



**Agreement on the Conservation of
Albatrosses and Petrels**

**REPORT OF THE SEVENTH MEETING OF THE
ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

La Rochelle, France

6 – 10 May 2013

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AC	Advisory Committee (AC1, AC2 etc. refer to the first, second, etc. meetings of the Advisory Committee)
ACAP	Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels
APEC	Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation
AUD	Australian Dollar
BLI	BirdLife International
CCAMLR	Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources
CCSBT	Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna
CMS	Convention on Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals
DOC	Department of Conservation
EEZs	Exclusive Economic Zones
ERS	Ecologically Related Species
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
HSI	Humane Society International
ICES	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea
IFOP	Instituto de Fomento Pesquero
IPOA-Seabirds	International Plan of Action-Seabirds
ISSF	International Sustainable Seafood Foundation
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources
LPO	Ligue pour la Protection des Oiseaux
MoP	Meeting of the Parties (MoP1, MoP2 etc. refer to the first, second etc. Session of the Meeting of Parties)
MPI	Ministry for Primary Industries
MSC	Marine Stewardship Council
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
NPOA-Seabirds	National Plan of Action – Seabirds
PCSWG	Population and Conservation Status Working Group
RLI	Red List Indices
RoP	Rules of Procedure
SBWG	Seabird Bycatch Working Group
SEAFO	South East Atlantic Fishery Organisation
(t)RFMO	(tuna) Regional Fisheries Management Organisation
TWG	Taxonomy Working Group
UK	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
UN	United Nations
USA	United States of America
WGs	Working Groups
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature

CONTENTS

LIST OF ACRONYMS	i
1 OFFICIAL OPENING AND OPENING REMARKS	1
2 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA	2
3 RULES OF PROCEDURE	2
4 REPORT OF THE DEPOSITARY	4
5 ACAP SECRETARIAT	6
5.1 Activities undertaken in 2012/2013 intersessional period.....	6
5.2 Secretariat Work Programme 2013-2015	7
5.3 Agreement Sponsorship Policy	7
5.4 Parties' AC Reports.....	9
6 AGREEMENT'S FINANCIAL MATTERS	10
6.1 Financial Report	10
7 OBSERVER REPORTS	11
7.1 Reports from ACAP Observers at international meetings	11
7.2 Reports from Observers to AC7.....	11
8 REPORT ON THE FOURTH MEETING OF THE PARTIES	14
9 POPULATION AND CONSERVATION STATUS OF ALBATROSSES AND PETRELS 14	
9.1 Report of the Working Group	14
9.2 Future Work Programme.....	18
10 TAXONOMY OF ALBATROSSES AND PETRELS	18
10.1 Report of the Working Group	18
10.2 Future Work Programme.....	18
11 SEABIRD BYCATCH	19
11.1 Report of the Working Group	19
11.2 Future Work Programme.....	26
12 ADVISORY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME	26
12.1 Advisory Committee Work Programme 2013-2015	26
12.2 Allocation of AC funds.....	26
12.3 Agreement Secondment Programme	29
13 INDICATORS TO MEASURE SUCCESS OF ACAP	30
14 LISTING OF NEW SPECIES	31
15 SPECIES ACTION PLANS	33
16 IMPACTS OF GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE	34
17 ELECTION AND APPOINTMENT OF AC OFFICERS	35
18 EIGHTH MEETING OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE	35
18.1 Timing and Venue	35
18.2 Draft agenda	36

19	FIFTH MEETING OF THE PARTIES.....	36
19.1	Timing and Venue	36
20	OTHER BUSINESS	36
20.1	Publication of meeting documents	36
21.	ADOPTION OF THE REPORT	37
22.	CLOSING REMARKS.....	37
ANNEX 1.	LIST OF AC7 MEETING PARTICIPANTS.....	39
ANNEX 2.	LIST OF MEETING DOCUMENTS	47
ANNEX 3.	AC7 AGENDA	49
ANNEX 4.	SECRETARIAT WORK PROGRAMME 2013-2015	51
ANNEX 5.	ADVISORY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2013-2015	61
ANNEX 6.	DRAFT AC8 AGENDA	73
ANNEX 7.	BRAZIL UPDATE ON PLANACAP	75
ANNEX 8.	USA UPDATE ON EVENTS AT BREEDING SITES	76
ANNEX 9.	USA STATEMENT ON THE PROPOSAL TO NOMINATE THE PINK-FOOTED SHEARWATER TO ANNEX 1	77
ANNEX 10.	CANADA STATEMENT ON THE PROPOSAL TO NOMINATE THE PINK- FOOTED SHEARWATER TO ANNEX 1	78
ANNEX 11.	ARGENTINA DISCLAIMER AMENDMENT PROPOSAL	79

1 OFFICIAL OPENING AND OPENING REMARKS

- 1.1 The Seventh Meeting of the Advisory Committee (AC7) to the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP) was held in La Rochelle, France from 6 - 10 May 2013, with Dr Marco Favero as Chair and Mr Mark Tasker as Vice-chair.
- 1.2 Twelve Parties were represented: Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, France, New Zealand, Peru, South Africa, Spain, the United Kingdom (UK) and Uruguay. Norway notified their apologies for not being able to attend.
- 1.3 In addition two Range States participated as observers: Canada and the United States of America (USA).
- 1.4 The CMS Secretariat, BirdLife International, Chinese Wild Bird Federation, Humane Society International (HSI), Ligue pour la Protection des Oiseaux (LPO), Medmaravis and World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) attended the meeting as Observers.
- 1.5 The list of participants is provided in **ANNEX 1**. The list of meeting documents and information papers is provided in **ANNEX 2**.
- 1.6 The meeting commenced with a welcoming address by Mr Pascal Bolot, Prefect for Terres Australes et Antarctiques Françaises. Mr Bolot welcomed delegates to the Seventh Meeting of the Advisory Committee being held in La Rochelle, France. As the Prefect for Terres Australes et Antarctiques Françaises responsible for the conservation of their biodiversity, he noted the importance of the work of the Advisory Committee in improving the conservation status of albatross and petrel species found in these territories. In particular, the Amsterdam Albatross only has a population of 38 breeding pairs and it is essential that all actions possible are taken to protect this and other species found there. France's National Plan of Action for the Amsterdam albatros was recently launched under the umbrella of ACAP and is designed to implement the actions required under the Agreement's Action Plan.
- 1.7 Mr Bolot drew attention to the existence of the recently created (2006) national natural reserve of Terres Australes Françaises which hosts many species listed under ACAP. He also spoke of the long history of seabird data collection in his territories, over 50 years of breeding site census data. He also noted the achievements of France in working in complementary international agreements on seabird issues and in particular in CCAMLR, where France has achieved a dramatic reduction in the bycatch of seabirds in this fishery. Where once thousands of seabirds were killed, now the numbers have been reduced to around 200-300 and France continues to work on reducing this level further. He finally welcomed the work done by ACAP on those issues.

2 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

- 2.1 An agenda was adopted by the meeting (**ANNEX 3**).

3 RULES OF PROCEDURE

Intersessional Committee established by Resolution 4.8

- 3.1 The AC considered the progress of the Intersessional Committee established by Resolution 4.8 ([AC7 Doc 22](#)). Australia (Chair), Brazil (observer), France, New Zealand, Peru and United Kingdom have been participating in this intersessional work. Five options were identified for further consideration concerning participation by APEC member economies as observers in sessions of the Meeting of the Parties (MoP) and in meetings of its subsidiary bodies: Option A – Amending Rule 4(1) of the rules of procedure; Option B – Status quo; Option C – Adopting provisions pursuant to art. VIII(15) to enable participation by any APEC member economy as observer; Option D – Amending the Agreement; and Option E – Memorandum of Understanding with APEC.
- 3.2 Members expressed their appreciation to the Intersessional Committee for its work, including the commitment of Australia in chairing the Intersessional Committee.
- 3.3 France stressed the importance of observership by APEC member economies to the work of ACAP in pursuing the conservation of albatrosses and petrels.
- 3.4 Argentina, South Africa and Spain indicated they would be pleased to participate in the work of the Intersessional Committee, as observers. The Chair of the Intersessional Committee (Mr Jonathon Barrington, Australia), welcomed the new participants to the Intersessional Committee noting that all Parties were welcome to participate in the work of the Intersessional Committee at any time.
- 3.5 Brazil welcomed the news that options were now on the table. Brazil expressed a preference for Option A through amending MoP Rules of Procedure (RoP) rule 4(1) to remove the reference to art VIII(15) of the Agreement and instead refer to art VIII(4). Brazil indicated it was not attracted to Option D.
- 3.6 [AC7 Doc 09](#) outlined a proposed modality for complementary changes to AC RoP should MoP decide at some juncture to amend its RoP concerning observership by APEC member economies, including intersessionally. It also suggested AC7 consider its participation in Intersessional Committee established by Resolution 4.8.
- 3.7 United Kingdom and Peru noted the composition of the Intersessional Committee was established by the MoP and, noting the involvement of the AC Chair in an ex officio capacity, preferred to not alter the composition of the Intersessional Committee.

