAL ARGENTINA STATEMENT	48

Report of the Population and Conservation Status Working Group – PCSWG1

La Rochelle, France, 29-30 April 2013

1. PURPOSE

This report outlines inter-sessional progress against the Work Programme of the Population and Conservation Status Working Group (hereafter PCSWG or WG), agreed at the ACAP Advisory Committee meeting in 2011 (AC6) and adopted at MoP4 in 2012. The report also reflects discussions and advice resulting from the 1st Meeting of the Population and Conservation Status Working Group (PCSWG1) held on 29-30 April 2013 in La Rochelle, France.

2. MEMBERSHIP AND MEETING PARTICIPANTS

Current PCSWG membership and PCSWG1 meeting participants are listed in **ANNEX 1**. The Co-Convenors of the PCSWG, Richard Phillips and Rosemary Gales, and the Vice-convenors, Henri Weimerskirch and Flavio Quintana, thanked WG members and observers for attending the meeting. The meeting was attended by Working Group members from Australia, Chile, France, New Zealand, South Africa, United Kingdom, United States and BirdLife International, Advisory Committee members from Argentina, Australia and Chile, as well as experts and observers from government agencies and non-government organisations. The WG agreed to review the membership in the inter-sessional period and also that it was important that convenors had the flexibility to invite experts to contribute to the activities of the WG between meetings and/or to attend one or more WG meetings.

ADVICE TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

The Working Group recommends that the Advisory Committee:

- (i) encourages revision of the membership to the PCSWG to maximise active participation by all members, and;
- (ii) endorses the option for Convenors to invite experts to contribute to the activities of the group between meetings and/or to attend Working Group meetings.

3. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The WG accepted the proposed agenda and meeting documents (PCSWG1 Doc 01 and PCSWG1 Doc 02).

4. PROGRESS REPORTS

4.1 Activities undertaken in inter-sessional period by PCSWG

With the assistance of the Science Officer, progress was achieved during the inter-sessional periods particularly in relation to the determination of global trends of ACAP species. The Convenors met on several occasions to progress this task, and the results were reviewed during the course of PCSWG1. Further development of a standard set of data outputs relating to population status and trends was delayed due to unforeseen difficulties with the ACAP database, so this will be a priority during 2013-2014. It is envisaged that these standard summaries of population and demographic monitoring, trends, and breeding site management actions will be included in the resources available on the ACAP website and updated prior to, and following, each WG meeting.

Progress was made in other aspects of the work of the group, particularly in relation to the timely provision of population data by members, data review and validation, and the ongoing development of best practice guidelines and other resource materials.

ADVICE TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

The Working Group recommends that the Advisory Committee:

- (i) endorses the production of standard summaries of population size and trend, demographic monitoring, and breeding site management actions to be published on the ACAP website and updated before, and again following, each Working Group meeting.

4.2 Updates on ACAP Species Assessments

The WG considered the assessments, which summarise current knowledge of biology and conservation of ACAP species, including population trends, distribution and threats etc. It was recognised that these products are a highly effective means of summarising current knowledge, and widely used by a range of stakeholders. The WG recognised the importance of ensuring that these assessments remain up-to-date. The species assessments were originally drafted between 2007 and 2009, and although most have since been updated to some extent, including to reflect changes in IUCN status and new information on population trends and threats, this process has slowed with the expansion in the workload of the Science Officer. The WG agreed that given the utility of these documents, priority should be given to updating all assessments prior to AC8. Consequently, a number of specialists were identified who could assist with these updates, which would be overseen by a panel to ensure consistency of the revisions (**ANNEX 2**). It was anticipated that the revised versions would be available in English by July 2014, and that their translation thereafter into the other two languages of the Agreement should be a priority.

ADVICE TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

The Working Group recommends that the Advisory Committee:

- (i) endorses the expert revision and update of all species assessments prior to AC8, and;

- (ii) endorses the support required to translate of all updated assessments, with a priority for assessments of new species as they become available.

4.3 Updates on management of land-based threats

Feral pig and cat at Auckland Island

Igor Debski (New Zealand) advised that eradication, as opposed to ongoing control, is considered to be the only feasible long term option. Plans based on previous eradications of these species elsewhere were developed, but are not deemed affordable. Cheaper, but higher risk options are currently being investigated, and some initial feasibility work was conducted in the field in January 2013.

House Mice at Gough

The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) and the University of Cape Town (UCT) have continued efforts to assess the impact of House Mice on a range of species at Gough Island, including the ACAP-listed Tristan Albatross, and to continue research on the feasibility and best approach to eradicate House Mice from the island. This has been incorporated into a preliminary Operational Plan to eradicate House Mice. Funding has been provided by the UK Government to the RSPB to support some of the initial high priority actions listed in the plan.

Reindeer at South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)^{1,2,3,4}

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”*

² Regarding the UK's statements over reindeer and rodents in the South Georgias Islands, the Argentine Republic reaffirms its sovereignty rights over the Malvinas Islands, South Georgias and South Sandwich Islands, and the surrounding maritime areas, which are an integral part of its national territory. Being those islands illegally occupied by the United Kingdom, they are subject to a sovereignty dispute which has been recognized by the United Nations and other international fora, requesting both governments to resume negotiations in order to find, as soon as possible, a peaceful solution to it. Argentina rejects once again the aforementioned occupation, any unilateral act from it emanated, as well as any reference to illegitimate “authorities” of those territories or their presentations pretending an international status that they do not have.

³ The United Kingdom has no doubt about its sovereignty over the Falkland Islands and South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime areas of both Territories. The Republic of Argentina continues to extend the geographical area under dispute to include South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands (SGSSI). The United Nations has never issued any resolutions referencing a sovereignty dispute over SGSSI.

The Government of the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland attaches great importance to the principle of self-determination as set out in Article 1.2 of the Charter of the United Nations and Article 1 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. That fundamental principle underlies the United Kingdom's position on the Falkland Islands - it is a universal right for all peoples. There can be no negotiations on the sovereignty of the Falkland Islands unless and until such time as the islanders so wish. The result of the Falkland Islands March 2013 referendum on their political status has clearly expressed to the international community the wishes of the people who live there to maintain their relationship with the United Kingdom as a British Overseas Territory.

⁴ In relation to footnote 3, Argentina presented an additional note as an annex to the Report (Annex 7).

Anton Wolfaardt (UK) reported that the Government of South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands (Islas Georgias del Sur e Islas Sandwich del Sur)¹ are leading a process, in collaboration with the Norwegian Nature Inspectorate, to eradicate Reindeer from South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)¹. The eradication operation will be implemented in two phases. The first phase targeted the eradication of the herd on the Busen Peninsula, and was completed in March/April 2013. The remaining herd is on the Barff Peninsula and will be targeted in the second phase, which is scheduled for 2014. Reindeer eradication is being co-ordinated with the rodent eradication initiative being implemented by the South Georgia Heritage Trust.

Rodents at South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)^{1,2,3,4}

The baiting operation to remove rodents (Brown Rat and House Mouse) from South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)¹ is being undertaken by the South Georgia Heritage Trust (with USD 8 million raised to date) in three phases (<http://www.sght.org/sght-habitat-restoration-project>). In Phase 1 in 2011, bait was spread over 10% of South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)¹; thorough subsequent monitoring has revealed no sign of rats and so after 2 years this can be regarded as successful. Phase 2, still in progress in May 2013, has so far involved bait spreading over another 40% of the island (the western part, which includes the areas with mice); Phase 3, to complete the task, is planned for 2015.

Macquarie Island Pest Eradication Plan

The Macquarie Island Pest Eradication Plan (MIPEP) is a \$25 million (AUD) eradication plan targeting European Rabbits, Ship Rats and House Mice that is jointly funded by the Australian Commonwealth and Tasmanian State Governments. The baiting phase was completed in July 2011, after an initial attempt to broadcast baits in 2010 was abandoned due to bad weather. An intensive hunting phase followed aerial baiting, with hunters and detector dogs traversing the island. A comprehensive non-target mortality plan was implemented to monitor and minimise mortality of non-target bird species. This plan included substantial efforts to detect and remove bird carcasses in order to minimise secondary and tertiary poisoning. During the MIPEP over 2400 bird carcasses were detected, including Northern and Southern giant Petrels, Kelp Gulls, Brown Skuas and ducks. Eighty-four percent of giant petrels killed were males. There has been no sign of the target species for almost two years. Bird monitoring is continuing to quantify the impacts of the MIPEP and the response of these populations in a landscape free of introduced pests.

Wake Atoll Rat Eradication Project

Feral cats were eradicated from Wake Atoll in 2004, and a project to eradicate Polynesian and Asian House Rats was implemented in May 2012, funded by the US Air Force. Brodifacoum was spread aerially, by hand, and using bait stations and bait bolas. Rats were observed within a few months of the baiting, and although this led to further hand broadcasting and deployment of bait stations, this was unsuccessful, and the rat population has rebounded. Genetic analysis indicates that the rats caught after the baiting were probably survivors of the original population. All those identified to date have been Polynesian Rats, so Asian House Rats may have been eradicated successfully. An independent review by several international experts is seeking to identify the cause(s) of failure.

Midway Atoll invasive plant management

The US Fish and Wildlife Service, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, and American Bird Conservancy are 2 years into a 5 year programme to rid Eastern Island at Midway Atoll of the invasive plant golden crownbeard (*Verbesina encelioides*) primarily because of its negative effects on breeding Black-footed and Laysan Albatrosses.

The WG welcomed the updates on these important eradication programmes and also requested that the results of the programmes are well documented and published so that lessons learned can be applied as widely as possible in future programmes.

ADVICE TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

The Working Group recommends that the Advisory Committee:

- (i) recognises the advances that are being achieved in planning and implementing large-scale eradication programmes that will ultimately benefit the status of ACAP species;
- (ii) encourages the thorough documentation and dissemination of details of the programmes, including non target impacts and mitigation, so that lessons and benefits can be widely applied in the future.

4.4 Implementation of Species Action Plans

Henri Weimerskirch (France) presented PCSWG1 Doc 08 and AC7 Inf 03, which provide updates on progress with the National Plan of Action for Amsterdam Albatross, led by the Natural Reserve and the CNRS, with the help of the French Polar Institute. Six actions have progressed since AC6. Monitoring indicates an increase of the population to 38 pairs in 2012. However, breeding success has declined progressively. Since 2011, a comprehensive study of disease at Amsterdam Island shows that avian cholera and Erysipelas were present in all five species of seabird that were screened, including Amsterdam, Indian Yellow-nosed and Sooty Albatrosses, as well as in Brown Skuas that commute between albatross colonies. Current studies have focused on identifying the reservoirs of the bacteria (environment and/or birds), the disseminators (birds, human, introduced mammals), genetic characterization of *P. multocida* isolates (MLST), and on the possibility of producing an auto vaccine. In addition, during the past 2 years a tracking programme including all age classes has provided comprehensive data on the distribution of Amsterdam Albatross. This shows that the species ranges widely over the Indian Ocean north of the sub-tropical front, from the Benguela Current to Tasmania. It was therefore possible to measure the extent of overlap with fisheries: this was mainly with Japanese and Taiwanese long-line fisheries. Finally, video monitoring of nests shows limited presence of rats; feral cats were not recorded.

Given the risk of disease transmission highlighted in PCSWG1 Doc 08 and AC7 Inf 03, the WG recognised the importance of implementing effective biosecurity protocols, and noted that generic guidance is provided in the Biosecurity Guidelines available on the ACAP website. The WG also requested that site custodians check that the information in the ACAP

database accurately reflects whether there is a current biosecurity plan for each breeding site.

The Argentine delegation advised the meeting that it highly appreciates the National Action Plan presented by France (AC7 Inf 03), but noted that the map which appears on page 22 of this document refers to CCAMLR as a RFMO, with further references to this on pages 36 and 79. The Argentine delegation recalled that CCAMLR is not an RFMO and that this has been recognised by the Commission of CCAMLR (Final Report of the CCAMLR Commission, 31st Meeting in Hobart, Australia, 23/10/2012 – 1/11/2012). The French representative at the meeting (Henri Weimerskirch) acknowledged this error in the document.

Flavio Quintana (Argentina) advised that a final draft of the National Plan for the Conservation of the Southern Giant Petrel has been completed by Argentina during the inter-sessional period. This version is currently awaiting official approval from the national authorities and, if finalised, will be presented at AC8.

5. POPULATION STATUS AND TRENDS

5.1 Data updates

Parties have made a concerted effort to update the ACAP database prior to the WG meeting and so the database is more up-to-date than in previous years (**ANNEX 3**). However, important data for some populations remain outstanding and this hinders progress in regional and global assessments of population status and trends.

Graham Robertson (Australia) presented results of recent censuses of Black-browed and Grey-headed Albatrosses in Chile, including at the Diego Ramirez and Idefonso archipelagos (PCSWG1 Doc 03 Rev 1). This indicates population increases of 23% between 2002 and 2011 (~2.5% annual increase) for Black-browed Albatross, potentially related to a reduction since 2007 in albatross bycatch to negligible levels in the Patagonian Toothfish fishery, associated with a switch to the Chilean method (also known as trotline with nets) of fishing. In contrast, Grey-headed Albatross numbers at Diego Ramirez remained stable, likely due to low overlap with fisheries off southern Chile. This study illustrates the clear benefits of changes in fishing practices that reduce detrimental effects on seabirds

Henri Weimerskirch (France) presented PCSWG1 Doc 11, which reported a decline of 9.8% from 1983 to 2013 in the Indian Yellow-nosed Albatross at Amsterdam Island (which holds 70% of the global population). The limited data available (two counts) for Sooty Albatross at the same site suggest a 17% decline over the last 10 years.

Anton Wolvaardt (UK) reported on an analysis of aerial and ground surveys of all breeding sites of Black-browed Albatross in the Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)¹ in 2010 (PCSWG1 Doc 14). The overall population was estimated at 475,500-535,000 pairs, representing an increase of >4% per annum since 2005. Although there are still some difficulties regarding the interpretation of earlier census data, the population has clearly increased since 2000.

The Argentine Delegation informed the meeting that it would present a note to the Secretary concerning PCSWG1 Doc 14. The Argentine Delegation has asked the Executive Secretary

to circulate this note among the delegations and the members of this Working Group, and to attach the note as an Annex to the final report of the PCSWG1. The UK presented a note in response. These notes are included in **ANNEXES 5** and **6** of this report.