- 3.8 United Kingdom and Peru preferred any potential decision of the MoP to change its RoP to be reflected through a consistent, timely amendment to the AC RoP. Brazil and United Kingdom requested clarification of the process for amending AC RoP. The Executive Secretary indicated that: (a) unless specified to the contrary MoP RoP do not apply to AC RoP (see MoP RoP rule 1(2)); (b) AC RoP may be amended intersessionally (AC RoP rule 13(3) refers); and (c) the intersessional voting procedures under MoP RoP rule 24 would apply (see MoP RoP rule 24(6) on application of that rule to intersessional voting generally). The AC Chair thanked the Executive Secretary noting the procedures would apply if changes to AC RoP were to be considered intersessionally.
- 3.9 An in-the-margins meeting was held of the Intersessional Committee. The participants (Australia, France, New Zealand, Peru, and United Kingdom) welcomed Argentina, Spain, South Africa, and USA as observers of the Intersessional Committee, along with Brazil. The meeting provided Intersessional Committee participants and observers an opportunity to discuss preliminary working principles to guide their work and exchange preliminary views about the merits of specific options. These discussions provided valuable insights about individual Parties' positions and an agreement to focus on the initial three options as a first priority. Attention would be given to the remaining options as a secondary priority. The Intersessional Committee Chair agreed to circulate a memorandum concerning the preliminary working principles and to work expeditiously with the participants and observers in developing specific modalities under the initial three options.

Amendment to Rule 20 concerning establishment of Working Groups

- 3.10 Argentina indicated that it is continuing to consult with Parties about amending AC RoP Rule 20 concerning the establishment of Working Groups. Argentina, Australia and United Kingdom are participating in this process (with United States observing). Argentina informed the meeting that based on a first proposal and comments made intersessionally by members of the working group, it has circulated an amended proposal of Rule 20 that was discussed in the margins. This text is currently being considered by participants of the intersessional group.
- 3.11 Brazil stressed that two issues of great concern have to be the object of urgent consideration: i) the criteria for the sponsorship of delegates and members of ACAP's Working Groups (WGs); and ii) the criteria for the composition and functioning of the WGs. Brazil also highlighted that the current framework allows some degree of bias in the work conducted by the WGs and that there is a lot of resistance for changing recommendations originated in those groups, even in the AC and the MoP. Therefore, representation in the WGs actually means more influence in further negotiations of the AC and the MoP and it would be desirable if Parties had fair representation in those groups. Brazil expressed its intention to take part in the intersessional process for the review of Rule 20.

- 3.12 Argentina thanked Brazil for their comments and welcomed Brazil to the informal Working Group that is considering the amendment of Rule 20.
- 3.13 Argentina understands Brazil's legitimate concerns about the assurance of the good functioning of Working Groups and its wishes to contribute with a transparent process in relation to the designation of their authorities and the sponsorship of experts.
- 3.14 Even though an amendment of Rule 20 will favour the good functioning of Working Groups, the aim of the informal WG is restricted and limits itself to define the WGs' composition in their different categories and the mechanisms that will allow participation in them. The appointment of WG's authorities and the definition of the Group's terms of reference is the responsibility of ACAP's Advisory Committee.
- 3.15 Australia and the UK highlighted that the role of the Working Groups is to provide technical and scientific advice to the AC relating to improving the conservation status of albatrosses and petrels. Therefore, amendments to Rule 20 concerning membership should ensure that the composition of Working Groups reflects relevant scientific and technical expertise and competence.

4 REPORT OF THE DEPOSITARY

- 4.1 Australia tabled the Report of the Depositary Government to the Agreement ([AC7 Doc 07](#)), which indicated that there been no new accessions or notifications to the Agreement since MoP4 in Lima, Peru, 23-27 April 2012, and that the Balearic Shearwater (*Puffinus mauretanicus*) was added to the list of petrel species in Annex 1 of the Agreement.
- 4.2 [AC7 Doc 19](#) outlines a proposed strategy to engage new Parties. There have been no new accessions to the Agreement since 9 October 2008. The proposed approach to engaging new Parties considered the species assessments and prioritisation framework, to identify non-Party States considered to have most relevance to the conservation objective of the Agreement. Non-Party States with breeding sites for Annex 1 species are identified (see Table 1) along with fisheries of non-Party States identified for priority conservation action (see Table 2). These highlight candidates for engagement based on threats to ACAP species on land and at sea.
- 4.3 The proposed engagement strategy includes: 1) preparation of briefing about the Agreement and its relevance to the conservation needs of species within the jurisdiction of the State concerned; 2) development of a demarche template; 3) establishing a timeline for advancing non-Party Range States; 4) monitoring progress; and 5) appointing officials to coordinate the engagement activities.
- 4.4 Argentina asked for the deletion of the row in Table 1 of AC7 Doc 19, which referred to Disputed Territories, and of the footnote that mentions the Senkaku or Diaoyutai Islands, as they are not States.

- 4.5 Brazil considered that any demarche should stress the importance to the conservation of albatrosses and petrels of accession by the relevant non-Party Range State, particularly noting the highly mobile nature of ACAP species and range of impacts on these species.
- 4.6 France stressed the ongoing importance of recommending to Contracting Parties to RFMOs their accession to the Agreement and expressed concerns about the listing of countries for disputed territories in Table 1 of AC7 Doc 19.
- 4.7 Peru supported the views of France, adding that some non-Party Range States do not belong to RFMOs and it was important to reach out to these States to explain the benefits of their accession to the conservation of ACAP species.
- 4.8 Australia indicated a willingness to assist in the engagement processes including drafting a demarche. Argentina expressed its disposition to cooperate with the engagement strategy.
- 4.9 Argentina suggested that, as new species are added to Annex 1 it would be important to include the countries that are in the distribution area of those species to the strategy.
- 4.10 Uruguay recommended considering the impacts of States' Parties to RFMOs on ACAP species, including by their flagged fishing vessels.
- 4.11 The United States suggested that multiple strategies be developed, including one encouraging accession of non-Party States and one encouraging the implementation of conservation actions by non-Party states not considering accession at this time. The United States noted that the engagement strategy currently prioritized non-Party States and RFMOs based on geography and jurisdiction, and suggested that the engagement strategy include prioritization of foreign flag fleets fishing in the waters of prioritized non-Party States and the engagement of RFMO individual members.
- 4.12 BirdLife International expressed its support for the engagement strategy suggesting a dual focus on non-Party Range States identified as a priority for accession to the Agreement, as well as on influencing the conservation actions of non-Party Range States that may not be considering accession to the Agreement. For example, engagement with Namibia may encourage early adoption of its NPOA-seabirds, and, because of its close ties, Brazil may be well-placed to forge links between Angola and the work of ACAP.
- 4.13 Brazil thanked BirdLife International for its intervention and indicated its willingness to investigate the options for, and possibilities of, engaging with Angola.
- 4.14 In relation to developing an ACAP Strategy to engage non-Parties, the AC recognised that there are two primary objectives, potentially interlinked:
- a) increasing ACAP membership, and
 - b) addressing priority ACAP conservation actions and objectives,
- There are three principal potential target groups:

- 1) Range States with jurisdictions which include breeding sites for ACAP species, e.g. Japan, Mexico, USA. These are the main current targets for objective a);
 - 2) Range States with domestic fisheries already identified by ACAP (in the recent prioritisation exercise) as priority targets with respect to seabird bycatch, e.g. Angola, Namibia. These should be important potential current targets for objective b); and
 - 3) Range States with distant water fleets already identified by ACAP (but not necessarily through the recent prioritisation exercise) as key targets with respect to seabird bycatch, e.g. China, Japan, Korea.
- 4.15 The AC developed some initial suggestions for the implementation of a strategy.
- 4.16 For group 1 above (Japan, Mexico, USA) for promoting accession: a) develop a consistent approach with country-specific sections, based on element 3.1 in AC7 Doc 19; b) identify which ACAP Parties (and/or Secretariat) are best-placed to approach the relevant departments of government in these countries; c) invite those identified in b) above to develop a plan and time scale for engagement and reporting back to the Advisory Committee.
- 4.17 For group 2 above, develop plans specific to each Range State, in consultation with appropriate stakeholders, before any formal approach is made by ACAP.
- 4.18 For group 3 above, a) develop a country-specific plan for approaching individual Range States (e.g. China, Japan, Korea); b) maximize the progress that can be made through interactions between ACAP and relevant RFMOs.
- 4.19 The AC Vice-chair recommended that briefings indicate approximate costs of membership for any proposed new Party to ACAP.
- 4.20 The AC agreed to establish an intersessional group, coordinated by the Vice-chair, Chair and Executive Secretary and open to any Party, to refine, develop and implement to the extent possible, a strategy to engage non-Parties.

5 ACAP SECRETARIAT

5.1 Activities undertaken in 2012/2013 intersessional period

- 5.1.1 The Executive Secretary presented [AC7 Doc 06](#) providing an overview of the Secretariat's operations since AC6. It was noted that all of the tasks included in its 2010-2012 Work Programme had been successfully completed, or substantial progress achieved on them.
- 5.1.2 In recognition of the key role played by the Science Officer in supporting the work of the Advisory Committee and its Working Groups, MoP4 made this a permanent, full-time position and appointed Dr Wiesława Misiak to the

position. MoP4 also extended the contract of the Executive Secretary, Mr Warren Papworth, for a further four-year term.

- 5.1.3 A key outcome in the intersessional period was the negotiation of a revised Memorandum of Understanding with the Government of Tasmania, which provides extensive support for the operation of the Secretariat through the provision of administrative support and a voluntary contribution towards the cost of office accommodation. The meeting was unanimous in its appreciation of the support provided to the Agreement's Secretariat and asked that this be communicated officially by the Executive Secretary to the Government of Tasmania.
- 5.1.4 It was noted that a large body of work has been achieved within the Secretariat with the assistance of volunteers, secondees, interns and students undertaking work placements. The Honorary Information Officer, Mr John Cooper continues to disseminate information on the work of the Agreement through daily news stories, Dr Nadeena Beck and Dr Yukiko Inoue were responsible for the development of a photographic identification guide for use by observers in fisheries management organisations and Mr Juan Pablo Seco Pon provided support at MoP4 and AC7. Mr Jorge Azocar, from Chile's Institute of Fisheries Observers (IFOP) completed a number of projects, including the development of data collection protocols.
- 5.1.5 The Secretariat continued to provide support for the Advisory Committee's Work Programme, through further development of the data portal and database and maintenance of key products, such as the species assessments. Support was also provided with implementation of the RFMO Engagement Strategy, through the preparation of briefs and meeting papers and attendance at meetings. Considerable success was achieved at these meetings during the intersessional period (refer agenda item 11.1), with the support of Dr Favero and other RFMO Coordinators.

5.2 Secretariat Work Programme 2013-2015

- 5.2.1 The Executive Secretary presented the Secretariat Work Programme for 2013-2015 ([AC7 Doc 17](#)), noting that this had been approved by ACAP Parties at MoP4. The Advisory Committee was requested to identify tasks arising from its revised Work Programme that required the assistance of the Secretariat.
- 5.2.2 Following consideration of the Advisory Committee's Work Programme under agenda item 12.1 a number of additional tasks were identified for inclusion in the Secretariat's 2013-2015 Work Programme. The revised Secretariat Work Programme is included in **ANNEX 4**.

5.3 Agreement Sponsorship Policy

- 5.3.1 The Executive Secretary presented a draft policy on the process to be followed for the sponsorship of delegates ([AC7 Doc 18](#)) for the consideration

and advice of the Advisory Committee. It was noted that at MoP4 several delegations expressed a desire to have a policy developed to provide transparent guidance on the sponsorship of delegates and experts to meetings. The Secretariat was requested by MoP4 to develop a draft policy in the intersessional period for its consideration at MoP5.

- 5.3.2 Argentina noted that the proposed criteria for Parties to pay the per diem costs for sponsored delegates presented difficulties under their administrative requirements and they stated that sponsorship should cover all costs. Under criterion 5, Argentina would prefer some flexibility in the case that there were exceptional circumstances. Under the proposed application criteria it was considered that the requirement to advise the name of the sponsored delegate 90 days in advance was excessive and that 60 days would be preferable. A number of delegations supported this suggestion. Under the proposed selection process, where funding is insufficient to meet all requests, Argentina did not support providing funding on a chronological basis.
- 5.3.3 Australia suggested that selection of sponsored delegates/experts should be based on the benefit that this individual's participation would make to the matters under consideration. Australia also proposed that cost-effectiveness should be one factor when considering selecting experts, e.g. taking advantage of local expertise. Under the proposed selection process, it was suggested that the Executive Secretary and the Chair of the Advisory Committee undertake assessments jointly.
- 5.3.4 France suggested that the selection criteria should be more clearly defined and that it should use the UN scale. France agreed with the proposal that the sponsored delegate's per diem be paid by their Party. It was suggested that selection criteria 1.2.5 be reworded more precisely to read, "If the Party has used properly the funds provided previously."
- 5.3.5 Peru agreed with Argentina that partial funding was not preferred and that 90 days advance of the sponsored delegates name was too early. Peru also agreed that the Secretariat should announce at the start of the process how many delegates would be supported and that the selection process should be undertaken jointly with the Chair of Advisory Committee.
- 5.3.6 Uruguay agreed with the suggestions made by Argentina and Peru and noted that the term 'experts' is ambiguous and that regional knowledge should be an important consideration when determining expertise.
- 5.3.7 Brazil supported Uruguay's comments, noting also that a key purpose of sponsoring delegates is to guarantee the participation of all Parties in ACAP meetings. Brazil noted that it should be left to Parties to decide who they will send and that the United Nations sponsorship system is focused on developing countries. The Brazilian delegation also noted the difficulties of supporting non-government experts to attend WGs meetings and that the ACAP sponsorship system plays a vital role for the participation of such national experts.
- 5.3.8 The United States suggested that a committee of Parties be formed to select

the delegates and experts to be sponsored; and with regard to the sponsorship of experts, that individual work group members be permitted to apply for sponsorship and provide justification for attendance

- 5.3.9 Noting the wide divergence of Parties' views on the proposed sponsorship policy, and following advice from the Chair of the Advisory Committee, the AC recommended that the draft policy be further developed in consultation with AC members during the intersessional period, for further consideration at AC8. The Secretariat will circulate the refined draft policy among AC members during the intersessional period to allow Parties to provide inputs with ample time prior to AC8.

5.4 Parties' AC Reports

- 5.4.1 The Secretariat presented [AC7 Inf 02](#) which summarised the electronic reporting process for AC7. It was noted that due to some technical difficulties, a number of Parties were not able to submit their reports on time, but nevertheless Parties made a concerted effort to provide the information required. The document also outlined a mechanism by which NGOs would be able to share their data with Parties in future reporting rounds.
- 5.4.2 Brazil was concerned about the ease with which NGO data could be clearly differentiated from that provided by Parties' government departments. The Secretariat noted that this is already possible to some extent in the database and that further amendments can be made to accommodate this in more detail.
- 5.4.3 Argentina noted that NGO data is indeed valued, and noted that it is an informative document. On the possibility for NGOs to submit "reports" to the Meeting of the Parties, Argentina - based on what was stated in the report of AC6, item 7 "Format for observers" – stated that the text should refer to "observers" instead of NGOs, as it is understood that the only NGOs that can participate are those that were admitted as observers to the corresponding previous meeting of the Agreement. Furthermore, Argentina understands that it is not necessary for observers to compile a similar report to the national report of the Meeting of the Parties, as that information can be presented as an information document under the Working Groups of the Advisory Committee.
- 5.4.4 Uruguay questioned the appropriateness of NGO involvement in AC reporting.
- 5.4.5 BirdLife International clarified that in its intersessional dialogue with the Secretariat leading to the procedures suggested in AC7 Inf 02, it simply wished to ensure that data held by BirdLife relating to sites and activities within the jurisdictions of ACAP Parties were available to Parties to include in their reports, if they wished to do so. It recognized that the process proposed in AC7 Info 02 would need further consideration by Parties, both on the principles involved and on the mechanisms for implementing these. BirdLife encouraged Parties to develop intersessionally a consensus on the best process and practice, recognizing that different Parties might have different

views on the extent to which they wished to implement this in respect of data available from NGOs.

- 5.4.6 Argentina asked the Secretariat to adopt the necessary measures in order that references to Antarctic sites in the database reflect Argentine toponymy on geographic Antarctic landforms. The Secretariat agreed to investigate the best way of reflecting all site name variants in the database.
- 5.4.7 Argentina also proposed that the Secretariat develops a manual for the ACAP database that can be distributed to database users to clarify access and data entry processes for Parties. The Secretariat agreed that this was a very valid proposal and undertook to draft a guide before the next call for data updates and reporting.
- 5.4.8 Brazil requested that information on the review of its National Action Plan for the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels to be included in this report. It is presented in **ANNEX 7**.