Pep Arcos (SEO) reported that at-sea surveys indicate a total population of approximately 25,000 Balearic Shearwaters, which is difficult to reconcile with the 3,200 breeding pairs estimated at breeding colonies (PCSWG Doc 15). It is unlikely that this reflects an increase in the overall population, given current demographic parameters and the known and potential impacts of fisheries bycatch.

ADVICE TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

The Working Group recommends that the Advisory Committee:

- (i) continues to encourage data holders and site custodians to ensure that data contributions are complete and up-to-date, including the information pertaining to ongoing population and demographic monitoring programmes

5.2 Current population trends of ACAP species

The result of inter-sessional work on species' current global trends is presented in **Table 1**. The approach combines the census information submitted to the ACAP database and results of published population models.

Table 1. 2013 Summary of status and trends of ACAP albatross and petrel species.

IUCN Status 2013 ¹	Common name	Number of sites (ACAP) ²	Single Country Endemic	Annual breeding pairs (ACAP) ³	Trend Confidence	Population Trend 1991-2011 ⁴
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	Black-browed Albatross	65		672,411	High	↑
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-footed Albatross	13		68,962	High	↑
VU	Black Petrel	2	NZ	881	Medium	↓
VU	Campbell Albatross	2	NZ	22,093	-	?
VU	Chatham Albatross	1	NZ	5,245	Medium	↔
VU	Grey-headed Albatross	29		94,580	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	↓

IUCN Status 2013 ¹	Common name	Number of sites (ACAP) ²	Single Country Endemic	Annual breeding pairs (ACAP) ³	Trend Confidence	Population Trend 1991-2011 ⁴
VU	Westland Petrel	1	NZ	4,000	Low	↔
VU	White-chinned Petrel	73		1,057,930	Very Low	↓
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 2013. *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

The above table lists the status of the 30 seabird species included by ACAP in Annex 1 of the Agreement; collectively these species comprise almost 3 million pairs breeding at 571 sites, across multiple jurisdictions. Of the 22 species of listed albatrosses, three are *Critically Endangered*, five are *Endangered*, nine are *Vulnerable* and four are *Near Threatened*. Of the eight petrel species, one is *Critically Endangered*, four are *Vulnerable*, one is *Near Threatened* and two species are *Least Concern*.

During the inter-sessional period, and in the margins of the PCSWG1 meeting, substantial progress was made in determining the population trend of ACAP species over the last twenty years (since 1991). 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. For the ACAP species, 9 (30%) were considered to be increasing, 11 (37%) to be decreasing, seven (23%) to be stable, and the trend for three others (10%, all New Zealand endemics) over this period remains unknown. The confidence of the assigned trend reflects both the accuracy and extent of the population data. Data-holders within the WG collectively considered this issue and concluded that approximately half of the assigned trends were of high or medium confidence, whilst there was reduced confidence surrounding the remaining assignments largely as a result of the trends being determined from a relatively small proportion of the species' breeding population.

ADVICE TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

The Working Groups recommends that the Advisory Committee:

- (i) notes that this is the most comprehensive assessment of current population trends for ACAP species to date.

5.3 Status and trends of ACAP species in relation to IUCN Red List category revisions

Cleo Small (BirdLife International) reported on the current round of evaluations of ACAP taxa, as part of the regular reviews of the IUCN Red List, which suggests six potential changes in status (PCSWG1 Doc 04). Working Group participants were encouraged to actively engage with the relevant BirdLife discussion fora, which will remain active until July 2013, with the final decisions expected to be announced in September 2013.

In reviewing the data contributing to these six assessments, the WG recommended that:

- a. The population estimates be carefully reviewed by the ACAP Secretariat and BirdLife after AC7 to ensure that the most recent and accurate estimates are used, and to consider whether an average value for the initial and final population size may be more appropriate in some cases;
- b. The methodology used to derive generation times be reviewed, particularly to ensure that the estimates of survival rate reflect populations under natural conditions without anthropogenic impacts, and to take account of known demographic traits.

In a number of cases, participants identified that new population data were available and corrected some errors in the spreadsheets underlying PCSWG Doc 04. This included starting population estimates for Black-footed Albatross, new counts of Black-browed and Grey-headed Albatrosses in Chile, Grey-headed Albatross at Campbell Island, and White-chinned Petrel at South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)¹.

The WG had the following comments in relation to the six potential Red List changes:

Black-footed Albatross: downlist from Vulnerable to Near Threatened?

The current status of Black-footed Albatross was based on suspected rapid ongoing population declines over three generations (A4bd). More recent data and analyses suggest that the species does not qualify as Vulnerable under A4, nor as Near-Threatened, because of the stable or increasing population. However, modelling of the effects of bycatch in causing potential future population declines, suggests a precautionary listing of Near Threatened under criterion A3d, i.e., a projected decline approaching 30% over the next 56 years, might be more appropriate. A US review has recognised that Black-footed Albatross and Laysan Albatross are exceptional in that the vast majority of the world population nests on islands <10 m a.s.l. Recent models that consider dynamic wave action, rather than passive “bathtub” models of inundation, predict greater loss than anticipated of nesting habitat at lower values of predicted sea level rise for several important Black-footed Albatross breeding islands (Storlazzi *et al.* 2013⁵; <http://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2013/1069/of2013-1069.pdf>). These more realistic models, in concert with accelerating sea level rise suggest repeated catastrophic reproductive failure in the future caused by loss of nest sites, resulting in population trajectories not easily predicted by current trends. This highlights the difficulty of incorporating climate change modelling into IUCN species listings using the current process.

⁵ 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 Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument—a comparison of passive versus dynamic inundation models: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2013-1069. 78 pp.

Amsterdam Albatross: downlist from Critically Endangered to Endangered?

The WG recognised that this population has steadily increased over the last 30 years and that its status as Critically Endangered depended on the projection of population declines which had not eventuated. Although this species would currently qualify as Endangered under criterion D, the WG considered that the potential risk of transmission of pathogenic disease to this tiny population, with consequential population decline, warranted its retention in the category of Critically Endangered.

Black-browed Albatross: downlist from Endangered to Near Threatened?

There have been substantial recent increases in the populations in the Falklands (Malvinas)¹ (PCSWG1 Doc 14) which accounts for 70% of the world population, and Chile (PCSWG1 Doc 03 Rev 1). However, the WG agreed that although population data alone would suggest listing as Least Concern, current levels of bycatch support precautionary listing as Near Threatened under criterion A4.

White-capped Albatross: uplist to Vulnerable?

The WG recognised that the data in PCSWG Doc 04 represented a persuasive case for up-listing to Vulnerable. However, Igor Debski (New Zealand) informed the meeting that the two latest aerial photographic censuses suggest that the breeding population may be substantially larger than anticipated from counts in preceding years, which may indicate a lower rate of decline or even stability. Further analyses will be available by June 2013, and Dr Debski was encouraged to submit these to the BirdLife Discussion Forum.

Grey-headed Albatross: uplist from Vulnerable to Endangered?

Population data from South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)¹ suggest a continuing, major decline, and support the up-listing of this species to Endangered. This is despite recent unpublished information from New Zealand suggesting that the Campbell Island population has stabilised following the major decline until 1997.

White-chinned Petrel: uplist from Vulnerable to Endangered?

The WG recognised that a change in status would depend largely on the situation at South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)¹, which represents a substantial proportion of the global population. The WG noted the need for an updated assessment of this population prior to any change in status. In the meantime, it was suggested that its status as Vulnerable be maintained.

The Working Group noted the importance of the IUCN Red List reviews and encouraged participants to provide input into the BirdLife Discussion Forums.

Recognising the difficulties presented by trend analysis involving relatively short time series and missing data, Neil Klaer (Australia) and Martin Cryer (New Zealand) suggested that state-space models, which use Bayesian techniques, might merit investigation. These describe the transition from one year to the next - the population at time t is described as a function of the population at time $t-1$. The function can be a simple smoother such as a random walk that does not rely on any knowledge of dynamics of the population. Improved functions could take account of information on population characteristics (e.g. adult survival

rate). State-space models explicitly separate process error from observation error, and can potentially make better use of observation error estimates normally associated with census counts of seabirds. A simple single model structure might be applicable across most species, or tailored according to available parameter estimates. WG members reflected that the group had previously considered a range of alternative statistical approaches to analyses of population trends (AC2 Doc 32). It was suggested that interested experts could review the ACAP data most suitable for these purposes and potentially develop an options paper describing trend analyses to be tabled for consideration at AC8.

ADVICE TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

The Working Group recommends that the Advisory Committee:

- (i) requests the ACAP Secretariat transmit the advice above to the BirdLife Secretariat for incorporation into the current re-assessments of the IUCN conservation status of ACAP species, and encourage WG members and other experts to participate in the discussion fora for addressing these issues.

6. DATA GAPS

6.1 Identification of key gaps in population data

Table 2 summarises data gaps for populations comprising at least 5% of the global total where a population census has not been carried out at any site within an island group in the last 10 and 20 years. Almost all of these populations are in jurisdictions which have very high numbers of species and breeding sites.

At the island group level, for populations that represent at least 5% of the global population:

- seven have not been counted for over 20 years (since 1992), and;
- 12 have not been counted for over 10 years (since 2002).

The most concerning gaps in information are for the New Zealand endemic Campbell Albatross which was last censused in 1998, the Grey Petrel on Antipodes Island (last counted in 2001) and the Kerguelen and Auckland Island populations of Light-mantled Albatross (last surveyed in 1987 and 1973 respectively). Paul Sagar (New Zealand) advised that recent data for the two New Zealand species (2009/2010 for Grey Petrel at Antipodes Island, and 2012 for Campbell Albatross and Grey-headed Albatross) are currently being analysed and will allow updates later in 2013. Henri Weimerskirch (France) also advised that recent data for the Northern Giant Petrel from Kerguelen will be available in the coming months.

Table 2. Populations at the island group level that comprise at least 5% of the species' total global breeding pairs, for which there has been no monitoring in the last 20 or 10 years, at any site within the given island group.

Jurisdiction	Island Group	Species	% global pop	Last year of data
Island group populations (>5% global breeding pairs) with no population data in last 20 years (post 1992)				
France	Crozet	Indian Yellow-nosed Albatross	6	1982
		Grey-headed Albatross	8	1985
	Kerguelen	Grey-headed Albatross	18	1984
		Northern Giant Petrel*	15	1987
		Light-mantled Albatross	40	1987
New Zealand	Auckland Island	White-chinned Petrel	9	1988
		Light-mantled Albatross	42	1973
Island group populations (>5% global breeding pairs) with no population data in last 10 years (post 2002)				
<i>All six populations above plus:</i>				
UK	Gough	Grey Petrel	22	2001
New Zealand	Antipodes	Grey Petrel*	66	2001
	Campbell	Grey-headed Albatross*	7	1997
		Campbell Albatross*	100	1998
		Light-mantled Albatross	17	1996

* analysis of recent data in progress.

In addition to the gaps identified above at the island group level (Campbell Albatross, Grey Petrel, Light-mantled Albatross), 12 important sites (>10% of known global breeding pairs) of 9 ACAP species on 9 islands have not been counted in the last 10 years, with 6 of those populations not counted in the last 20 years (**Tables 3a and 3b**). Most significantly, at the site level, current data are absent for important sites for Atlantic Yellow-nosed and Sooty Albatrosses at Tristan da Cunha (UK), and Indian Yellow-nosed Albatross and Wandering Albatross at Crozet Islands (France).

Table 3a. Sites with >10% of species' global breeding pairs where population census has not been conducted in the last 10 years (latest estimate is pre: 2002)

Jurisdiction	Island Group	Breeding Site	Species	Population Estimate (annual breeding pairs)	% of total known population	Survey Accuracy	year of estimate
Disputed – South Atlantic	South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur) ¹	Bird Island (SGSSI (IGSISS)) ¹	Northern Giant Petrel	2 062	19	High	1996
New Zealand	New Zealand	Little Barrier Island	Black Petrel	100	10	Medium	1998
	Campbell Islands	Campbell Island	Light-mantled Albatross	1 600	16	Low	1996
			Campbell Albatross*	22 093	100		1998
	Antipodes Islands	Antipodes Island	Grey Petrel*	53 000	67	Medium	2001
United Kingdom	Gough	Gough Island	Grey Petrel	10 000-25 000	13-31	Unknown	2001

*recent data analysis in progress

Table 3b. Sites with >10% of species' global breeding pairs where population census has not been conducted for at least 20 years (latest estimate is pre 1992, plus all sites in Table 2a).

Jurisdiction	Island Group	Breeding Site	Species	Population Estimate (annual breeding pairs)	% of total known population	Survey Accuracy	Year of estimate
France	Crozet	Ile aux Cochons	Wandering Albatross	1 060	13		1981
		Ile de l'Est	Sooty Albatross	1 300	11	Medium	1984
			Grey Petrel	2 000-9 000	2-11	Low	1982
		Ile des Pingouins	Indian Yellow-nosed albatross	5 800	15	High	1984
United Kingdom	Tristan da Cunha	Tristan da Cunha	Sooty Albatross	2 000-3 000	16-25	Unknown	1974
			Atlantic Yellow-nosed Albatross	16 000-30 000	48-89	Low	1974

Demographic information for ACAP species

ACAP recognises the importance of studies on survival rates and productivity that are required to inform understanding of population trends. Based on information provided to the ACAP database and at this and previous Working Group meetings (**Table 4 and 5**), information exists on:

- Adult survival for 29 species (no data for Spectacled Petrel),
- Juvenile survival for 21 species (no data for nine species, seven of which are endemics - New Zealand (5 species), UK (1 species), Japan (1 species),
- Productivity data available for 27 species (no data for three species – all of which are endemics – New Zealand (2 species) and UK (1 species).

Table 4: ACAP species for which no demographic data is known

Demographic statistics	ACAP species	Jurisdiction	
No data on adult survival	Spectacled Petrel	UK	
No data on juvenile survival (9 species)	Northern Giant Petrel	Australia	
		Disputed – South Atlantic	
		France	
		NZ	
		South Africa	
	Chatham Albatross Salvin’s Albatross Southern Royal Albatross Westland Petrel White-capped Albatross	NZ	
		Light-mantled Albatross	Australia
			Disputed – South Atlantic
			France
			New Zealand
	South Africa		
Short-tailed Albatross	Japan		
Spectacled Petrel	UK		
No data on productivity (3 species)	Chatham Albatross	NZ	
	Salvin’s Albatross	NZ	
	Spectacled Petrel	UK	

There are no survival or breeding success data for the Spectacled Petrel, and data are extremely limited for a range of other species, including Chatham, Salvin’s and White-capped Albatrosses. Whilst noting the absence of demographic data for the above species, it is encouraging that for some other species there are survival and productivity studies at multiple sites, particularly for Wandering, Grey-headed and Black-browed Albatrosses (**Table 5**). This is important as these rates differ between sites, reflecting the varying population trends and trajectories.