6 AGREEMENT'S FINANCIAL MATTERS

6.1 Financial Report

- 6.1.1 The Executive Secretary presented the interim financial report for 2013 ([AC7 Doc 08 Rev 2](#)). In relation to income received, the Executive Secretary noted that at the time of preparing the report, approximately 28% of Parties contributions were still outstanding. This shortfall has been offset by the payment of outstanding contributions from previous financial years, with all outstanding contributions from previous years now being paid, with the exception of small amounts resulting from currency fluctuations occurring at the time of the payment being received.
- 6.1.2 In relation to Appropriation No. 1 - Secretariat, expenditure is approximately 70% of the annual budget allocation. It is expected that the level of expenditure will remain slightly below budget.
- 6.1.3 For Appropriation No. 2 – Advisory Committee, expenditure is approximately 41% of the budget allocation. It is expected that expenditure against this appropriation will be over-budget due to the higher cost of holding AC7 and the preceding Working Group meetings in France. It was also necessary to provide interpretation services in all official languages for the Working Group meetings, which is not normally the case. Any over-expenditure against this appropriation will be offset against expected savings in Appropriation No. 1.
- 6.1.4 There is, proportionally, a high level of expenditure against Appropriation No. 4 – Advisory Committee Work Programme, which reflects expenditure made from the Special Fund, which is operated on a cash basis. The reconciliation of the Special Fund provided in Annex 2 of AC7 Doc 08 Rev 2, shows a significant level of outstanding commitments (AUD 387,100), however the current level of cash on-hand is sufficient to meet these commitments.
- 6.1.5 Brazil noted the full expenditure of funds allocated for the rental of the

Secretariat's office and queried whether this included the contribution for office accommodation provided by the Government of Tasmania. The Executive Secretary advised that the full-year cost for office rental was approximately AUD 20,000 higher than the budget allocation and that the contribution from the Government of Tasmania is used to off-set this additional cost. The Executive Secretary also provided explanations for the low level of expenditure against the stationery and staff training budget allocations.

- 6.1.6 The Chilean delegation noted that it had paid its 2013 contribution, however Annex 3 to the financial report showed an amount of AUD 619 outstanding. The Executive Secretary advised that this may be the result of exchange rate fluctuations at the time of payment, and undertook to consult with the Embassy of Chile in Australia to identify the cause of this underpayment.

7 OBSERVER REPORTS

7.1 Reports from ACAP Observers at international meetings

- 7.1.1 New Zealand presented a report ([AC7 Inf 07](#)) on the Thirty-first Annual Meeting of CCAMLR held in Hobart, Australia, from 23 October to 1 November 2012. In accordance with previous CCAMLR meetings, the assessment and avoidance of incidental mortality was included as an agenda item. No documents were submitted to the Commission or Scientific Committee in relation to this agenda item, but the Scientific Committee considered advice on this issue from the Working Group on Fish Stock Assessment. While there is a continued low level of seabird bycatch in some parts of the Convention Area, the Commission welcomed efforts by France to address seabird bycatch issues within the French EEZs in Subarea 58.6 and Division 58.5.1. During the meeting, it was noted that significant issues exist for seabirds that breed in the Convention Area but forage in fisheries to the north. It was also noted that opportunities for collaboration with regional initiatives on conservation of seabirds with distributions that span management areas. The CCAMLR Commission commended ACAP's work in reducing incidental mortality of seabirds in fishing and recommended strengthening the links between CCAMLR and ACAP.

7.2 Reports from Observers to AC7

- 7.2.1 Ms Melanie Virtue spoke on behalf of Dr. Bradnee Chambers, the new Executive Secretary of CMS, who was unable to attend the meeting but who wanted to assure the AC of the role of ACAP within the CMS Family of Agreements. The CMS Secretariat stated that it will be reaching out to the non-Bonn-based Agreements, such as ACAP, to maximize synergies between the Convention and its various daughter agreements. CMS noted the small size of the ACAP Secretariat and was impressed with the quality and quantity of documents produced for this meeting. CMS would not want to add any additional workload to the Secretariat, but wondered if there are

ways that CMS can further assist ACAP Secretariat and its Parties, in carrying out its mandate. Finally, CMS provided some updates from the CMS COP, held in Norway (AC7 Inf 06).

- 7.2.2 BirdLife International thanked Parties for the invitation to attend AC7. Staff from BLI and from BL partner organisations in France, Spain, and UK were able to participate directly in the meetings of the AC Working Groups; intersessionally many other BirdLife partners in Party and collaborating non-Party Range States (e.g. Argentina, New Zealand, South Africa, Uruguay, Canada, Japan, USA) were involved in activities contributing to the AC Work Programme.
- 7.2.3 BLI renewed its commitment to contribute to the current AC Work Programme, especially through: a) the work of its Albatross Task Force in eight jurisdictions of Parties/ Range States (for which it thanked all relevant governments for this support), b) its management of the Global Procellariiform Tracking Database; c) matters relevant to the IUCN Red List of threatened species; and d) continued collaboration with ACAP in interactions with tuna RFMOs.
- 7.2.4 WWF-New Zealand noted that WWF appreciates the opportunity to formally observe the Seventh Advisory Committee meeting to ACAP. WWF congratulated Parties and non-parties engaged in the Agreement on its important achievements to-date which improve the conservation status of ACAP species and thus meet the objective of the Agreement. The importance of critical information, formal advice and sound technical knowledge imparted by ACAP cannot be underestimated. In addition, the development and implementation of effective NPOAs that are compliant with FAO IPOA Technical Guidelines are vital to achieving the objective of the Agreement. WWF urged those Range States that are not yet Party to the Agreement to join and ratify as a matter of priority and encourage existing Parties to help facilitate this transition. Finally, WWF acknowledged the success of the recent Albatross and Petrel Conference held in New Zealand which was of particular relevance to this Agreement, as is highlighted in the Population and Conservation Status Working Group report. WWF confirmed that it continues to be committed to supporting the Agreement to help further its role in the conservation of albatrosses and petrels on a global scale.
- 7.2.5 Humane Society International (HSI) Australia appreciated the opportunity provided by the ACAP parties to participate as an Observer at AC7, and thanked this year's meeting host country, France. HSI was particularly concerned about the fisheries bycatch of the ACAP-listed seabird species and continues to attend ACAP in order to try to accelerate the widespread implementation of effective mitigation measures. HSI noted that this is the third consecutive ACAP meeting at which HSI has urged Members to make mandatory the appropriate line weighting requirements for seabird bycatch mitigation in all longline fisheries, irrespective of additional mitigation measures. Evidence to assist Members to support such action can be found in meeting documents SBWG5 31, 33 and 49. HSI also indicated that a gulf exists between the recent adoption by virtually all tRFMOs of effective

mitigation measures on paper and the demonstrated uptake and proven at-sea performance of these measures. This shortfall must be addressed. HSI also noted that for trawl fisheries that also cause seabird mortalities, there is a need to identify mitigation measures that are dependable. Incorporating certain features into the construction of new ships can solve many bycatch problems in both trawl and longline fisheries, but this is a neglected aspect of bycatch mitigation efforts.

- 7.2.6 Finally, HSI pointed out that it is important to remember that the escalating paper-driven processes associated with the conservation effort for ACAP listed species are of limited value unless they directly precipitate practical improvements at-sea. The continuing success of efforts by Member countries to eliminate on-land threats to many ACAP listed species is impressive and will hopefully remain a focus of members.
- 7.2.7 Medmaravis thanked the ACAP Secretariat and Parties for the opportunity to attend the Advisory Committee meeting as an observer and to Birdlife International for the sponsorship that made this possible. Medmaravis is a small organization of scientists and conservationists in the Mediterranean region. The attendance at this meeting gives Medmaravis visibility to ACAP and, also, it gives the chance to bring a regional view. Further, attendance at this meeting gives ACAP visibility in the Mediterranean region.
- 7.2.8 Medmaravis submitted a paper, in collaboration with BirdLife International, which has been tabled as [AC7 Inf 04](#). The aim of this document was to provide information about two species identified as potential candidate species for listing under ACAP (Yelkouan Shearwater *Puffinus yelkouan* and Scopoli's Shearwater *Calonectris diomedea*), and an update of the population status of Balearic Shearwater *Puffinus mauretanicus*. The organization drew the attention of the AC to the recommendations made in that paper (AC7 Inf 04) (see para 14.8).
- 7.2.9 Finally, Medmaravis expressed its congratulations to the ACAP Secretariat and Parties for the work done so far, and encouraged them to continue to devote attention, and to allocate resources for the conservation of marine birds.
- 7.2.10 The USA stated that it was pleased to be able to support the work of ACAP through many of their seabird conservation activities and participation in the Advisory Committee and Working Groups as an observer and as invited experts. USA reported updates on two events related to ACAP species that have been reported two years ago at AC6 and other developments in the conservation of those species in the United States. The details of these updates are included in **ANNEX 8**.
- 7.2.11 The Advisory Committee expressed its gratitude to all organizations for their contributions to the conservation of albatrosses and petrels. As an example, it mentioned the involvement of CMS in areas such as capacity building, climate change, etc and appreciated the continued collaboration of Birdlife International in different topics of the Agreement.

- 7.2.12 The ACAP Executive Secretary notified the AC on the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding between the CCAMLR and ACAP Secretariats, ensuring the continuity of collaborative work in the future.

8 REPORT ON THE FOURTH MEETING OF THE PARTIES

- 8.1 The AC Chair reported on the main outcomes of the Fourth Session of the Meeting of the Parties ([AC7 Doc 11](#)), addressing the operation of the Secretariat, operation of the Advisory Committee and operation of the Agreement.
- 8.2 MoP4 noted the considerable progress made by the Advisory Committee and its Working Groups in the implementation of the Agreement since the last Meeting of the Parties.
- 8.3 Regarding the Secretariat, the appointment of Dr Wiesława Misiak to the Science Officer position on an ongoing full-time basis, and the re-appointment of Mr Warren Papworth to the position of Executive Secretary were highlighted.
- 8.4 In respect to the operation of the Advisory Committee, MoP4 congratulated the AC on the progress achieved in implementing the Agreement. The Parties highlighted the expected outcomes for the next triennium, including: 1) improvement in the collation of data, 2) refinement and use of performance indicators; 3) review and update and implementation of best practice mitigation, and 4) significant reduction in the data gaps relevant to the status and trends of ACAP species.
- 8.5 Regarding the operation of the Agreement, reference was made to 1) the listing of the Balearic Shearwater in Annex 1, 2) the use of the framework to identify conservation priorities as a tool to guide the future work of the Agreement, 3) the progress made towards the identification of performance indicators, and 4) the strategy on capacity building and changes for the secondment programme.

9 POPULATION AND CONSERVATION STATUS OF ALBATROSSES AND PETRELS

9.1 Report of the Working Group

- 9.1.1 The Convenors of the Population and Conservation Status Working Group (hereafter PCSWG or WG), Dr Rosemary Gales and Dr Richard Phillips introduced the report of the 1st Meeting of the PCSWG. This report outlined inter-sessional progress against the Work Programme of the PCSWG, agreed at the ACAP Advisory Committee meeting in 2011 (AC6) and adopted at MoP4 in 2012. The report also reflected discussions and advice resulting from the WG meeting (PCSWG1) held on 29-30 April 2013 in La Rochelle, France.
- 9.1.2 The meeting was attended by representatives from Argentina, Australia,

Chile, France, New Zealand, South Africa, United Kingdom, United States and BirdLife International, as well as experts and observers from government agencies and non-government organisations. The full report of the Working Group ([AC7 Doc 12 Rev 1](#)) provided a comprehensive record of the inter-sessional progress, a 2013 assessment of the global status and trends of ACAP species (**Table 1**), the deliberations of the WG and the recommendations that the PCSWG presented to the AC.

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	↓
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

9.1.3 The Advisory Committee accepted the following recommendations and took note of them when developing the AC Work Programme:

- i. encourage revision of the membership of the PCSWG to maximise active participation by all members;
- ii. endorse 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;
- iii. endorse the expert revision and update of all ACAP Species Assessments prior to AC8;
- iv. endorse the support required to translate all updated Species Assessments, giving priority to those of new species;
- v. recognise the advances that are being achieved in planning and implementing large-scale eradication programs that will ultimately benefit the status of ACAP species;
- vi. encourage the thorough documentation and dissemination of details of eradication programs, including non-target impacts and mitigation, so that lessons and benefits can be widely applied in the future;
- vii. 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 programs;
- viii. note the comprehensive assessment of current population trends for ACAP species presented in Table 1;
- ix. request that the ACAP Secretariat transmit the advice in the PCSWG report relevant to the re-assessments of the IUCN conservation status of ACAP species to the BirdLife Secretariat, and encourages WG members and other experts to participate in the BirdLife discussion fora;
- x. urge Parties and others responsible for breeding populations of ACAP species to ensure the continuation of their current long-term monitoring programs;
- xi. encourage Spain to contribute population data for Balearic Shearwater to the ACAP database so that it can be included in future analyses and syntheses;
- xii. encourage Parties and other Range States responsible for breeding populations of ACAP species to implement the monitoring programs identified as priorities in the PCSWG report in order to increase current knowledge of population size, trends and demography;
- xiii. encourage ACAP Parties to, where possible, undertake or plan for the tracking studies identified as priorities in the PCSWG report;
- xiv. request 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;

- xv. invite BirdLife to review key gaps in tracking data in a submission to AC8, in consultation with Parties, to identify datasets that have been collected but are awaiting submission to the BirdLife database;
- xvi. request that ACAP Parties continue to focus on the high priority populations for conservation actions 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;
- xvii. request that the PCSWG and Secretariat assess whether other breeding populations should be considered as candidate ACAP priorities for conservation at AC8;
- xviii. in the inter-sessional period, progress the assessment of appropriate indicators and also consider the development of a composite indicator of the population status of ACAP species;
- xix. urge Parties to update biosecurity plan information in the database, and where necessary, develop and implement biosecurity plans for ACAP breeding sites;
- xx. request that PCSWG members update the ACAP best practice guidelines on eradication and biosecurity to ensure that they adequately address non-target mortality, and disease transmission issues, respectively;
- xxi. recognise the efforts by NZ and US in developing resource material relating to translocation techniques and encourages NZ and US to collate and harmonise best practice translocation guidelines for ACAP species;
- xxii. support an update of a review of disease in ACAP species to include recent data from France;
- xxiii. encourage Parties to provide details to the ACAP Secretariat of plastic bands applied to ACAP species;
- xxiv. request Parties provide contact details for national bird banding schemes for publication on the ACAP website;
- xxv. support the revision and finalisation of the hook removal guidelines during the inter-sessional period, and their translation into Spanish and French, and consider whether these guidelines should be available as a joint BirdLife/ACAP fact sheet
- xxvi. support efforts by the Secretariat and Convenors to progress the identification guide for birds killed in fishing operations;

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"

- xxvii. encourage members and observers to contribute relevant photographs and information to assist in the development of the identification guide; and
 - xxviii. encourage the Convenors and Secretariat to develop guidelines for the collection and curation of tissues samples obtained from bycaught seabirds, and to explore options for compiling a list of metadata relating to these collections.
- 9.1.4 The Advisory Committee noted the following recommendation from PCSWG but did not endorse the option for Convenors to invite experts to contribute to the activities of the group between meetings and/or to attend Working Group meetings; The AC noted that this issue is being considered by the AC during the inter-sessional period.
- 9.1.5 Regarding the composition of the Working Groups, Argentina stressed the importance of clearly defining who are members, experts and observers, and how they should be appointed. In this regard, Argentina recalled that the inter-sessional Working Group, concerning Rule 20 "Working Groups" of the Rules of Procedure of the AC, is active.
- 9.1.6 In relation to the annexes of the PCSWG Report, Argentina reserved its position on them. Argentina will present an additional note as an annex to the Report.

9.2 Future Work Programme

- 9.2.1 The Committee endorsed the Working Group's Work Programme following discussion under Agenda Item 12.1.

10 TAXONOMY OF ALBATROSSES AND PETRELS

10.1 Report of the Working Group

- 10.1.1 The report of the Taxonomy Working Group (TWG, [AC7 Doc 13 Rev 1](#)) was presented by the Vice-chair (who is also a member of the Working Group). He apologised for the late posting of the Report.
- 10.1.2 TWG had one task since the last meeting of the AC, to review the taxonomic status of the eastern and western populations of the Black-footed Albatross.
- 10.1.3 TWG applied the taxonomic guidelines of ACAP and following a review of the published, taxonomy-related data for this species, TWG concluded that the available information does not warrant an amendment to the species currently listed under Annex 1 of the ACAP Agreement.

10.2 Future Work Programme

- 10.2.1 The future Work Programme of TWG is outlined in section 1 of the AC's Work Programme (**ANNEX 5**). TWG is essentially on permanent standby to answer questions posed by AC or MoP. It was agreed that it would be useful to add a new task to the Work Programme that was agreed at MoP4 – to develop a database of site-specific information on the availability of samples relevant to studies of population genetics of ACAP species. This will require input from PCSWG (for a list of ACAP populations) and once developed, the output should be of use to SBWG, Parties and others in understanding the origins of bycaught birds. The initial database would be useful in identifying gaps in knowledge. It was felt that this work might be suitable for a student project.

11 SEABIRD BYCATCH

11.1 Report of the Working Group

- 11.1.1 The Convenor and Vice-convenor of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group (hereafter SBWG), Mr Barry Baker and Dr Anton Wolfaardt, introduced the report of the 5th Meeting of the SBWG. This report outlined inter-sessional progress against the Work Programme of the SBWG, agreed at the ACAP Advisory Committee meeting in 2011 (AC6) and adopted at MoP4 in 2012. The report also reflected discussions and advice resulting from the SBWG meeting held on 1-3 May 2013 in La Rochelle, France.
- 11.1.2 The meeting was attended by Working Group members from most of the Parties to the Agreement, as well as experts and observers from government agencies and non-government organisations. The full report of the Working Group ([AC7 Doc 14 Rev 1](#)) provides a comprehensive record of the inter-sessional progress, the deliberations of the WG and the recommendations that the SBWG presented to the AC.
- 11.1.3 The Advisory Committee accepted the following recommendations of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group and:
1. Adopted the definition of Best Practice outlined in SBWG report Item 1 (points i to vi) for use when developing advice on mitigation measures to reduce seabird bycatch.
 2. With respect to pelagic longline bycatch mitigation:
 - i. supported the current advice that a combination of weighted branch lines, bird scaring lines and night setting represent best practice mitigation for seabird bycatch in pelagic longline fisheries;
 - ii. afforded priority to line weighting when considering mitigation for seabird bycatch on the basis that line weighting is integral to fishing gear and has the advantage of being more consistently implemented, subject to weighting regime characteristics being adequately specified, safety issues being adequately addressed; and that issues relating to application to artisanal fisheries are taken into account;