Table 5: Demographic information for all ACAP species

() indicate data collection in progress

IUCN status	ACAP species	Number of sites	Number of island groups	Number of sites with:		
				Adult survival data	Juvenile survival data	Breeding success data
CR	Amsterdam Albatross	1	1	1	1	1
VU	Antipodean Albatross	6	3	2	2	2
CR	Tristan Albatross	1	1	1	(1)	1
VU	Southern royal Albatross	4	2	2	0	2
VU	Wandering Albatross	28	5	4	4	6
EN	Northern royal Albatross	5	3	2	1	4
LC	Southern giant Petrel	119	25	3	1	14
LC	Northern giant Petrel	50	9	2	0	3
VU	Short-tailed Albatross	2	2	1	0	1
NT	Laysan Albatross	17	5	1 (+1)	(1)	1
CR	Waved Albatross	3	2	1	(1)	1
EN	Black-footed Albatross	13	4	1 (+1)	(1)	?
EN	Sooty Albatross	15	6	1	1	3
NT	Light-mantled Albatross	71	9	2	0	5
VU	White-chinned Petrel	73	8	1	1	3
NT	Grey Petrel	17	9	(1)	(1)	2
VU	Spectacled Petrel	1	1	0	0	0
VU	Black Petrel	2	1	1	2	2
VU	Westland Petrel	1	1	1	0	1
CR	Balearic Shearwater	5	1	1	1	2
NT	Buller's Albatross	10	4	2	1	2
EN	Indian Yellow-nosed Albatross	6	4	1	1	1
NT	Shy Albatross	3	1	1	(1)	1
EN	Atlantic Yellow-nosed Albatross	6	2	2	1	3
VU	Grey-headed Albatross	29	8	4	3	4
VU	Chatham Albatross	1	1	1	0	0
VU	Campbell Albatross	2	1	1	1	1
EN	Black-browed Albatross	66	15	4	3	7
VU	Salvin's Albatross	12	4	1	0	0
NT	White-capped Albatross	5	3	(1)	0	1

ACAP population trends - Jurisdiction assessment

Comprehensive population studies are essential to monitoring the effectiveness of management actions and the success of the Agreement. **Table 6** summarises availability (or otherwise) of trend data in the last decade (2002-2011, trend starting or ending, or contained during this time interval) at island group level (trend available for at least one part-site or site

in the island group, calculated for island groups that hold >1% of global total breeding pairs). The 30 species are divided into 3 categories: well known (75-100% island groups have trend), moderately known (30-50 % island groups have trend), and poorly known (less than 30% of island groups for these species have any trend information for the period specified).

This table also summarises the availability of recent trend data by jurisdiction. Generally, species with the best data include Wandering Albatross and seven endemic species, species with a moderate level of information on population trend at the island group level are more widely distributed between both island groups and jurisdictions. The species for which there is least information include both species of Yellow-nosed Albatross, Campbell Albatross, Black-footed Albatross, and four species of burrowing petrels.

Table 6. Gaps at island group level (Island groups with >1% of global breeding pairs) for recent population trend (last 10 years) data summarised by species and jurisdictions as submitted to the ACAP database by 29 April 2013. Blank cells indicate that there is no island group population greater than 1% of global breeding pairs in this jurisdiction (see text for more details).

ACAP species	% of all island groups (with >1% global population) with trend data 2002-2011	% of island groups in each jurisdiction that have trend data during the period 2002 - 2011														
		Antarctic	Argentina	Australia	Chile	Disputed-South Atlantic	Disputed – North Pacific	Ecuador	France	Japan	Mexico	New Zealand	South Africa	Spain	United Kingdom	USA
Amsterdam Albatross	100							100								
Southern royal Albatross	100										100					
Wandering Albatross	100			100		100		100				100				
Waved Albatross	100						100									
Spectacled Petrel	100														100	
Black Petrel	100										100					
Shy Albatross	100			100												
Chatham Albatross	100										100					
White-capped Albatross	100										100					
Northern royal Albatross	100										100					
Tristan Albatross	100													100		
Laysan Albatross	100															100
Buller's Albatross	67										67					
Black-browed Albatross	60				33	100										
Northern Giant Petrel	50			100		100		50			0	100				
Antipodean Albatross	50										50					
Short-tailed Albatross	50						0		100							
Salvin's Albatross	50										50					

ACAP species	% of all island groups (with >1% global population) with trend data 2002-2011	% of island groups in each jurisdiction that have trend data during the period 2002 - 2011													
		Antarctic	Argentina	Australia	Chile	Disputed-South Atlantic	Disputed – North Pacific	Ecuador	France	Japan	Mexico	New Zealand	South Africa	Spain	United Kingdom
Light-mantled Albatross	44			50		100		50			0	100			
Southern Giant Petrel	42	36	50	50	0	67		50				100		0	
Grey-headed Albatross	38			100	0	100		0			0	100			
Sooty Albatross	40							33				100		0	
Black-footed Albatross	33								0						100
White-chinned Petrel	17					0		50			0	0			
Grey Petrel	0							0			0			0	
Indian Yellow-nosed Albatross	0							0				0			
Westland Petrel	0										0				
Balearic Shearwater	0												0		
Atlantic Yellow-nosed Albatross	0													0	
Campbell Albatross	0										0				

Priority programmes.

The WG reviewed the priority programmes identified at AC6 for ACAP species, by jurisdiction, and the progress that has been achieved against these priorities since AC6 (2011).

Population (census), productivity (breeding success) and demographic (breeding age, breeding rate and survival) monitoring is intended to be annual unless stated otherwise.

ANTARCTICA: one species; 49 sites, 2 of unknown size.

Priority programmes:

(i) Resurvey Southern Giant Petrel at King George and Nelson islands. **Progress since AC6:** *None reported.*

New (ii) Maintain long-term population and productivity monitoring at Signy Island, South Orkney Islands.

ARGENTINA: one species at four sites, population size known for all sites but no recent breeding pairs trend data; no survival data; potential impact of introduced species at Isla de los Estados.

Priority programmes:

(i) Maintain population and productivity monitoring at Isla Arce and Gran Robredo. **Progress since AC6:** *Maintained long-term programmes.*

(ii) Resurvey the two sites at Isla de los Estados. **Progress since AC6:** *None.*

AUSTRALIA: eight species at 17 sites in three island groups; 18% of populations of unknown size.

Priority programmes:

(i) Maintain long-term demographic, productivity or population monitoring at Macquarie Island (seven ACAP species) and Tasmania (Shy Albatross). **Progress since AC6:** *Maintained all six long term programmes.*

(ii) Resurvey Shy Albatross at Mewstone. **Progress since AC6:** *Analysing aerial images to determine population trend.*

(iii) Resurvey Black-browed and Light-mantled Albatrosses at Heard Island. **Progress since AC6:** *No progress.*

New (iv) Resurvey Black-browed Albatrosses at Bishop and Clerk Islands.

CHILE: three species at 33 sites in seven island groups; no demographic data.

Priority programmes:

(i) Begin long-term demographic monitoring of Black-browed and Grey-headed Albatrosses at minimum of one island group. **Progress since AC6:** *None reported.*

- (ii) Resurvey all island groups. **Progress since AC6:** *Census of Black-browed and Grey-headed Albatrosses at Diego Ramirez and Idefonso archipelagos (PCSWG1 Doc 03).*

New (iii) Re-survey Southern Giant Petrel at Isla Noir.

DISPUTED – NORTH PACIFIC: two species at two sites; current population trends unknown; no survival data.

Priority programmes:

- (i) Confirm breeding and begin long-term population monitoring at Minami-Kojima in the Senkaku (Diaoyu) Islands. **Progress since AC6:** *None (political dispute limits access).*

DISPUTED – SOUTH ATLANTIC: seven species at 232 sites; 34% of populations of unknown size; steep declines in Wandering, Black-browed and Grey-headed Albatrosses, and White-chinned Petrel; possible decline in Light-mantled Albatross.

Priority programmes:

- (i) Maintain long-term demographic or productivity monitoring at South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)¹ (six ACAP species). **Progress since AC6:** *Maintained all programmes.*
- (ii) Maintain long-term population monitoring at other sites at South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)¹ (three ACAP species). **Progress since AC6:** *Maintained all programmes.*
- (iii) Resurvey White-chinned Petrel at South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)¹. **Progress since AC6:** *Study plots were established in 2012 at three sites on the mainland of South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)¹ as part of a monitoring programme to assess recovery following current eradication operations.*
- (iv) Maintain long-term demographic monitoring of Black-browed Albatross at two sites in the Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)¹. **Progress since AC6:** *Both programmes maintained.*
- (v) Maintain long-term population monitoring of Black-browed Albatross elsewhere in the Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)¹. **Progress since AC6:** *Analyses of aerial and ground counts now complete, and population trend available for 2000 to 2010 (PCSWG1 Doc 14).*

New (vi) Resurvey Southern Giant Petrel at the Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)¹.

ECUADOR: single endemic species, declining; no juvenile survival data.

Priority programmes:

- (i) Survey all of Española, Galapagos Islands. **Progress since AC6:** *None reported.*
- (ii) Establish demographic monitoring in the interior colonies ('Colonia Central') on Española. **Progress since AC6:** *None reported.*
- (iii) Confirm breeding and establish long-term population and productivity monitoring at Isla de la Plata. **Progress since AC6:** *None reported.*

FRANCE: twelve species at 99 sites in three island groups; 20% of populations of unknown size; steep declines in Sooty Albatross.

Priority programmes:

- (i) Maintain long-term demographic or population monitoring at Kerguelen (5 species). **Progress since AC6:** *Maintained all programmes.*
- (ii) Maintain long-term demographic or population monitoring at Crozet (6 species). **Progress since AC6:** *Maintained all programmes.*
- (iii) Maintain long-term demographic or population monitoring at Amsterdam Island (3 species). **Progress since AC6:** *Maintained all programmes.*
- (iv) Resurvey Wandering Albatrosses at Cochons and Ile de l'Est, Crozet, and western colonies, Kerguelen; Indian Yellow-nosed Albatrosses at Pingouins and Apotres, Crozet; Grey-headed Albatrosses at Pingouins, Crozet and Iles Nuageuses, Kerguelen; Sooty and Light-mantled Albatrosses at Ile de l'Est, Crozet; Northern and Southern Giant Petrels at Cochons and Ile de l'Est, Crozet; White-chinned Petrel at Possession Island, Crozet, and; Grey Petrels at Kerguelen. **Progress since AC6:** *None.*

JAPAN: three species; current trend, adult survival and productivity unknown for four populations; no juvenile survival data.

Priority programmes:

- (i) Establish long-term demographic monitoring at all sites. **Progress since AC6:** *None reported.*

MEXICO: one species at four sites; no trend or demographic data.

Priority programmes:

- (i) Establish demographic monitoring at all sites. **Progress since AC6:** *None reported.*

NEW ZEALAND: 16 species (10 endemic) including 98 populations; 27% of populations of unknown size.

Priority programmes:

- (i) Resurvey Campbell Albatross at Campbell Island. **Progress since AC6:** *Standardised photo survey point field work has been completed since AC6, and analysis in progress. A final report will be available by December 2013.*
- (ii) Survey Salvin's Albatross at Bounty Islands. **Progress since AC6:** *A complete aerial census was undertaken recently to provide a baseline for further aerial monitoring to establish a population trend. An agreement has been reached with data-holders of existing ground counts, and the analysis should be completed by end 2013. A project plan is in place for a repeat aerial survey and associated ground truthing in late 2013. If this is achieved on schedule, results will be reported in early 2014.*

New (iii) Maintain long-term demographic monitoring of Black Petrel at Great Barrier Island.

- New (iv)** Maintain long-term demographic monitoring of Antipodean Albatross at Adams Island, Auckland Islands.
- New (v)** Maintain long-term demographic monitoring of Buller's Albatross at the Snares, and resurvey Snares and Solander islands.
- New (vi)** Maintain population monitoring of White-capped Albatross at all sites in the Auckland Islands.
- New (vii)** Survey White-chinned Petrel at the Auckland Islands.
- New (viii)** Collate existing data on Light-mantled Albatross populations and survey at major breeding sites.

SOUTH AFRICA: 9 species including 17 populations; 18% of populations of unknown size; no survival data for 13 populations.

Priority programmes:

- (i)** Maintain long-term population monitoring of Sooty and Light-mantled Albatrosses at Marion Island. **Progress since AC6:** *Maintained all programmes.*
- (ii)** Survey White-chinned and Grey Petrels at Marion and Prince Edward Islands. **Progress since AC6:** *Estimates of numbers of White-chinned Petrels are now available for both Prince Edward and Marion Islands (Ryan PG, Dilley BJ, Jones MGW. 2012. Polar Biology 35:1851–1859).*
- (iii)** Maintain long-term demographic monitoring of Wandering and Grey-headed Albatrosses at Marion Island. **Progress since AC6:** *Maintained all programmes.*
- (iv)** Maintain intermittent population monitoring at Prince Edward Island (9 species). **Progress since AC6:** *No visits since AC6.*

UNITED KINGDOM: 6 species including 16 populations on two island groups

Priority programmes:

- (i)** Maintain long-term demographic monitoring of Tristan and Atlantic Yellow-nosed Albatrosses and Southern Giant Petrels at Gough Island. **Progress since AC6:** *Maintained all programmes.*
- (ii)** Maintain long-term demographic monitoring of Atlantic Yellow-nosed Albatross at Tristan and Nightingale islands. **Progress since AC6:** *Maintained all programmes.*
- (iii)** Maintain intermittent population monitoring of Sooty Albatross at Gough Island. **Progress since AC6:** *Some work has been initiated to establish a Sooty Albatrosses monitoring study at Gough Island*
- (iv)** Maintain intermittent population monitoring of Spectacled Petrel at Inaccessible Island. **Progress since AC6:** *No survey work since AC6.*
- (v)** Establish intermittent population monitoring of Sooty Albatross at Tristan Island. **Progress since AC6:** *None.*
- (vi)** Survey Atlantic Yellow-nosed Albatross at Tristan Island. **Progress since AC6:** *None.*
- (vii)** Survey all island and establish intermittent population monitoring in study plots of Grey Petrel at Gough Island. **Progress since AC6:** *None.*

- (viii) Confirm breeding of Grey Petrel at Inaccessible and Tristan islands. **Progress since AC6:** *None.*

UNITED STATES: two species, 25 populations, all of known size; few demographic data.

Priority programmes:

- (i) Maintain long-term demographic monitoring at several sites. **Progress since AC6:** *Studies of adult survival for both species at 3 breeding sites ongoing. Data analysis commencing for French Frigate Shoals populations.*
- (ii) Survey the five breeding sites where not currently monitored, and at all sites at 5-year intervals population monitoring. **Progress since AC6:** *None.*

ADVICE TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

The Working Group recommends that the Advisory Committee:

- (i) urges Parties and others responsible for breeding populations of ACAP species to ensure the continuation of their current long-term monitoring programmes;
- (ii) encourages Spain to contribute population data for Balearic Shearwater so that it can be included in future analyses and syntheses;
- (iii) encourages Parties and others responsible for breeding populations of ACAP species to implement the monitoring programmes identified as priorities at AC6 in order to increase current knowledge of population size, trends and demography of ACAP species, and;
- (iv) reviews these priority programmes, and progress achieved in the inter-sessional period, at AC8.

6.2 Identification of key gaps in tracking data

Javier Arata (Chile) presented new tracking data from brooding Black-browed Albatross at Albatross Islet, Admiralty Sound, Chile (PCSWG1 Doc 13 Rev 1). The tracked birds made extensive use of Admiralty Sound and the Magellan Strait area but did not reach the open ocean.

Marco Favero (Argentina) presented new data on the non-breeding distribution of Black-browed Albatross on the continental shelf of Argentina, Uruguay and Brazil (PCSWG1 Doc 09). This species shows the highest levels of interaction of any ACAP species with various Argentine and neighbouring fisheries, and is killed incidentally in large numbers. Areas of greatest use by tracked birds were in central Patagonia and the mouth of Rio de la Plata and neighbouring waters.

The WG reviewed the priority tracking programmes for each jurisdiction identified at AC6.

ARGENTINA – Southern Giant Petrels (adults and juveniles) at Isla Arce and Gran Robredo. **Progress since AC6** – New publications on adults tracked during the breeding period. Ongoing analyses of marine habitat use of adults and juveniles during the winter. New data were collected from adults in the 2012/13 breeding season.

AUSTRALIA - Shy Albatross (juveniles) in Tasmania; juveniles of all albatross species at Macquarie Island. **Progress since AC6** – No progress.

CHILE – Juvenile and nonbreeding Black-browed and Grey-headed Albatrosses at Diego Ramirez. **Progress since AC6** – Geolocators have been retrieved from Black-browed Albatrosses, and analyses are in progress.

New – Southern Giant Petrel at Isla Noir.

DISPUTED - Black-browed and Grey-headed Albatrosses (juveniles) at South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)¹

Progress since AC6 – None.

ECUADOR - Waved Albatross (juveniles) at Galapagos.

Progress since AC6 – None reported.

FRANCE - Grey-headed and Indian Yellow-nosed Albatrosses at Crozet Islands, Grey-head Albatross at Kerguelen.

Progress since AC6 – None.

JAPAN - Black-footed Albatross at Ogasawara Islands.

Progress since AC6 - None reported.

NEW ZEALAND – Campbell and Grey-headed Albatrosses at Campbell Island; Salvin's Albatross at Bounty Islands; White-chinned Petrel at Auckland Islands; Light-mantled Albatross at key sites.

Progress since AC6 - 50 geolocators were deployed on breeding adult Salvin's Albatross at the Bounty Islands in October 2012. Retrieval is planned for 2013, and analysis and reporting by early 2014. Geolocators have been retrieved from Campbell and Grey-headed Albatross at Campbell Island, and analysis and reporting is in progress.

SOUTH AFRICA - Juveniles of all species at Prince Edward Islands (*Phoebetria* species higher priority).

Progress since AC6 - Initial deployments of tracking devices on both *Phoebetria* species were made in May 2013 at Marion Island.

UNITED KINGDOM - Grey Petrel at Gough Island; juveniles of most species at Gough and Tristan da Cunha.

Progress since AC6 - Funding was obtained from ACAP to track juvenile Tristan Albatrosses at Gough Island. The project was delayed because of logistical problems associated with the timing of the award and lead times for obtaining devices for delivery to the field site; deployments are now expected to proceed in December 2013.

USA - Black-footed Albatross at Laysan Island.

Progress since AC6 – Geolocators were deployed in 2012 but have yet to be retrieved.

ADVICE TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

The Working Group recommends that the Advisory Committee:

- (i) encourages ACAP Parties to, where possible, undertake or plan for the tracking studies identified as priorities to take place;

- (ii) requests ACAP Parties to ensure timely submission of tracking data to the database, especially for species newly added to the Agreement, such as the Balearic Shearwater, and;
- (iii) invites BirdLife to review key gaps in tracking data in a submission to AC8, in consultation with Parties to identify datasets collected but awaiting submission to the BirdLife database.

7. PRIORITISATION

7.1 Review high priority species or populations based on terrestrial threats

The WG considered the land-based priorities for conservation action identified at AC6 on the basis of the vulnerability of each population, magnitude of the threat and likelihood of success of management for each breeding site by species by threat combination from the ACAP database. The WG agreed that the prioritisation analysis should be repeated before AC8 with the addition of Balearic Shearwater, which was added recently to Annex 1 of ACAP, and any other changes to threats (for example with regard to the risk of disease in Albatrosses at Amsterdam Island). The WG asked the relevant Parties to assist Pep Arcos and Thierry Micol (LPO) with the provision of population and threat data for Balearic Shearwater.

7.2 Review at-sea prioritisation process

The Secretariat introduced SBWG5 Doc 17 and advised of the progress made since AC6 in the development of the at-sea prioritisation framework, including the endorsement of this tool by MoP4. Meeting delegates were alerted to a forthcoming request to review and update the information on which this framework relies during the inter-sessional period so that the priorities identified through this mechanism can be considered at AC8.

7.3 Review ACAP Priority Populations for Conservation

The WG reviewed the interim priority populations for conservation management identified at AC6. These five breeding populations represented sizeable proportions (>10%) of the global total and were in rapid decline (>3% a year), for which a major underlying cause was incidental mortality in fisheries: Wandering and Black-browed Albatrosses at South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)¹, Tristan Albatross at Gough Island, and Sooty Albatross at the Crozet and Prince Edward islands.

Wandering Albatross at South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)¹ - remains a priority. The count in 2013 was the lowest ever recorded. New data have been provided to AC7 by Uruguay on bycatch rates of this species for domestic pelagic longline vessels (in 2004-11), and Japanese pelagic longline vessels licensed to fish in Uruguayan waters (in 2009-11) (SBWG5 Doc 37).

Black-browed Albatross at South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)¹ – remains a priority. The population continues to decline. New bycatch information from South American fisheries

indicated a slight decrease in bycatch contemporaneous with a decrease in fishing effort. However, note that <5% of Black-browed Albatrosses from South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)¹ use Argentinian waters; the majority winter in the Benguela Upwelling region off southwest Africa.

Tristan Albatross at Gough Island - remains a priority. Breeding success remains at a very low level, and the population has continued to decline. Annual monitoring of the population is ongoing, and funds have recently been acquired to track juveniles. The outcome will provide a clearer understanding of the nature and extent of the risk from fisheries bycatch.

Sooty Albatross at Crozet islands – remains a priority. Several papers on distribution will be published soon.

Sooty Albatross at Prince Edward Island - no new information, but work is in progress.

The WG agreed that consideration be given during the inter-sessional period to the inclusion of other priority populations. These might include the Amsterdam and Yellow-nosed Albatrosses at Amsterdam Island, given the potentially major impact of disease.

ADVICE TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

The Working Group recommends that the Advisory Committee:

- (i) requests that the land-based threat prioritisation be updated to include the Balearic Shearwater;
- (ii) requests that ACAP Parties continue to focus on the high priority populations that were identified at AC7 as requiring urgent attention. These priorities remain current and include the globally-important populations of Wandering and Black-browed Albatrosses at South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)¹, Tristan Albatrosses at Gough Island, and Sooty Albatrosses at the Crozet and Prince Edward Islands , and;
- (iii) requests that the WG review these priorities and progress achieved in the inter-sessional period, consider the addition of any other priority populations, and provide a report to AC8.

8. ACAP PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

8.1 IUCN Red List indicator for ACAP species

In respect of developing indicators to measure the success of ACAP, MoP2 (2006) agreed that relevant IUCN Red List indices (RLI) would be used as an interim indicator. Following a request at AC6 (2011), BirdLife International provided the latest version of the current RLI, covering the period 1998 to 2010, to MoP4 (MoP4 Inf 02 and MoP4 paragraphs 7.5.4 to 7.5.5). At MoP4 it was indicated that the projection of this index to 2012 suggested that a degree of stability was apparent in relation to the 2004 and 2008 assessments.

PCSWG1 Doc 04 indicates that the pending assessment of status change for ACAP species needs to be completed before the next revision of the RLI. This process will be conducted in late 2013, enabling a revised RLI paper to be tabled at AC8.

8.2 Select the most useful indicators of population status and breeding site condition

The candidate indicators for site condition and population status and trends discussed at AC6 were summarised in MoP4 Doc 23; these and the development process proposed at AC6 were endorsed by MoP4 (Report paragraphs 7.5.1 and 7.5.2). In brief, the next step recommended to and by AC6 (AC6 Doc 11 Rev 4 paragraph 9.2) was for the Secretariat to: a) extract and analyse the appropriate data to create values for as many of the indicators as possible; b) provide indicator values reflecting the situation when ACAP came into force (referred to below as hindcasting), and; c) address any relevant issues of data availability.

At the present meeting the Secretariat provided an update for all indicators using data currently submitted by Parties for 2013, and indicated that hindcasting is in progress, but would require further work for some indicators. The WG agreed that this should proceed as soon as possible and the outcomes be circulated inter-sessionally to members. Once the hindcasting exercise was completed, the WG would review the list of status and trend indicators and propose removal of those that are redundant.

The Convenors requested the assistance of BirdLife International with developing an alternative, composite indicator of the status of ACAP species similar to that in Szabo *et al.* 2012⁶. that can be hindcast to the year of ratification (2004), and could be calculated separately for (i) the original ACAP species (southern hemisphere albatrosses, both *Macronectes* and all *Procellaria*), and (ii) all current ACAP species including Balearic Shearwater and the North Pacific albatrosses.

The WG requested that site custodians check that the information in the ACAP database reflects the existence or otherwise of current biosecurity plans for each site, and of ongoing population and demographic monitoring programmes to allow the production of reliable indicator metrics.

ADVICE TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

The Working Group recommends that the Advisory Committee:

- (i) in the inter-sessional period, considers the applicability of a composite RLI as an alternate/additional indicator of the status of ACAP species, and;
- (ii) requests a report on these to AC8

9. BEST PRACTICE GUIDELINES AND OTHER ONLINE RESOURCES

9.1 Updates to existing guidelines (Eradications, and Guideline Census Methodologies for Surface Nesting Albatrosses and Petrels)

The Convenors indicated that the Eradication Guidelines would be updated with improved advice on monitoring and mitigation of non-target mortality by end 2013. This would incorporate lessons learned from the recent aerial baiting operations at Macquarie Island, Henderson Island and South Georgia (Islas Georgias del Sur)¹. Anton Wolfaardt (UK) offered

⁶ Szabo *et al.* 2012. Adapting global biodiversity indicators to the national scale: A Red List Index for Australian birds. *Biological Conservation* 148, 61-68.

to update the Biosecurity Guidelines to take account of current practices to restrict the risk of potential human transfer of pathogens between albatross colonies at Amsterdam Island, and any other relevant information arising from the update of the review of pathogens (Agenda Item 9.3).

9.2 Review new translocation guidelines

Igor Debski (New Zealand) presented draft best practice guidelines for the translocation of burrow-nesting petrel and shearwater species (PCSWG1 Doc 05), and Beth Flint (USA) presented guidelines for translocations of surface nesting albatrosses and petrels, which draws on experience from the translocation of Short-tailed Albatross from Torishima (PCSWG1 Doc 06).

The WG agreed that it would be useful to combine these two documents into a concise summary document for non-experts for the ACAP website, and proposed using PCSWG1 Doc 06 as a basis for this, extending it to cover burrow-nesting taxa. The Convenors agreed to work with interested participants to develop the objectives for the summary within a short time period, and to develop the summary document in time for AC8. Proposals made for contents included a definition of translocation, examples of success stories, and a checklist of the key issues that must be considered when undertaking translocations. Such a document should also cover the Balearic Shearwater, that was added recently to Annex 1 of ACAP.

9.3 Review of diseases in ACAP species

Recognising the importance of this issue, the Vice-convenors agreed to work together to update the review of parasites, pathogens and diseases in ACAP species presented at AC7 by Flavio Quintana (BSWG4/STWG6 Doc 7), with the intention of including this as an online resource on the ACAP website, and informing the update of the Biosecurity Guidelines.

ADVICE TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

The Working Group recommends that the Advisory Committee:

- (i) urges Parties to update, and where necessary, develop and implement biosecurity plans for ACAP breeding sites;
- (ii) requests that members update best practice guidelines on eradication and biosecurity measures to ensure that they adequately address non-target mortality, and disease transmission issues respectively, and;
- (iii) recognises the efforts by NZ and US in developing resource material relating to translocation techniques and encourage NZ and US to collate and harmonise best practice translocation guidelines for ACAP species, and;
- (iv) supports updating the disease review to include recent data from France by AC8.

10. PLASTIC BAND COORDINATION

10.1 Consider progress

As requested at the joint Breeding Sites and Status and Trends Working Groups meeting, the Secretariat has produced tables to summarise the colour and alphanumeric codes on plastic bands used for each ACAP species, and to list contact details of banding authorities to whom metal band recovery details can be submitted. These tables have been populated with data provided by France and will be distributed to WG members to provide feedback and enter their data by the end of 2013, before posting on the ACAP website.