- iii. noted the review of mitigation technology available for pelagic longline gear ([AC7 Doc 14 Rev 1](#), Annex 2); and
 - iv. endorsed the revised best practice advice for mitigation in pelagic longline fisheries ([AC7 Doc 14 Rev 1](#), Annex 3) and encouraged Parties to use this information to guide the development of policy and practice within the fisheries under their jurisdiction.
3. With respect to demersal longline bycatch mitigation:
- i. noted that research results presented at the meeting reinforce current ACAP best practice advice;
 - ii. noted that information on the Chilean, or trotline, system presented at the meeting was used to update both the ACAP review ([AC7 Doc 14 Rev 1](#), Annex 4) and best summary advice (SBWG5 Report, Annex 5) for demersal longline mitigation;
 - iii. encouraged Parties to use the advice presented in [AC7 Doc 14 Rev 1](#), Annex 5 to guide the development of policy and practice within demersal longline fisheries under their jurisdiction;
 - iv. noted the high levels of estimated annual seabird mortality in the Namibian demersal longline fishery for hake and encouraged the adoption in Namibia of best practice mitigation; and
 - v. endorsed the updated list of research priorities, including the addition of a new priority area of research: investigating the influence on sink rates of additional buoys that are used in some demersal longline fisheries to raise sections of the line off the seabed, as well as developing mitigation options.
4. With respect to trawl bycatch mitigation:
- i. noted that research results presented at the meeting reinforce the current ACAP best practice advice; this includes the use of mitigation measures that minimise the risk of seabird collisions with trawl cables, managing offal discharge and discards, and reducing the time the net is exposed on the surface ([AC7 Doc 14 Rev 1](#), Annex 7);
 - ii. noted that specifications for streamer materials and deployment guidelines, descriptions of the Tamini Tabla off-setting towed device, information on the net restrictor being tested in the New Zealand scampi fishery, and further information on baffler designs presented at the meeting have been used to update the ACAP review ([AC7 Doc 14 Rev 1](#), Annex 6);
 - iii. encouraged further work to improve the accuracy of seabird bycatch estimates, by quantifying the extent and nature of undetected mortality associated with trawl fisheries;
 - iv. encouraged Parties to use the advice presented in [AC7 Doc 14 Rev 1](#), Annex 7 to guide the development of policy and practice within trawl fisheries under their jurisdiction; and

- v. endorsed the updated list of research priorities, including the addition of a new priority area of research: to investigate options to improve the efficacy of bird scaring devices in reducing seabird interactions with trawl gear.
5. With respect to gillnet bycatch mitigation, noted that:
 - i. there is generally limited data on global gillnet fishing effort and bycatch levels of albatrosses and petrels, but levels of bycatch in gillnets of ACAP species including Waved Albatross, White-chinned Petrel, Westland Petrel, Giant Petrel, Black-browed Albatross, Grey-headed Albatross, Short-tailed Albatross and Balearic Shearwater, and other species including Pink-footed Shearwater, are sufficient to cause concern;
 - ii. no technical bycatch mitigation measures have been fully developed or defined as best practice for gillnet fisheries;
 - iii. gear switching and spatial and temporal closures are currently the main options available to reduce seabird bycatch; and
 - iv. intersessional work should be undertaken to develop definitions and descriptions of the different types of net fisheries, including purse-seine fisheries, as current gears used are extremely diverse and their impact on non-target species remains largely unknown.
 6. In relation to bycatch data collection, agreed to:
 - i. continue to support an intersessional process to progress the bycatch data collection, reporting and assessment framework, and the progressive improvement in the resolution of data submitted for this process;
 - ii. endorse continued engagement by ACAP with RFMOs to improve their observer programmes, and data collection and reporting protocols;
 - iii. engage in initiatives to investigate and progress the use of electronic monitoring (e-monitoring) to influence the direction of research underway or planned to ensure that seabird bycatch mitigation issues are adequately incorporated;
 - iv. collaborate on an e-monitoring project with the International Sustainable Seafood Foundation (ISSF), which would require a contribution of AUD 10,000; and
 - v. encourage Parties involved in e-monitoring to provide feedback at the next meeting of the SBWG, to determine more specifically the priority areas of e-monitoring on which ACAP should focus.
 7. In relation to the development of indicators:
 - i. noted the proposed indicators presented at the meeting;
 - ii. agreed to continue to support an intersessional process to further develop and refine the suite of State-Pressure-Response

- Indicators that have been proposed for seabird bycatch. This work should be harmonised with the work proposed for the bycatch data reporting and assessment framework, and feedback provided at the next meeting of the SBWG; and
- iii. agreed to consider what data would be appropriate as baselines for assessing global trends in bycatch levels and rates and formulate suitable indicators.
8. In relation to RFMO coordination:
- i. noted the progress that has been achieved through the implementation of the RFMO engagement strategy and plan;
 - ii. agreed to continue to implement the RFMO engagement plan, i.e. endorse the revised list of actions to be taken in the tuna RFMOs (identified in Table 2 of SBWG5 Doc 24), support the implementation of these actions and provide the resources necessary to undertake this work. These actions relate to promoting the effective implementation of seabird conservation measures, and refinement of those not following the current best practice advice; and
 - iii. supported the work of the intersessional group established to identify minimum elements and appropriate methods and indicators to review the effectiveness of seabird bycatch mitigation requirements in the tuna RFMOs.
9. In relation to priority actions for conservation:
- i. as required by the MoP, a workshop to review and update the prioritisation framework for at-sea threats should be conducted immediately prior to the SBWG6 meeting; Parties should ensure that relevant information in the database is updated prior to the meeting.
10. In relation to FAO IPOA/NPOA-Seabirds:
- i. noted the progress undertaken by ACAP Parties and Range States to develop and implement NPOA-Seabirds; and
 - ii. encouraged all Parties and Range States to adopt, implement and review NPOA-Seabirds in accordance with FAO's best practice technical guidelines.
11. With respect to Mitigation Fact Sheets:
- i. agreed that where feasible future updates to existing fact sheets be undertaken within the timeframe of SBWG meetings to ensure harmonisation with ACAP's best practice mitigation advice for various gear types; and.
 - ii. requested the Secretariat to undertake intersessional work with BirdLife staff and SBWG members to develop a strategy for the dissemination of fact sheets to fishery managers, fishers and other

key target audiences.

12. The use of lethal experiments to test the efficacy of mitigation devices was discussed; SBWG considerations were included under Agenda Item 12.2.
 13. The policy on publication of meeting documents was discussed; SBWG considerations were included under Agenda Item 20.14.
 14. In relation to the development of tools and guides:
 - i. supported the revision and finalisation of the hook removal guidelines during the inter-sessional period;
 - ii. supported efforts by the Secretariat and Convenors to progress the seabird identification guide during the inter-sessional period.
 - iii. encouraged the submission of suitable photos of dead or live birds (especially in flight), to the Secretariat for inclusion in the identification guide;
 - iv. supported the development of a central repository of information on where samples are held in order that researchers can access these samples;
 - v. agreed to the development of guidelines for the collection and curation of samples for DNA analysis.
 15. With respect to ecological risk assessments:
 - i. agreed to submit to the Marine Stewardship Council's (MSC) review processes ACAP's best practice advice and standards in relation to recording and reporting seabird bycatch data and implementation of appropriate best (and improving) practice methods to mitigate seabird bycatch for adoption into MSC assessments; and
 - ii. encouraged the participation of Parties in the MSC workshops in 2013, and requested the Secretariat to interact with potential attendees to provide the relevant ACAP documents.
 16. The listing of new species on Annex 1 was discussed; SBWG considerations were discussed under Agenda Item 14.
- 11.1.4 A number of significant points were made by delegates arising from the presentation of the SBWG report.

Definition of best practice

- 11.1.5 HSI suggested that an identified component of ACAP best practice definition of mitigation measures - that these must be practical, cost effective and widely available - does not make provision for new vessel design to circumvent the necessity for mitigation measures (ie. these would not necessarily be "readily available" or "widely available"). HSI also pointed out that the matter of new vessel design is a neglected area as a means to avoid seabird bycatch.

RFMO engagement

- 11.1.6 On the topic of ACAPs RFMO engagement strategy (SBWG5 Doc 24) there was some discussion about the relative importance of engaging with the Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna (CCSBT). BirdLife International suggested enhanced ACAP activity at the CCSBT Ecologically Related Species (ERS) Working Group meeting, may be needed to counter any risk of weakening the seabird bycatch conservation measure adopted in 2012. It encouraged the ACAP Secretariat to work with all relevant ACAP Parties, who are also members of CCSBT, to coordinate a common position as close to the ACAP best practice advice as possible.
- 11.1.7 HSI endorsed Birdlife's suggestion that ACAP review the extent of its tRFMO engagement and highlighted recent examples to substantiate increasing its engagement with the CCSBT. An ERSWG9 recommendation to adopt best practice measures for seabird bycatch mitigation in high-risk areas was adopted by the Extended Commission; the implications of this have yet to be fully considered by CCSBT members. Furthermore, the Extended Commission agreed that the ERSWG would proceed with its proposal to lead global work on assessment of impacts of fishing for tunas, on seabirds and porbeagle sharks. Australia's delegation to CCSBT had proposed development of a Resolution to make mandatory the mitigation measures for reducing seabird bycatch, which was being progressed intersessionally.
- 11.1.8 In response, the Secretariat indicated that the priorities listed in Table 2 of SBWG5 Doc 24 would be revised to reflect the importance of engaging with CCSBT on seabird bycatch mitigation, and also highlighted the importance of ensuring that the ACAP RFMO engagement strategy remained sufficiently flexible to respond to emerging issues that affect seabird bycatch.
- 11.1.9 Australia indicated its support for flexibility in the RFMO engagement strategy if circumstances change.
- 11.1.10 The UK highlighted the importance of expanding the scope of the ACAP RFMO engagement strategy to include non-tuna RFMOs. The South Pacific RFMO, and the South East Atlantic Fisheries Organisation (SEAFO) were considered good examples of RFMOs that should be considered in the ACAP engagement strategy.

ISSF project on electronic monitoring

- 11.1.11 Uruguay raised concerns about the implications of the Agreement providing funds to the International Sustainable Seafood Foundation (ISSF) to support a research project on electronic monitoring because this organisation has a direct link to certain fishing companies. The secretariat noted that the Agreement currently works with a number of other NGOs and they make an important contribution to the work of the Agreement.

FAO IPOA/NPOA Seabirds

- 11.1.12 "WWF-New Zealand reported it was part of a multi-stakeholder group comprised of conservation groups, fishing industry and governmental representatives (including MPI and DOC), and independently convened by

Bill Mansfield, chair of Southern Seabirds Solutions Trust, to help develop the National Plan of Action in New Zealand. WWF welcomed the fact that after many years of discussions, the NZ government has now approved a national plan for tackling the serious problem of seabirds dying in fishing gear in NZ waters. WWF noted this is a good first step that will need to be implemented effectively by officials and industry to achieve real on the water gains for our vulnerable and threatened seabirds.”

- 11.1.13 BirdLife International congratulated WWF on its work to assist the development of the new New Zealand NPOA Seabirds. As noted in the SBWG report ([AC7 Doc 14 Rev 1](#)) sections 11 and 17, BirdLife urges New Zealand rapidly to implement line-weighting mitigation methods for its demersal longline fishery for snapper, which are essential to reduce bycatch of the tiny (<1000 breeding pairs), decreasing population of the endemic Black Petrel.
- 11.1.14 In respect of the EU Plan of Action – Seabirds, BirdLife asked Spain to clarify its position, as an ACAP Party, in effectively opposing the timely implementation of the EU Plan of Action, adopted by the European Commission in November 2012. BirdLife indicated that to impose a delay by asking for more scientific data and a risk assessment is entirely unwarranted, given that the relevant scientific expert group in ICES had strongly supported endorsement and that the EU Plan of Action is itself a risk assessment. Furthermore, the lack of available bycatch data reflects the continuing refusal of some EU members to support enacting legal obligations to collect and report such data. BirdLife urged ACAP Parties who are members of the EU to submit relevant data and to support the immediate implementation of the EC Plan of Action. It urged all ACAP Parties with species potentially affected by bycatch in EU fisheries (including those of distant-water fleets), to emphasise to ACAP Parties who are members of the EU the importance ACAP accords to the rapid implementation of the EU Plan of Action.
- 11.1.15 In relation to the request made by BirdLife International on the timely implementation of the EU Plan of Action, Spain noted that it fully supports the measures to reduce the impact of fisheries on seabirds and, for this reason, it also shares and identifies itself with the objectives of the EU Action Plan for reducing incidental catches of seabirds in fishing gears.
- 11.1.16 In this respect, since 2006, Spain has adopted rules to mitigate the impact of certain fisheries on seabirds, such as longline fisheries. In addition, Spain has incorporated into its legislation any rules dictated by the different RFMOs in which it participates.
- 11.1.17 Spain wanted to clarify that it is necessary to gather sufficient information in order to allow the assessment of the impact of fisheries, taking into account the distinctive or special features of all different fishing gears and areas. Therefore, a specific plan to collect data should be developed as well as the corresponding scientific observer programmes.
- 11.1.18 On the other hand, Spain has already started working on some of the EU-PA objectives and thus some meetings have already been held between the unit

in charge of management of fleet activity and several NGOs involved in the protection of seabirds. In addition, Spain is also funding research projects on the interaction of seabirds with fisheries and testing mitigation measures.

- 11.1.19 In relation to the annexes of the SBWG Report, Argentina reserved its position on them.

11.2 Future Work Programme

- 11.2.1 The Committee discussed the Working Group's work under Agenda Item 12.1.

12 ADVISORY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME

12.1 Advisory Committee Work Programme 2013-2015

- 12.1.1 The Work Programme adopted by MoP4 was introduced by the Vice-chair. It had been developed further during the meetings of PCSWG1 and SBWG5, and following suggestions and discussion, actions that were completed were noted (with strikethrough text) and further actions (numbered separately) were decided upon. Some actions include further notes or have been amended to better describe the Topic or Task. A final version of the Work Programme was agreed (**ANNEX 5**).

- 12.1.2 Some actions in the Work Programme have a cost indicated against them (in Australian dollars). These figures are indicative only. The value of work to implement the Work Programme that is carried out by Parties, Range States, Observer Organisations and the Secretariat, and many scientists on their budgets and in their time, is not included. The agreed prioritisation and grant allocation processes will be used to determine which of the proposed actions will be funded in 2013-14.

12.2 Allocation of AC funds

- 12.2.1 The AC Chair presented [AC7 Doc 16](#) detailing the process followed for the allocation of grant funds in 2012, highlighting difficulties faced, lessons learnt and adjustments that the Advisory Committee may wish to consider to further improve the procedure.
- 12.2.2 The Advisory Committee endorsed the strategy for calling for grant applications twice in every three year period.
- 12.2.3 The document also discussed issues that may arise in relation to actual or perceived conflicts of interest. The approach followed by the Grants Sub-Committee to avoid conflict of interests during the evaluation of proposals in the last round of applications was to exclude from the whole process members of the Sub-Committee and/or reviewers from the Working Groups, if they were either an applicant, co-investigator, or part of the group of researchers applying for funds.
- 12.2.4 A number of delegations spoke in favour of only excluding an assessor from

the component of the assessment process relating to the consideration of the grant application they were associated with. Other delegations however, supported the continuation of the current approach, noting that this would add more transparency and integrity to the process. The Committee endorsed the process currently in place.

- 12.2.5 The United Kingdom noted that the distribution of grant applications has the potential to infringe the intellectual property rights of the applicant/s. Following discussion of approaches followed in other grant schemes and the benefits and disadvantages of these approaches, it was agreed that projects that are funded could be made available, upon request, to Advisory Committee Members, however further consultation with applicants would be required prior to dissemination of grant applications that were not funded.

Lethal experimentation

- 12.2.6 During the last call for applications one of the projects involved the use of lethal experimentation. This raises an important policy issue on whether the Agreement should support projects that involve the use of lethal experimentation.
- 12.2.7 Developing robust conclusions about the efficacy of seabird bycatch mitigation measures require an experimental approach. Such experiments have the potential to injure and kill birds, which presents an ethical challenge. Consideration of the technical merits of a research design that may have lethal consequences for ACAP species is a scientific or technical issue. However, ACAP funding of projects involving lethal experimentation may raise policy issues, on which Parties expressed varying views.
- 12.2.8 The Convenor of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group drew the AC's attention to a point raised in the recent SBWG meeting. So called "lethal experiments" occur in the context of "lethal fisheries" and the legacy of responsibly conducted experiments evaluating changes in seabird bycatch rates in response to different seabird bycatch mitigation measures, is measured in decades, and not just a short period of time. As an example, experimental research carried out in Alaskan fisheries in 1999 and 2000 resulted in the mortality of over 300 birds (none of which were threatened species). This occurred in a fishery that averaged over 12,000 bird mortalities each year. The legacy of that work today is that over 100,000 seabird mortalities have, most likely, been prevented since fishers adopted bycatch mitigation measures assessed in the initial experiment, assuming that original bycatch rates would have continued to apply in the absence of mitigation. In this context, a so called "lethal experiment" made a fishery significantly less lethal over the long term. Success in virtually eliminating seabird bycatch in CCAMLR longline fisheries further supports the conservation benefits emerging from responsible experimentation, following the implementation by CCAMLR of effective bird scaring lines tested and refined in the Alaskan experiments.
- 12.2.9 The UK expressed the view that there should be a distinction between the technical merits of a research design that may involve lethal experiments,

and the ethical considerations associated with funding such projects, using collective Party funds. France noted the potential negative perception by fishermen of lethal experiments conducted by scientists; when they were also being asked to reduce by-catch mortality, and said that it would in such cases not authorise those activities. Ecuador and Peru also raised concerns about the use of ACAP funds to support research involving lethal experiments, and requested that these policy issues relating to funding lethal experiments be considered by the MoP.