ADVICE TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

The Working Group recommends that the Advisory Committee:

- (i) supports the revision and finalisation of a spreadsheet for posting on the ACAP website that summarises plastic band details as they apply to ACAP species, and;
- (ii) encourages Parties provide details of plastic band information to the ACAP summary, and;
- (iii) requests Parties provide national banding office contact details for publication on the ACAP website.

11. ACAP HOOK REMOVAL GUIDELINES

11.1 Review draft guidelines

A guide illustrating best practice guidelines to remove fishing hooks from albatrosses and petrels was developed by the Secretariat with advice from PCSWG and SBWG members during the inter-sessional period (PCSWG Doc 07). Although several guides describing hook removal techniques already exist, the ACAP guide is intended to provide best practice guidelines that are relevant to ACAP species drawing on the extensive expertise of WG members.

The WG discussed improvements to the draft guidelines, ensuring that the language and technical advice was appropriate for a range of fishing operations. The WG agreed that the guidelines would be updated following input from both PCSWG1 and SBWG5 before being finalised and made available on the ACAP website during the inter-sessional period.

11.2 Euthanasia options

Jonathon Barrington (Australia) raised the issue of euthanasia for birds that are seriously injured when brought aboard such that they are not appropriate for release (e.g. broken wing). There was brief consideration of the legal implications of euthanasia of protected species during fishing operations. Whilst the WG considered it was appropriate for ACAP to provide best practice advice relating to the retrieval and recovery of birds injured whilst interacting with fishing operations, it was not considered appropriate for ACAP to provide advice on options for the euthanasia of seabirds.

ADVICE TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

The Working Group recommends that the Advisory Committee:

- (i) supports the revision and finalisation of the hook removal guidelines during the inter-sessional period;
- (ii) endorses that the guidelines are then translated into Spanish and French and posted on the ACAP website, and;
- (iii) considers whether the guidelines should be available as a joint BirdLife/ACAP fact sheet.

12. PHOTO IDENTIFICATION GUIDE FOR BYCAUGHT SEABIRDS

12.1 Discussion of concept design

As part of efforts to harmonise the data collected by RFMOs on seabird bycatch, ACAP had offered to develop a seabird identification guide for use by observer programmes. Nadeena Beck (Australia), in collaboration with Yukiko Inoue of the National Research Institute of Far Seas Fisheries of Japan, reviewed available information and compiled a draft identification guide (SBWG5 Doc 14). This includes a key based particularly on bill shape and size. In addition, one sheet summarises information for each species, including photographs of dead birds, distribution maps, and distinguishing features. The difficulty of identifying juvenile albatrosses, particularly in the genus *Thalassarche*, was highlighted. The group congratulated the authors on this work. Recommendations for further improvement were provided by the WG. There was also discussion regarding the usefulness of obtaining tissue samples, enabling accurate genetic determination of taxon identity, sex and, in some cases, provenance (to island group), and how ACAP might assist. The contribution of further material, including photographs was sought. This work was supported by a voluntary contribution from the Australian Government, and advice from Paul Scofield and Peter Ryan was also acknowledged.

ADVICE TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

The Working Group recommends that, the Advisory Committee:

- (i) supports efforts by the Secretariat and Convenors to progress the identification guide during the inter-sessional period;
- (ii) encourages the Convenors and Secretariat to develop guidelines for the collection and curation of biological material relevant to bycaught seabirds, and to explore options for compiling a list of metadata relating to these collections;
- (iii) encourages members and observers to contribute relevant photographs and information to assist in the development of the identification guide.

13. CONSIDERATION OF BYCATCH ASSESSMENTS

13.1 Review/update of CCAMLR seabird bycatch risk assessment

The Executive Secretary noted that at its 2011 meeting, the CCAMLR Scientific Committee (para. 4.15 of SC-CCAMLR XXX report) agreed that the routine review of incidental mortality and of the implementation of conservation measures associated with mitigation measures,

be undertaken by the (CCAMLR) Secretariat and reported to the Scientific Committee. The Scientific Committee encouraged further coordination between the Secretariats of ACAP and CCAMLR in order to ensure that requests for information to ACAP on by-catch mitigation and data with which to review seabird risk assessments are provided on a schedule that allows consideration by the appropriate expert group of ACAP. However, no formal approach to ACAP has been received from the CCAMLR Secretariat for this to be undertaken.

In these circumstances, the WG agreed that it would be premature to discuss whether, and if so to what extent, ACAP could contribute to such an undertaking. Not only would this have potential substantial resource implications (recent seabird bycatch risk assessments in tuna RFMOs had usually been multi-year projects), but also any response from ACAP, even in principle, should be conditional on a clear indication by CCAMLR of the detail of the process envisaged.

Given the continuing success of CCAMLR in maintaining seabird bycatch at negligible levels, the utility of CCAMLR reviewing its risk assessment process was unclear to the WG.

The WG noted that Doc 18 raises interesting issues, including the extent to which the ISO standards of risk management are appropriate frameworks and benchmarks for seabird bycatch risk assessments by organisations such as CCAMLR and RFMOs.

It was noted that the CCAMLR process of risk assessment was published by Waugh et al (2008)⁷ and summarised in Croxall (2008)⁸. The concept and principles of seabird bycatch risk assessment, pioneered by CCAMLR were subsequently used by most tuna RFMOs, wherein they were developed and refined in much greater detail and sophistication. These risk assessments have themselves also been published, together with an assessment of relevant best practice (Small et al. 2013)⁹, produced under the auspices of ACAP.

13.2 Bycatch reporting by Parties

Anton Wolfaardt (UK) indicated that the ACAP Action Plan gives consideration to further analysis of bycatch data; he presented a document that summarises options for the assessment framework (SBWG Doc 16). A major problem hindering analyses is the current broad spatial and temporal resolution of bycatch data.

The WG agreed that the initial priority should be to improve the reporting and analysis of data on bycatch rates and fishing effort, and that when sufficient data had been acquired at appropriate spatial and temporal scales, it would be important to consider how those might be used, in conjunction with ACAP data on seabird demography, to assess impacts on populations.

⁷ Waugh SM, Baker GB, Gales R, Croxall JP. 2008. CCAMLR process of risk assessment to minimise the effects of longline fishing mortality on seabirds. *Marine Policy* 32:442-54.

⁸ Croxall JP (2008) The role of science and advocacy in the conservation of Southern Ocean albatrosses at sea. *Bird Conservation International* 18, S13-S29.

⁹ Small, C., Waugh, S.M. and Phillips, R.A. (2013) The justification, design and implementation of Ecological Risk Assessments of the effects of fishing on seabirds. *Marine Policy* 37, 192-199.

13.3 Use of lethal experiments to test efficacy of mitigation devices

Igor Debski (New Zealand) presented a paper outlining a preliminary framework for the assessment of lethal trials of mitigation (SBWG5 Doc 22). Recently, a proposal to conduct a lethal experiment in New Zealand did not gain support from local authorities. The WG recognised that lethal experimentation was potentially contentious and that the draft framework could form the basis for considering the issue, but would need to be modified to take other factors into account, including the population size and conservation status of affected species.

It was noted that recent assessments evaluating risks to seabird species as non-target victims of eradication programmes directed at alien invasive species might be relevant to ACAP.

The WG concluded that SBWG5 Doc 22 was a very important first step, but that further consideration and the advice of experts should be sought.

14. REVIEW ACAP-FUNDED PROGRAMMES

14.1 Review reports

Document AC7 Inf 01 describes the five projects funded by ACAP in 2012 (total AUD\$ 97,600), as well as reports from projects funded in the 2010-11 funding round. It was noted that three of the eight projects funded in 2011 had not been implemented, and that this may have taken funds away from other projects that could have been undertaken. In some cases, the lack of implementation may be due to unforeseen project delays, and it would be useful to resolve how to deal with delayed projects. It was noted that it might be useful to add a feasibility criterion as part of the project application process.

14.2 Funding priorities for 2013

Document AC7 Doc 16 proposes a schedule for inviting applications for both conservation and secondment projects twice every three years. The document also raised other issues, including conflict of interest, lethal experimentation, the level of detail required in project proposals, and delays in implementation. The Secretariat emphasised the role of the WGs in identifying priority research areas or projects to be supported under either core or grant funding.

14.3 New model for prioritising/funding secondments

Document AC Doc 10 proposes guidelines for developing a secondment programme under which it is envisaged that secondments could be at locations other than Hobart, and that the Secretariat would coordinate the implementation of the secondment programme with the AC. The Executive Secretary noted the value of the secondment programme to ACAP, and that it was important that projects suitable for secondment be identified by the WGs.

15. LISTING OF NEW SPECIES ON ANNEX 1

15.1 Consider criteria for selection of candidate species

The WG first discussed the criteria that should be used to select new candidate species to be included in the Agreement (AC7 Doc 20). The original paper by Cooper & Baker (AC3 Doc 18) was used as a basis of the discussions on the criteria to be used to select species (Global conservation status, Listing within the Convention on Migratory Species CMS, Current population trend, Population size, Level of endemism, Migratory nature, Land-based threats, At-sea conservation threats). The present process is iterative; a Party submits a draft species assessment similar to those available on the ACAP website, all three WG review the assessment and provide to the AC, thence to MoP.

The Secretariat expressed concern that if too many species are proposed for inclusion, this would reduce the limited resources available for the Agreement. The WG agreed the importance of considering criteria other than those listed in AC3 Doc 18, such as the ability of ACAP, through multi-national action, to deliver addition benefits which would improve the status of the proposed species.

The WG concluded that it was important to review the criteria inter-sessionally and to establish a clear process for consideration of new species for inclusion in the Agreement. This would help in providing guidance and advice to the MoP and to Parties considering nominations of further species. The possibility of delisting may also be addressed, but this would need very careful consideration.

15.2 Proposals to list new species on Annex 1

Two species are proposed for listing on Annex 1.

Pink-footed Shearwater, proposed by Chile (AC7 Doc 24)

The species breeds on Juan Fernandez and Mocha Islands off Chile. Major problems are land-based: introduced species that compete for habitat (rabbits), or predate on adult and young shearwaters (rats and dogs), and; the harvesting of chicks by local inhabitants. The Pink-footed Shearwater migrates in coastal waters to North America. There is a need to estimate the impact of fisheries throughout its range given the extensive overlap and significant mortalities off Peruvian coast.

The WG recognized that the species ranked highly using the criteria indicated in AC7 Doc 20. Furthermore most of the Range States are already Parties to ACAP. The WG gave strong support for the inclusion of the species in the Agreement.

Galapagos Petrel proposed by Ecuador (AC7 Doc 25)

The species breeds on several islands of the Galapagos archipelago. Populations are probably declining due to impact from introduced predators, and use of land for farming. At sea distribution is oceanic in the south-east Pacific, with limited overlap with fisheries.

Several members of WG pointed out that this species does not score highly under the criteria in AC3 Doc 18, particularly as it is not known to be affected by bycatch interactions with

fisheries. In addition, its inclusion might establish a precedent for many other gadfly petrels *Pterodroma* spp. of similar adverse conservation status. The WG therefore expressed reservations about the inclusion of the Galapagos Petrel.

The WG discussed AC7 Inf 04 which provides an update on the conservation status of two Mediterranean species, Scopoli and Yelkouan Shearwaters, that might also be considered as potential candidate species for ACAP. Yelkouan Shearwater was upgraded from Near Threatened to Vulnerable on the IUCN 2012 Red List. The group acknowledged that the Yelkouan Shearwater faces the same threats as the Balearic shearwater and therefore was a potentially strong candidate for listing in Annex 1. Pep Arcos (SEO) indicated that although populations of Yelkouan Shearwater are larger than those of Balearic Shearwater, they may be subject to higher levels of bycatch.

ADVICE TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

The PCSWG and SBWG Working Groups advise the Advisory Committee that:

- (i) the Pink footed Shearwater remains a strong candidate for listing on Annex 1 of the Agreement, based on the degree and types of the threats it faces;
- (ii) the WGs considered that the Galapagos Petrel was not a strong candidate for listing on Annex 1 of the Agreement due to the nature of the threats that it faces and the extent to which ACAP can assist in improving its conservation status, and;
- (iii) the criteria for listing new species on Annex 1 should be reviewed during the inter-sessional period.

16. REVIEW AND INFORMATION

16.1 International Albatross and Petrel Conference (Aug 2012)

Paul Sagar (New Zealand) provided an overview of the 5th International Albatross & Petrel Conference (5IAPC) held in New Zealand in August 2012 which was attended by over 200 delegates. Presentations covered a wide range of subjects including at-sea distribution, fisheries interactions, taxonomy, restoration and translocation. ACAP species dominated the reporting of species-specific research in oral and poster presentations. There were 23 papers focussed on albatrosses. The final conference presentation reported on ACAP's international efforts to improve the conservation status of threatened seabirds. The WG recognised the success of 5IAPC and congratulated the organisers for their efforts.

16.2 Paper on conservation of ACAP species

An outline of a manuscript that collates information on the conservation of albatrosses and large petrels was mentioned to the WG. This multi-authored review is intended to provide a succinct update on taxonomy, distribution, population trends and threats (at sea and on land) on 29 of the 30 ACAP listed species. This review is intended to be submitted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal and will be provided as an information paper to AC8.

16.3 Review online posting/circulation of WG documents

The Secretariat introduced AC7 Doc 21, which outlined options addressing issues relating to posting papers submitted to WG meetings on the ACAP website so as not to jeopardize subsequent publication of these papers in peer-reviewed journals. It was recognized that it is important to both ensure that the information submitted to ACAP for consideration is as transparent as possible whilst also ensuring that such submissions are not restricted to published work. The WG agreed that most flexibility would be maintained if authors are provided with options to indicate their preference for: 1) inclusion of standard ACAP disclaimer to appear on the cover page of papers; and /or 2) papers to be publicly available on ACAP website; or 3) papers only be accessible on the ACAP website with a password (with an abstract or short summary only made available publicly on the website). Published papers submitted to ACAP for consideration may also be required to be restricted through password protection in order to adhere to journal copyright requirements.

16.4 Current or recent research on ACAP species

The WG agreed that in order to focus discussion on specific agenda items at future meetings, submitted papers that provide background information may be assigned as Information Papers at the discretion of the Convenors. Whilst informing discussion, these papers would not require detailed review and consideration during the meeting.

17. FUTURE WORK PROGRAMME

The draft work programme for 2012-15 for the new working group is included in **ANNEX 4**.

ADVICE TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

- (i) The Advisory Committee is requested to incorporate the tasks identified in its work programme.

18. REPORTING TO AC7

ADVICE TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

A report shall be prepared for consideration by the Advisory Committee.

19. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The Second World Seabird Congress, organised under the auspices of the World Seabird Union (WSU) and hosted by the African Seabird Group will be held from 12 to 16 October 2015 in Cape Town, South Africa. It was suggested that ACAP and its Working Groups might wish to explore with WSU how to ensure the optimum presentation and input of the work of the Agreement.

20. CLOSING REMARKS

The Convenors and Vice Convenors of the Population and Conservation Status Working Group thanked the Members and Observers for their valuable contributions at the meeting and in developing the report, and the ACAP Science Officer, Wiesława Misiak, for her diligence and commitment to assisting the work of the Working Group during the inter-sessional period and at the meeting. The group thanked the Convenors and Vice Convenors for their work in progressing the aims and work plan of the WG and Agreement.

21. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are very grateful to the Populations and Conservation Status Working Group members and observers, the ACAP Secretariat and ACAP officials for progressing the work of the PCSWG. The WG is also extremely grateful to the French delegation for providing such excellent facilities for the WG meeting. We also thank Juan Pablo Seco Pon and Mathilde Huon for technical assistance during the meeting. Interpreters Alexandra Borghese, Claire Garteiser, Sandra Hale and Roslyn Wallace are gratefully acknowledged for their interpretation services.

ANNEX 1. LIST OF MEETING PARTICIPANTS AND NON-ATTENDING PCSWG MEMBERS

MEETING PARTICIPANTS

PCSWG Members	
Javier Arata	Instituto Antartico Chileno (INACH), Chile
José Manuel (Pep) Arcos	SEO/BirdLife
Rob Crawford	Department of Environmental Affairs, South Africa
John Croxall	BirdLife International
Igor Debski	Department of Conservation, New Zealand
Karine Delord	Centre national de la recherche scientifique (CNRS), France
Elizabeth Flint	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, United States of America
Rosemary Gales (Convenor)	Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and the Environment (Tasmania), Australia
Richard Phillips (Convenor)	British Antarctic Survey (BAS), United Kingdom and Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR)
Flavio Quintana (Vice-convenor)	National Research Council of Argentina (CONICET), Argentina
Paul Sagar	NIWA, New Zealand
Cleo Small	BirdLife International
Mark Tasker	Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC), United Kingdom
Henri Weimerskirch (Vice-convenor)	Centre national de la recherche scientifique (CNRS), France
Anton Wolvaardt	Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC), United Kingdom
Advisory Committee Members	
Jonathon Barrington	Australia
Marco Favero	Advisory Committee Chair
Germán Proffen	Argentina
Marcelo Garcia Alvarado	Chile
Observers	
Jorge Azocar	Instituto de Fomento Pesquero, Chile
Christophe Barbraud	Centre national de la recherche scientifique (CNRS), France
Nigel Brothers	Humane Society International
Charles Cheng	Chinese Wild Bird Federation
Martin Cryer	Ministry for Primary Industries, New Zealand
Johannes de Goede	Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, South Africa
Neil Klaer	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO), Australia
Fabrice Le Bouard	Terres Australes et Antarctiques Françaises (réserve naturelle)
Azwianewi Makhado	Department of Environmental Affairs, South Africa
Cedric Marteau	Terres Australes et Antarctiques Françaises

Ed Melvin	Washington Sea Grant, University of Washington, United States of America
Thierry Micol	LPO, France
Gabriela Navarro	Dirección Nacional de Planificación Pesquera – Subsecretaría de Pesca y Acuicultura, Argentina
Graham Robertson	Australian Antarctic Division, Australia
Geoff Tuck	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO), Australia
Secretariat	
Wiesława Misiak	Science Officer
Warren Papworth	Executive Secretary
Juan Pablo Seco Pon	AC7 Staff
Mathilde Huon	AC7 Staff
Interpreters	
Alexandra Borghese	OnCall Interpreters and Translators
Claire Garteiser	OnCall Interpreters and Translators
Sandra Hale	OnCall Interpreters and Translators
Roslyn Wallace	OnCall Interpreters and Translators

NON-ATTENDING PCSWG MEMBERS

PCSWG Members not attending PCSWG1	
Leandro Bugoni	Universidade Federal do Rio Grande (FURG), Brazil
Sebastien Descamps	Nowegian Polar Institute, Norway
Hiroshi Hasegawa	Toho University, Japan
Gustavo Jiménez-Uzcátegui	Charles Darwin Foundation, Ecuador
Ken Morgan	Environment Canada, Canada
Daniel Oro	Grupo d'Ecologia de Poblacions, IMEDEA (CSIC-UIB), Spain
Carlos Zavalaga	University of Nagoya, Japan

ANNEX 2. SPECIALISTS AND TIMEFRAME FOR REVIEW OF SPECIES ASSESSMENTS

Species	Specialists (Provisional TBC)	
Amsterdam Albatross	<i>Henri Weimerskirch</i>	
Antipodean Albatross	<i>Kath Walker</i>	<i>Graeme Elliott</i>
Tristan Albatross	<i>Richard Cuthbert</i>	<i>John Cooper</i>
Southern Royal Albatross	<i>Paul Sagar</i>	<i>Igor Debski</i>
Wandering Albatross	<i>Richard Phillips</i>	<i>Henri Weimerskirch</i>
Northern Royal Albatross	<i>Paul Scofield</i>	<i>Igor Debski</i>
Southern Giant Petrel	<i>Flavio Quintana</i>	<i>John Cooper</i>
Northern Giant Petrel	<i>Flavio Quintana</i>	<i>Richard Phillips</i>
Short-tailed Albatross	<i>Beth Flint</i>	
Laysan Albatross	<i>Beth Flint</i>	
Waved Albatross	<i>Kate Huyvaert</i>	<i>Gustavo Jiménez-Uzcátegui</i>
Black-footed Albatross	<i>Beth Flint</i>	
Sooty Albatross	<i>Henri Weimerskirch</i>	<i>Rob Crawford</i>
Light-mantled Albatross	<i>Richard Phillips</i>	<i>Rosie Gales</i>
White-chinned Petrel	<i>Richard Phillips</i>	<i>Christophe Barbraud</i>
Grey Petrel	<i>John Cooper</i>	<i>Peter Ryan</i>
Spectacled Petrel	<i>Peter Ryan</i>	<i>John Cooper</i>
Black Petrel	<i>Biz Bell</i>	<i>Igor Debski</i>
Westland Petrel	<i>Sue Waugh</i>	<i>Igor Debski</i>
Buller's Albatross	<i>Paul Sagar</i>	<i>Igor Debski</i>
Indian Yellow-nosed Albatross	<i>Henri Weimerskirch</i>	<i>Christophe Barbraud</i>
Shy Albatross	<i>Rosie Gales</i>	<i>Rachael Alderman</i>
Atlantic Yellow-nosed Albatross	<i>Peter Ryan</i>	<i>Richard Cuthbert</i>
Grey-headed Albatross	<i>Richard Phillips</i>	<i>Javier Arata</i>
Chatham Albatross	<i>Paul Scofield</i>	<i>Igor Debski</i>
Campbell Albatross	<i>Paul Sagar</i>	<i>David Thompson</i>
Black-browed Albatross	<i>Anton Wolfaardt</i>	<i>Javier Arata</i>
Salvin's Albatross	<i>Paul Sagar</i>	<i>Igor Debski</i>
White-capped Albatross	<i>Dave Thompson</i>	<i>Barry Baker</i>

Species Assessment Panel		
Richard Phillips	Rosie Gales	John Cooper
Henri Weimerskirch	Flavio Quintana	Cleo Small

Timeframe – 2013-2014
30 August 2013 – Science Officer to send out English assessments to reviewers with updated population numbers
28 February 2014 – Reviewers to return assessments to Science Officer (track changes) – forward to panel
30 June 2014 – Panel to complete revisions, return to Science Officer, updates posted on web
Translations to be progressed as soon as possible following review

ANNEX 3. LATEST POPULATION DATA UPDATES

As submitted by Parties by 29 April 2013. Shaded cells indicate no new data entered since AC6 (not collected or not yet available).

Jurisdiction	Species	Latest population data
Antarctic	<i>Macronectes giganteus</i>	22-Feb-13
Argentina	<i>Macronectes giganteus</i>	4-Apr-13
Australia	<i>Diomedea exulans</i>	1-Mar-13
Australia	<i>Macronectes halli</i>	14-Feb-13
Australia	<i>Macronectes giganteus</i>	1-Mar-13
Australia	<i>Procellaria cinerea</i>	1-Mar-13
Australia	<i>Phoebetria palpebrata</i>	17-Apr-13
Australia	<i>Thalassarche cauta</i>	4-Apr-13
Australia	<i>Thalassarche melanophris</i>	17-Apr-13
Australia	<i>Thalassarche chrysostoma</i>	17-Apr-13
Chile	<i>Macronectes giganteus</i>	5-Jul-11
Chile	<i>Thalassarche melanophris</i>	30-Apr-13
Chile	<i>Thalassarche chrysostoma</i>	23-Feb-13
Disputed	<i>Diomedea exulans</i>	13-Feb-13
Disputed	<i>Macronectes halli</i>	13-Feb-13
Disputed	<i>Macronectes giganteus</i>	26-Feb-13
Disputed	<i>Phoebastria albatrus</i>	2-Mar-10
Disputed	<i>Phoebastria nigripes</i>	7-Dec-09
Disputed	<i>Phoebetria palpebrata</i>	29-Jun-12
Disputed	<i>Procellaria aequinoctialis</i>	23-Mar-10
Disputed	<i>Thalassarche melanophris</i>	25-Jan-13
Disputed	<i>Thalassarche chrysostoma</i>	29-Jun-12
Ecuador	<i>Phoebastria irrorata</i>	20-Apr-13
France	<i>Diomedea amsterdamensis</i>	8-Feb-10
France	<i>Diomedea exulans</i>	14-Sep-12
France	<i>Macronectes halli</i>	24-Feb-11
France	<i>Macronectes giganteus</i>	24-Feb-11
France	<i>Procellaria cinerea</i>	25-Mar-10
France	<i>Phoebetria palpebrata</i>	24-Feb-11
France	<i>Phoebetria fusca</i>	29-Aug-12
France	<i>Procellaria aequinoctialis</i>	16-Mar-10
France	<i>Thalassarche carteri</i>	2-Mar-10
France	<i>Thalassarche melanophris</i>	5-Apr-11
France	<i>Thalassarche chrysostoma</i>	18-Jan-10
France	<i>Thalassarche salvini</i>	24-Feb-10
Japan	<i>Phoebastria albatrus</i>	7-Feb-13
Japan	<i>Phoebastria immutabilis</i>	31-Oct-11
Japan	<i>Phoebastria nigripes</i>	7-Feb-13
Mexico	<i>Phoebastria immutabilis</i>	27-Feb-13

Mexico	<i>Phoebastria nigripes</i>	27-Feb-13
New Zealand	<i>Diomedea antipodensis</i>	20-Feb-13
New Zealand	<i>Diomedea epomophora</i>	30-Jan-13
New Zealand	<i>Diomedea sanfordi</i>	20-Feb-13
New Zealand	<i>Macronectes halli</i>	21-Feb-13
New Zealand	<i>Procellaria cinerea</i>	3-Apr-11
New Zealand	<i>Procellaria westlandica</i>	17-Jan-13
New Zealand	<i>Phoebetria palpebrata</i>	20-Feb-13
New Zealand	<i>Procellaria parkinsoni</i>	23-Dec-12
New Zealand	<i>Procellaria aequinoctialis</i>	12-Jul-12
New Zealand	<i>Thalassarche bulleri</i>	30-Jan-13
New Zealand	<i>Thalassarche eremita</i>	19-Dec-11
New Zealand	<i>Thalassarche carteri</i>	18-Jan-10
New Zealand	<i>Thalassarche melanophris</i>	25-Mar-10
New Zealand	<i>Thalassarche chrysostoma</i>	4-Apr-11
New Zealand	<i>Thalassarche salvini</i>	11-Sep-12
New Zealand	<i>Thalassarche steadi</i>	17-Jan-13
New Zealand	<i>Thalassarche impavida</i>	9-Mar-10
South Africa	<i>Diomedea exulans</i>	7-Mar-13
South Africa	<i>Macronectes halli</i>	7-Mar-13
South Africa	<i>Macronectes giganteus</i>	7-Mar-13
South Africa	<i>Procellaria cinerea</i>	16-Mar-10
South Africa	<i>Phoebetria palpebrata</i>	7-Mar-13
South Africa	<i>Phoebetria fusca</i>	7-Mar-13
South Africa	<i>Procellaria aequinoctialis</i>	7-Mar-13
South Africa	<i>Thalassarche carteri</i>	6-Jan-10
South Africa	<i>Thalassarche chrysostoma</i>	7-Mar-13
Spain	<i>Puffinus mauretanicus</i>	10-Aug-12
United Kingdom	<i>Diomedea dabbenena</i>	24-Oct-12
United Kingdom	<i>Macronectes giganteus</i>	25-Oct-12
United Kingdom	<i>Procellaria cinerea</i>	25-Oct-12
United Kingdom	<i>Procellaria conspicillata</i>	28-Oct-11
United Kingdom	<i>Phoebetria fusca</i>	25-Oct-12
United Kingdom	<i>Thalassarche chlororhynchos</i>	25-Oct-12
USA	<i>Phoebastria albatrus</i>	2-Feb-13
USA	<i>Phoebastria immutabilis</i>	13-Feb-13
USA	<i>Phoebastria nigripes</i>	13-Feb-13

ANNEX 4. DRAFT ADVISORY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2013-15

2. Information on status, trends and breeding sites							
	Topic/Task	Responsible group	Timeframe	Resources			Action detail
				Time	Funds for AC	Grant/core	
2.1	<i>Establish Population and Conservation Status Working Group membership</i>	<i>Parties with assistance of Convenors</i>	<i>Ongoing</i>				Completed. Provide further considerations of the role and participation of members.
2.2	Consider gaps in population, tracking, breeding site management, threats and regulatory protection data submitted to ACAP; request any outstanding data and incorporate changes	PaCSWG, Science Officer	2013-2015	8 weeks p.a.	AUD 0		Parties to provide new or outstanding data each year. Science officer to issue reminders in June each year.
2.3	Improve data portal structure and queries.	Science Officer, Convenors	2013-2015	12 weeks p.a.	AUD 15,000		Science Officer to facilitate modification and improvements of database as required
2.4	Review and refine standardised queries and outputs for analysis and interpretation	Science Officer, Convenors	2013-2015	3 weeks p.a.	AUD 5,000		Priority for refining queries and outputs. Outputs to be performed 3 months after each AC if required and 3 months before next AC.
2.5	<i>Accurately assess and update global population trends</i>	<i>PaCSWG Convenors, data holders, Science Officer and BirdLife International, other experts as required</i>	<i>By end 2014</i>	3 weeks	AUD 5,000		<i>May require further data portal updates. Progress the assessment of global population trends. Consider alternative approaches as required.</i>

	Review ACAP performance indicators relevant to populations and tracking data	<i>PaCSWG Convenors, Science Officer and BirdLife International</i>	2013-2015	3 weeks			<i>Date stamp input parameters as far as practicable, hindcast to 2004, and assess indicators at AC8. Consider tracking data indicators, consider composite RLI index options</i>
2.6	Update ACAP Species Assessments	PaCSWG Convenors, members, Science Officer, experts, BirdLife International (maps)	2013-2015	6 weeks p.a.	AUD \$4000 for BLI		updated by AC8 with a 3-year working plan for future updates and reviews. Update maps.
2.7	Translate updates to Species Assessments and ACAP guidelines into Spanish and French.	Science Officer, Spanish and French speaking Parties	2013-2015		AUD 15,000		No costs if translation can be undertaken in kind by Spanish and French speaking Parties. Minimal costs (\$250 per assessment) budgeted to assist in translation
2.8	Identify priority species or populations for monitoring of numbers, trends and demography	PaCSWG, Science Officer	2013-2015	2 weeks p.a.	AUD 0		Review and update priorities and reflect on progress against priorities and provide reports to each AC.
	Review, refine and standardise criteria to include new species on Annex 1.	PaCSWG Convenors and Members, , Science Officer,	By AC8	1 week p.a.			Document for consideration at AC8
2.9	Review availability of albatross and petrel tracking/distribution data to ensure representativeness of species/age classes. Prioritise gaps and encourage studies to fill gaps.	PaCSWG, AC, Science Officer and BirdLife International	2013-2015	1 week p.a.	AUD 5,000		Review status at AC8
2.10	Identify priority species or populations for conservation actions	PaCSWG, Science Officer	2013-2015	2 week p.a.	AUD 0		Review at AC8.

2.11	Review progress and prioritise the threats to breeding sites and identify gaps in knowledge	PaCSWG, Science Officer	2013-2015	1 week p.a.	AUD 0		Annual updating of priorities by Parties, re-run prioritisation as required. Include Balearic shearwater in terrestrial prioritisation
	Review existing, and advise on new NPAs for ACAP species	PaCSWG, Parties	2013-2015				Amsterdam Albatross (France), Southern Giant Petrel (Argentina), Balearic Shearwater (Spain)
2.12	Develop, review and update best-practice guidelines to mitigate selected threats to breeding sites (including updates for eradication and biosecurity protocols)	PaCSWG members, Science Officer	2013-2015	3 weeks p.a.	AUD \$500		Update eradication guidelines by AC8. Translate updated document. Update biosecurity guidelines to ensure adequate for disease issues.
	Develop a translocation best practice guidelines for ACAP species	PaCSWG, Lead NZ and US	2013-2015				Document to be presented at AC8
2.13	Develop best-practice guidelines for monitoring of numbers and trends	PaCSWG, Lead UK, Science Officer	By MoP4, AC7	4 weeks	AUD 0 ???		Production of two documents (<i>one by MoP4, other by AC7</i>). Do we need funds to translate ?
2.14	Review evidence for impacts of pathogens and parasites on ACAP species and effectiveness of mitigation measures	PaCSWG, Science Officer, Lead Argentina and France	By AC8	4 weeks	AUD 0		Update review of pathogens and parasites. Consider need for input from pathologists and wildlife vets. Document for AC8
	Parties urged to update database/develop/implement biosecurity plans for ACAP breeding sites	Members, PaCSWG, Science Officer	Ongoing	1 week			Ongoing
	Develop best-practice dehooking guidelines	PCSWG, SBWG members, Secretariat,	By AC8	2 weeks	\$5000		Document at AC8, funds required for graphic design and translation

	Progress ID guide for bycaught seabirds, including catalogue of biological samples and best practice guidelines for acquisition of tissue samples for genetic analyses	PCSWG, SBWG.TWG,, Secretariat,	By AC8	3 weeks	\$?????		Draft document for AC8
2.15	Post web links on biological sampling guidelines following disease outbreaks	Science Officer, PaCSWG	2013-2015	1 day	AUD 0		PCSWG members to provide links/material. Ongoing.
2.16	<i>Produce centralised catalogue of plastic rings used on ACAP species and contact list, and addresses of ringing authorities</i>	<i>Science Officer, PaCSWG, Lead France?</i>	<i>By 2013?4</i>	<i>1 week</i>	<i>AUD 0</i>		<i>A summary table will be provide by the Science Officer. Parties will check gaps and update by AC8.</i>
2.17	Provide reports on activities to AC meetings	PaCSWG, Science Officer	As needed	12 weeks	AUD 0		

ANNEX 5. ARGENTINA STATEMENT

La Delegación Argentina a la Séptima Reunión del Comité Asesor del Acuerdo sobre la Conservación de Albatros y Petreles (ACAP) presenta sus atentos saludos a la Secretaría del Acuerdo y en relación a los documentos presentados por el Reino Unido SBWG5 Doc 07 y Doc 08 y PCSWG1 Doc 14, se recuerda que la República Argentina al ratificar el Acuerdo sobre Albatros y Petreles rechazó la pretendida extensión territorial del mismo efectuada por el Reino Unido a las Islas Malvinas, Georgias del Sur y Sandwich del Sur por constituir dichas islas y los espacios marítimos circundantes parte integrante del territorio nacional argentino.

El Gobierno argentino rechaza las referencias a pretendidas autoridades de las Islas Malvinas, Georgias del Sur y Sandwich del Sur y que se presente a los mencionados archipiélagos detentando un status internacional que no poseen.

La presencia británica en dichos archipiélagos y sus espacios marítimos circundantes constituye una ocupación ilegítima y es rechazada por la República Argentina, al igual que cualquier acto unilateral emanado de aquélla.

El Gobierno argentino también rechaza toda referencia a los mencionados archipiélagos, y los sitios geográficos en ellos contenidos, con una toponimia que la Argentina no reconoce.

La República Argentina reafirma sus derechos de soberanía sobre las Islas Malvinas, Georgias del Sur y Sandwich del Sur y los espacios marítimos circundantes, que son parte integrante del territorio nacional argentino y que, estando ilegítimamente ocupadas por el Reino Unido, las mismas son objeto de una disputa de soberanía entre ambos países, que ha sido reconocida por las Naciones Unidas.

La Delegación Argentina a la Séptima Reunión del Comité Asesor del Acuerdo sobre la Conservación de Albatros y Petreles (ACAP) reitera a la Secretaría del Acuerdo las expresiones de su consideración más distinguida.

La Rochelle, 29 de abril de 2013.

ANNEX 6. UNITED KINGDOM STATEMENT

The UK Delegation to the Seventh Meeting of the Advisory Committee for Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP) presents its compliments to the Agreement Secretariat. In response to the intervention from the Republic of Argentina, the United Kingdom has no doubt about its sovereignty over the Falkland Islands and South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime areas of both Territories.

The Republic of Argentina continues to extend the geographical area under dispute to include South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands (SGSSI). The United Nations has never issued any resolutions referencing a sovereignty dispute over SGSSI. The Government of the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland attaches great importance to the principle of self-determination as set out in Article 1.2 of the Charter of the United Nations and Article 1 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. That fundamental principle underlies our position on the Falkland Islands – it is a universal right for all peoples. There can be no negotiations on the sovereignty of the Falkland Islands unless and until such time as the islanders so wish. The recent result of the Falkland Islands referendum on their political status has clearly expressed to the international community the wishes of the people who live there to maintain their relationship with the United Kingdom as a British Overseas Territory.

The democratically elected representatives of the Falkland Islands continue to express their own views at the United Nations, most recently immediately following the referendum result in March this year. At a session of the UN Decolonisation Committee in June 2012 they asked the Committee to recognise that they, like any other people, were entitled to exercise the right of self-determination. They reiterated the historical facts that the Falkland Islands had no indigenous people, and that rather than representing an ‘illegal occupation’ no civilian population was removed prior to the decedents of the current population settling on the islands over eight generations ago. They confirmed that they are and have been the only people of the Falkland Islands and they did not wish for any change in their status.

Furthermore, the United Kingdom rejects any use or application of toponymy other than that applied to the Falkland Islands by the people and Government of the Falkland Islands.

ANNEX 7. ADDITIONAL ARGENTINA STATEMENT



*Embajada de la
República Argentina*

La Delegación Argentina a la Séptima Reunión del Comité Asesor del Acuerdo sobre la Conservación de Albatros y Petreles (ACAP) presenta sus atentos saludos a la Secretaria del Acuerdo y desea referirse a la nota británica contenida en el Anexo 11 y 6 del informe del Grupo de Trabajo sobre Captura Incidental y aquél de Estado de Población y Conservación, respectivamente, y en la que el Reino Unido hace alusión a la disputa de soberanía que sostiene con la Argentina sobre las Islas Malvinas, Georgias del Sur y Sandwich del Sur, y los espacios marítimos circundantes.

Al respecto, cabe destacar que la existencia de la disputa de soberanía denominada en el ámbito de Naciones Unidas como la "Cuestión de las Islas Malvinas" fue reconocida en las resoluciones 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII), 31/49, 37/9, 38/12, 39/6, 40/21, 41/40, 42/19 y 43/25 de su Asamblea General, así como en aquellas adoptadas por el Comité Especial de Descolonización.

La existencia de la controversia entre la Argentina y el Reino Unido como así también su ámbito espacial, que necesariamente incluye los tres archipiélagos del Atlántico Sur nombrados y los espacios marítimos circundantes, fueron reconocidos por el Reino Unido al suscribir las Declaraciones Conjuntas de Madrid en 1989 y 1990.

La República Argentina recuerda que la Resolución 2.9, adoptada por la segunda reunión de las Partes del Acuerdo sobre la Conservación de Albatros y Petreles (ACAP) en base a un proyecto acordado entre la Argentina y el Reino Unido, refiere a la "nomenclatura sobre territorios en controversia" e incluye a los archipiélagos precedentemente citados. Dicha Resolución, aprobada por consenso, dispone que para la presentación de documentación respecto de las Islas Malvinas, Georgias del Sur y Sandwich del Sur, la Secretaría del ACAP y los otros órganos del Acuerdo emplearán, para los tres archipiélagos comprendidos en la disputa de soberanía, la doble nomenclatura en los siguientes términos:

- a) En los textos en inglés: "Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)"; "South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands (Islas Georgias del Sur e Islas Sandwich del Sur)".
- b) En los textos en español: "Islas Malvinas (Falkland Islands)"; "Islas Georgias del Sur e Islas Sanwich del Sur (South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands)".

Asimismo, en diversos foros regionales e internacionales, tales como la CELAC, UNASUR, MERCOSUR y la Cumbre ASA se han adoptado declaraciones en las que se reconocen los legítimos derechos argentinos en la disputa de soberanía con el Reino Unido sobre las Islas Malvinas, Georgias del Sur y Sanwich del Sur, y los espacios marítimos circundantes.



*Embajada de la
República Argentina*

La presencia británica en los archipiélagos aludidos y los espacios marítimos circundantes constituye una ocupación ilegítima del territorio argentino. Los hechos históricos que fundamentan la posición argentina han sido reiteradamente expuestos por nuestro país en el ámbito de las Naciones Unidas. Se adjuntan dos breves documentos que fueron circulados en dicha organización recientemente.

La Argentina propone al Reino Unido que en lugar de procurar refutar los hechos históricos cuya ocurrencia ya ha admitido y cuyas consecuencias también conoce, honre su compromiso y reanude de inmediato las negociaciones con la Argentina relativas a la Cuestión de las Islas Malvinas. Si así lo hiciera, estaría actuando lícita y responsablemente, de conformidad con las obligaciones que sobre él recaen en su calidad de miembro de las Naciones Unidas.

La realización de una votación entre los ciudadanos británicos que residen en las Islas Malvinas en nada altera aspecto alguno de la Cuestión de las Islas Malvinas, la cual continúa irresuelta como resultado de la contumacia del Gobierno británico a cumplir con la obligación que el derecho internacional le impone de resolver pacíficamente la controversia mediante la reanudación de las mencionadas negociaciones bilaterales.

El Gobierno Argentino rechaza toda referencia a pretendidas autoridades de las Islas Malvinas, Georgias del Sur y Sandwich del Sur, que se presente a los mencionados archipiélagos detentando un status internacional que no poseen, así como todo otro acto unilateral emanado de dicha ocupación.

En efecto, quienes peticionan ante el Comité Especial de Descolonización lo hacen en tal carácter, y como ocurre en el caso de otros territorios no autónomos bajo tratamiento del Comité, expresan su visión. Esta es tenida en cuenta por los Estados miembros del órgano para adoptar la resolución sobre la Cuestión de las Islas Malvinas, que año a año solicita al Reino Unido y la Argentina que reanuden las negociaciones bilaterales para poner fin, lo antes posible, a la mencionada disputa.

El Gobierno argentino reafirma una vez más los imprescriptibles derechos de soberanía de la República Argentina sobre las Islas Malvinas, Georgias del Sur y Sandwich del Sur y los espacios marítimos circundantes, los cuales son parte integrante de su territorio nacional.



John McEwen House, 7 National Circuit, Barton ACT-2600 Tel.: (612) 6273-9111 Fax: (612) 6273-0500
P.O. Box 4835, Kingston ACT 2604 www.argentina.org.au Email: info@argentina.org.au

La Cuestión de las Islas Malvinas

ANTECEDENTES HISTÓRICOS

Las Islas Malvinas fueron descubiertas en 1520 por integrantes de la expedición de Magallanes. A pesar de haber sido denominadas en la cartografía europea con diversos nombres, siempre quedaron dentro de los espacios bajo control efectivo de las autoridades españolas.

Las Bulas Pontificias y el Tratado de Tordesillas de 1494 son los primeros instrumentos que reflejan los títulos de España de acuerdo con el derecho internacional de la época. Toda la región austral de América, con sus costas, mares e islas, quedó indiscutiblemente preservada bajo la soberanía española a través de los diversos tratados suscriptos en este período, como el Tratado "Americano" de 1670, entre España e Inglaterra.

La Paz de Utrecht, firmada en 1713, aseguró la integridad de las posesiones de España en América del Sur y confirmó su exclusividad de navegación en el Atlántico Sur. Inglaterra aceptó dichas cláusulas como signataria de los acuerdos de Utrecht y de tratados posteriores del siglo XVIII que lo ratificaban.

En 1749, España se enteró de un proyecto británico para establecerse en las Islas Malvinas y protestó firmemente ante el Reino Unido, cuyo gobierno desistió de llevarlo a cabo. En 1764 fue Francia la que manifestó interés en las Islas Malvinas creando un establecimiento al que denominó "Port Louis" en la Isla Soledad. España se opuso enérgicamente y obtuvo el reconocimiento de Francia de los derechos españoles a las islas, la desocupación del archipiélago y su entrega formal a las autoridades españolas.

Poco después de la instalación francesa, el Reino Unido volvió a manifestar sus intenciones de apropiarse de las Islas, esta vez a través de una expedición que llegó clandestinamente al archipiélago y levantó un pequeño fuerte que llamaron "Port Egmont", en una isla situada al oeste de la Gran Malvina. Pese al secreto de la operación, España tuvo conocimiento de ello, protestó insistentemente y, como no obtuvo una respuesta aceptable en 1770, expulsó a sus ocupantes.

Los dos países estuvieron al borde de la guerra, llegándose en 1771 a un acuerdo plasmado en dos Declaraciones: una Declaración por la que España restituía a los británicos "Port Egmont" haciendo reserva expresa de su soberanía sobre la totalidad del archipiélago de las Islas Malvinas y una Aceptación de la Declaración en la que Gran Bretaña guardaba silencio acerca de la reserva de derechos

española. Como parte del acuerdo se convino que los ingleses se retirarían de "Port Egmont" a breve plazo, lo que efectivamente ocurrió en 1774.

Desde entonces las autoridades españolas con asiento en Puerto Soledad continuaron ejerciendo su jurisdicción y control sobre la totalidad del archipiélago. En 1790, con la firma del tratado de San Lorenzo de El Escorial, Gran Bretaña se comprometió a no formar ningún establecimiento en las costas tanto orientales como occidentales de América Meridional ni en las islas adyacentes ya ocupadas por España, cual era el caso de las Malvinas.

A partir de la Revolución de Mayo de 1810 las islas Malvinas fueron consideradas por los primeros gobiernos argentinos como parte integrante del territorio heredado de España. En 1820, a pesar de las luchas internas que enfrentaba el Estado argentino en formación, el Coronel de la Marina argentina David Jewett tomó posesión de su cargo en las Islas Malvinas en nombre de las Provincias Unidas del Río de la Plata en un acto llevado a cabo públicamente en Puerto Soledad, ante loberos y balleneros de varias nacionalidades, entre ellos estadounidenses y británicos. La noticia fue publicada en medios de los Estados Unidos y del Reino Unido (diario Times de Londres David Jewett del 3 de agosto de 1821).

Pese a la publicidad del acto llevado a cabo por la autoridad argentina ni en esa ocasión, ni más tarde en el proceso de reconocimiento del Estado argentino, que culminó con la firma del Tratado de Amistad, Comercio y Navegación de 1825, Gran Bretaña formuló manifestación alguna sobre eventuales pretensiones sobre las Islas Malvinas.

Los gobiernos argentinos realizaron diversos actos demostrativos de su soberanía sobre las islas concediendo tierras y legislando sobre recursos pesqueros. En este marco se fue desarrollando Puerto Soledad, cuyos habitantes se ocupaban de la cría de ganado, la caza de lobos marinos y la prestación de servicios a los buques que tocaban puerto.

El 10 de junio de 1829 el gobierno argentino creó la Comandancia Política y Militar de las Malvinas y designó a Luis Vernet al frente de la misma. Después de haber mantenido silencio por más de medio siglo desde el episodio fugaz de Puerto Egmont, y luego de haberse sucedido sin oposición alguna administraciones españolas y argentinas en las islas Malvinas, es recién en noviembre de 1829 que el Reino Unido, en el marco de un renacimiento de su interés estratégico en el Atlántico Sur, presentó una protesta contra la decisión del 10 de junio de ese año. Poco tiempo después, el 3 de enero de 1833, una corbeta de la Marina Real británica por un acto de fuerza expulsó a las autoridades argentinas que se negaron a reconocerle autoridad alguna.

Este acto, llevado a cabo en tiempo de paz, sin que mediara comunicación ni declaración previa alguna de parte de un gobierno que se suponía amigo de la República Argentina, fue inmediatamente rechazado y protestado por parte de las autoridades argentinas. En efecto, el 16 de enero de 1833, al llegar a Buenos Aires las primeras noticias de lo ocurrido en las Islas Malvinas, el gobierno argentino pidió explicaciones al Encargado de Negocios británico, que no estaba al tanto de la acción de su país. Pocos días después, el 22 de enero, el Ministro de Relaciones Exteriores argentino presentó una protesta formal ante el funcionario británico, que fue renovada y ampliada en reiteradas oportunidades por el representante argentino en Londres. Las reiteradas presentaciones argentinas ante el gobierno británico tropezaron invariablemente con respuestas negativas de parte de ese gobierno.

La cuestión quedó pendiente y así lo reconoció el Secretario de Asuntos Extranjeros británico en 1849 en una comunicación oficial. Por el lado argentino, la cuestión continuó planteándose a distintos niveles del gobierno y fue objeto de debates en el Congreso de la Nación.

En 1884, ante la falta de respuesta a las protestas, la Argentina propuso llevar el tema a un arbitraje internacional, lo cual también fue rechazado sin dar razones por el Reino Unido.

Los sucesivos gobiernos argentinos continuaron presentando, sin éxito, protestas ante el Reino Unido y realizando en cada oportunidad propicia las presentaciones y reservas correspondientes en defensa y preservación de sus derechos de soberanía sobre los archipiélagos disputados.

**LA CUESTIÓN
DE LAS ISLAS MALVINAS
EN LAS NACIONES UNIDAS**

La llamada "Cuestión de las Islas Malvinas", entendida como la disputa de soberanía entre la Argentina y el Reino Unido por las Islas Malvinas, Georgias del Sur, Sandwich del Sur y los espacios marítimos circundantes, antes incluso de constituirse las Naciones Unidas, estuvo presente en la Conferencia de San Francisco, en la que la delegación argentina presentó una reserva de derechos según la cual la República Argentina en ningún caso acepta que dicho sistema pueda ser aplicado a o sobre territorios que le pertenezcan, ya sea que ellos estén sujetos a reclamo o controversia, o estén en posesión de otros Estados.

Ya en pleno desarrollo el proceso de descolonización impulsado por la Carta de la ONU, el 14 de diciembre de 1960, la Asamblea General de las Naciones Unidas aprobó la Resolución 1514 (XV) "Declaración sobre la concesión de la independencia a los países y pueblos coloniales", que proclamó "la necesidad de poner fin, rápida e incondicionalmente, al colonialismo en todas sus formas y manifestaciones", consagrando dos principios fundamentales que debían guiar el proceso de descolonización: el de autodeterminación y el de integridad territorial.

Esta Resolución establece en su párrafo sexto que "todo intento encaminado a quebrar total o parcialmente la unidad nacional y la integridad territorial de un país es incompatible con los propósitos y principios de la Carta de las Naciones Unidas". Indiscutiblemente esta Resolución deja en claro que, allí donde está en juego el principio de integridad territorial de los Estados no puede tener aplicación el de autodeterminación.

En ejecución de la Resolución 1514 (XV) el 16 de diciembre de 1965 la Asamblea General aprobó la Resolución 2065 (XX) por cuyo intermedio reconoció la existencia de una disputa de soberanía entre la Argentina y el Reino Unido e invitó a ambos países a negociar para encontrar una solución pacífica a la controversia.

Esta Resolución contiene los elementos esenciales que encuadran la Cuestión:

- El caso de las Islas Malvinas es una de las formas de colonialismo al que debe ponerse fin.
- Se toma nota de la existencia de una disputa entre los gobiernos argentino y británico.

- Se invita a los gobiernos argentino y británico a entablar negociaciones a fin de encontrar una solución pacífica al problema y a informar el resultado de las mismas al Comité Especial o a la Asamblea General.
- Para dichas negociaciones deberán tenerse en cuenta los objetivos y las disposiciones de la Carta (entre ellos el art. 33 relativo a la obligación de las partes de un diferendo de buscar la solución ante todo por la vía de la negociación) y de la Resolución 1514 (principio de integridad territorial), así como los intereses de la población de las Islas (dejando de esta manera de lado el principio de autodeterminación).

Poco tiempo después de adoptarse la citada Resolución se inició un proceso de negociación bilateral respecto de la soberanía las Islas Malvinas, Georgias del Sur y Sandwich del Sur y los espacios marítimos circundantes, en los cuales ambas Partes propusieron distintas alternativas de solución pero sin llegar a concretarse ninguna.

En los años siguientes, mientras se mantenía el ámbito de negociación de la disputa de soberanía, se desarrollaron conversaciones especiales sobre aspectos prácticos que hacían al bienestar de la población de las Islas, explicitando así la Argentina, su voluntad de atender los intereses de los mismos.

Como resultado de esas conversaciones especiales ambos gobiernos arribaron, en 1971, a un acuerdo, bajo fórmula de soberanía, para cooperar en materia de servicios aéreos y marítimos regulares; y en comunicaciones postales, telegráficas y telefónicas; mientras que la Argentina asumió el compromiso de cooperar en los campos de la salud, educacional, agrícola y técnico.

No obstante ello, en el año 1973 la AGNU declaró la necesidad de acelerar las negociaciones en curso y mediante su resolución 3160 (XXVIII) instó a ambos gobiernos a proseguirlas sin demora.

Las negociaciones que versaban sobre la cuestión de fondo, trataron oficial u oficiosamente distintas fórmulas de solución, todas de las cuales contemplaban la restitución del ejercicio de soberanía a la Argentina. Pero a pesar de dichas negociaciones en curso y las acciones argentinas en favor de los intereses de los habitantes de las Islas que, por cierto, aliviaban las cargas de las responsabilidades de la potencia ilegalmente ocupante y administradora, el Reino Unido simultáneamente realizaba actos pretendidamente jurisdiccionales, relacionados con la exploración de los recursos naturales del área en disputa, que fueron protestados por el Gobierno argentino.

Atento a ello, en diciembre de 1976, la Asamblea General de la ONU adoptó una nueva Resolución- la número 31/49-, de significativa importancia por su contenido, por 102 votos a favor, 1 en contra (Reino Unido) y 32 abstenciones. Ésta insta a las

dos partes de la disputa a que se abstengan de adoptar decisiones que entrañen la introducción de modificaciones unilaterales en la situación mientras las Islas están atravesando por el proceso recomendado por las Resoluciones 2065(XX) y 3160 ya mencionadas. Es el día de hoy que esta Resolución continúa siendo desoída por el Reino Unido, que persiste en el desarrollo de actividades unilaterales en el área disputada relativas, principalmente, a la exploración y explotación de recursos naturales renovables y no renovables, así como de carácter militar.

El conflicto de 1982 no alteró la naturaleza de la controversia de soberanía entre la Argentina y el Reino Unido por las Islas Malvinas, Georgias del Sur, Sandwich del Sur y los espacios marítimos circundantes, que continuó pendiente de negociación y solución. Así lo reconoció la Asamblea General en noviembre de 1982 cuando aprobó la Resolución 37/9 y lo reiteró mediante las resoluciones 38/12, 39/6, 40/21, 41/40, 42/19 y 43/25.

A partir de 1989, el examen anual de la Cuestión de las Islas Malvinas está radicado en el Comité Especial de Descolonización, Este Comité aprueba anualmente una resolución en términos semejantes a las resoluciones pertinentes de la Asamblea General.

Asimismo, en el ámbito de la ONU, se mantiene el mandato de la misión de buenos oficios del Secretario General y el tema de la Cuestión de las Islas Malvinas figura desde el año 2004 en la agenda permanente de la Asamblea General, el cual puede ser tratado previa notificación de un Estado miembro.

La reanudación de las relaciones consulares y diplomáticas ente ambos países en octubre de 1989 y febrero de 1990 fue precedida por un entendimiento sobre las condiciones en las que ambos países considerarían la disputa de soberanía sobre las Islas Malvinas, Georgias del Sur y Sandwich del Sur y los espacios marítimos circundantes. A este fin se acordó, a partir de las Declaraciones Conjuntas de Madrid de 1989 y 1990, una fórmula de reserva o salvaguarda de soberanía sobre las Islas Malvinas, Georgias del Sur y Sandwich del Sur y los espacios marítimos circundantes que, al mismo tiempo constituye un reconocimiento por parte de ambos países sobre la existencia y contenido de la controversia de soberanía.

Sin embargo, la cuestión de la soberanía, tema central de la disputa, no ha podido aún ser abordada debido a la negativa del Reino Unido a reanudar las negociaciones sobre esta materia. El Reino Unido insiste en su posición rechazando las reiteradas exhortaciones de la Argentina, de las Naciones Unidas, del Grupo de los 77 más China, de la comunidad internacional toda, de los organismos regionales (OEA, MERCOSUR, UNASUR, CELAC) y de las Cumbres Iberoamericanas, entre otros foros multilaterales.

El Reino Unido une a su rechazo a la reanudación de las negociaciones la invocación de un pretendido derecho a la autodeterminación por parte de la población de las Islas que es inaplicable al caso y que ha sido reiteradamente rechazada por las Naciones Unidas. Ello es así porque la Organización entendió que una población transplantada por la Potencia colonial, como es la población de las Islas Malvinas, no es un pueblo con derecho a la libre determinación ya que no se diferencia del pueblo de la metrópoli.