12.2.10 Regarding lethal experimentation, Argentina considered that under the exception of Article 3 (b) of the Agreement and, in the event that a proposed research project includes the use of lethal experimentation, the Grant Committee should evaluate the following criteria:

- Projects should demonstrate that no other alternative less invasive and invasive study can be used;
- The benefits of the results to be obtained must clearly outweigh the costs of removing individuals of a population;

It should be noted also that ACAP species have differing conservation statuses.

12.2.11 It was pointed out that lethal experiments are defined in SBWG5 Doc 22, and in the Seabird Bycatch Working Group report, as an experiment using a lethal metric which may elevate seabird deaths above the level of bycatch that would have occurred under normal fishing operations. Consequently, experimental research that aims to investigate the efficacy of seabird bycatch mitigation measures by comparing these measures with a control that comprises the status quo in that fishery at the time would not be considered a lethal experiment.

12.2.12 The Advisory Committee agreed to bring this issue to the attention of the next MoP, in order that it could consider whether it should develop a policy on how to deal with project proposals that include lethal experiments.

12.2.13 It was considered important to provide interim advice to the Grants Subcommittee on how to assess bycatch mitigation research proposals prior to a policy being developed by the MoP. Given the concerns expressed by some Parties on the one hand, and the importance of supporting further seabird bycatch mitigation research on the other, the following interim principles were proposed: 1) project applications submitted as part of the ACAP grants scheme must show that the proposals are in line with the ethical requirements of the proponent's country, and the country in which the research will take place; and 2) proponents must show unequivocally that the proposed research does not include a lethal experimental approach, as defined above.

Implementation of Projects

12.2.14 It was noted that a number of grant applications that had been approved in recent years had not yet commenced. It was queried whether a process was required to approve the extension of time for implementation of these

projects. The Committee decided that it would be appropriate for the Secretariat, in consultation with the Chair of the Advisory Committee, to grant an extension for one year for the commencement of the project, but that longer extensions would require further consultation with the Advisory Committee.

- 12.2.15 Uruguay mentioned that the second phase of the South American project (ACAP 09-10 Regional workshop “Improving data collection on incidental mortality of seabirds from South American Observer Programmes”) was not implemented due to a variety of logistical reasons, and informed the Advisory Committee that it will now take place in Uruguay in December 2013.

Details of Project Proposals

- 12.2.16 One of the issues identified by the Grants Sub-Committee and project reviewers was that the limited information in some project proposals made it difficult to assess rigorously the value of the project. The Committee agreed that a revised template addressing these issues should be developed by the Grants Sub-committee and the Secretariat in the intersessional period and applied to the next round of grant applications.

12.3 Agreement Secondment Programme

- 12.3.1 The AC Chair presented AC7 Doc 10 detailing proposed guidelines for the further development of the Agreement’s secondment programme, including a process for the selection of candidates. This paper was developed in response to a decision made by Parties at MoP4 that (1) secondments may not necessarily occur in the Agreement’s Headquarters in Hobart, (2) the Secretariat should coordinate the implementation of secondment programmes with the Advisory Committee and, (3) that funds for the secondment programme should be placed in Appropriation 4, the Advisory Committee’s Work Programme.
- 12.3.2 Brazil queried whether the proposed process would be used to assess the suitability of both the candidate and the project to be undertaken. It was noted that the selection process is only to select the candidate and that the work to be undertaken would normally be tasks identified in either the Advisory Committee or the Secretariat’s Work Programmes. France noted a possible confusion between secondments and grants, so it was agreed to describe the work to be undertaken through the secondment as a task, rather than a project/programme.
- 12.3.3 Chile queried how the process would be used to evaluate the capacity of the person to undertake the task. Following discussion on this issue it was agreed that the process should include criteria for selecting candidates. A number of delegations proposed potential criteria. The meeting agreed that the following criteria should be incorporated into the selection guidelines:
1. The work to be undertaken addresses a task identified in the Advisory Committee’s or Secretariat’s Work Programme, and/or is deemed to be of high importance to achievement of the Agreement’s objective.

2. The task proposed is international in nature e.g. the outcomes will be of relevance to more than one country.
 3. The funds allocated will not be used for the purpose of paying salaries. It is expected that the applicant's institution will continue to pay the applicant's salary.
 4. The task to be undertaken has a capacity building focus.
 5. The funds allocated will be primarily used for travel, accommodation and per diem costs.
 6. That the applicant has received in-principle agreement from the Host Country to host this work.
- 12.3.4 The meeting agreed to the revised guidelines as detailed in [AC7 Doc 10 Rev 1](#).

13 INDICATORS TO MEASURE SUCCESS OF ACAP

- 13.1 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 had provided the latest version of the current RLI, covering the period 1998 to 2010, to MoP4 ([MoP4 Inf 03](#) and [MoP4 Report](#) 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. The pending assessment of status change for ACAP species will be completed in late 2013, enabling a revised RLI paper to be tabled at AC8.
- 13.2 The candidate indicators for site condition and population status and trends discussed at AC6 ([AC6 Report](#) Annexes 8 and 9) 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). AC6 had requested 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.
- 13.3 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.
- 13.4 The AC noted that this process would be completed intersessionally and that the WG would be able to review all current candidate indicators by AC8. This review would include the index relating to the progressive acquisition of tracking data.
- 13.5 The AC also supported a proposal to assess the feasibility of developing a composite index of population trends of ACAP species ([AC7 Doc 12 Rev 1](#), 8.2).

- 13.6 The AC noted the progress made by the SBWG in further developing candidate seabird bycatch indicators (the details of which are in SBWG Report section 8) and in particular in defining potential indicators deriving from or linked to the work being progressed on bycatch reporting. The AC supported the proposed intersessional work to develop and refine the indicators currently proposed for Seabird Bycatch and to report on this to AC8. It also noted that existing data on seabird bycatch, potentially suitable as baseline contributions to a future indicator, would be reviewed intersessionally.
- 13.7 Argentina introduced [AC7 Doc 23](#) on performance indicators related to capacity building. Article IV of the Agreement text was used as a framework for the construction of the proposed draft indicators. In this article addressing capacity building, two levels were identified in relation to the effective implementation of ACAP, one on the Agreement's assistance to Parties and Range States, and another on actions conducted within countries but addressing actions in the Agreement's Action Plan. Examples from Argentina are provided for both proposed indicators.
- 13.8 The AC congratulated Argentina on its paper, the first contribution to the AC on the topic of measuring the contribution of ACAP towards developing capacity to help deliver the objectives of the Agreement. The AC noted that the kind of indicators being proposed by Argentina offer the opportunity to assess both the contributions of ACAP to the development of relevant capacity in-country and also the contributions of individual countries in developing their own national and regional capacities.
- 13.9 The AC highlighted the value of further developing performance indicators during the intersessional period, including giving consideration to the value of this approach to develop indicators on capacity. Australia, Brazil, Chile and New Zealand committed to help Argentina in the drafting of a refined proposal to be submitted to AC8.

14 LISTING OF NEW SPECIES

- 14.1 Chile presented the proposal of adding the Pink-footed Shearwater, *Puffinus creatopus*, to Annex 1 of the Agreement ([AC7 Doc 24](#)). Chile noted the main marine threats faced by the Pink-footed Shearwater and other arguments as described in AC7 Doc 24. Chile also thanked the PaCS and SB Working Groups for considering this document. The Chilean delegate remarked that Chile gave priority to the creation of this document and highlighted the assistance of Mr Jorge Azocar (Instituto de Fomento Pesquero, Chile), Mr Marcelo García (Subsecretaría de Pesca, Chile), Ms Valentina Colodro (Oikonos, Chile), Dr Javier Arata (Instituto Antártico Chileno), Mr Peter Hodum (Oikonos, USA) and Mr Ken Morgan (Canadian Wildlife Service).
- 14.2 Ecuador introduced the proposal to include the Galapagos Petrel *Pterodroma phaeopygia* on Annex 1 of the Agreement ([AC7 Doc 25](#)). Ecuador encouraged the AC to review the information provided and

- recommended that the Fifth Meeting of the Parties (MoP5) include the species on Annex I of the Agreement.
- 14.3 Convenors of PCSWG and SBWG reported that both groups discussed the proposed nominations and considered that the Pink-footed Shearwater ranked highly using the criteria in AC3 Doc 18, and strongly supported the inclusion of this species in the Agreement. However, both WGs expressed reservations about the inclusion of the Galapagos Petrel. Convenors noted that this species does not score highly under the criteria in AC3 Doc 18, and more research is needed to confirm possible interactions with fishing fleets.
- 14.4 The Vice-convenor of PCSWG, Dr Henri Weimerskirch, noted some other general issues discussed by the WG in relation to the criteria for inclusion of new species as presented in the PCSWG Report, such as the ability of the Agreement to provide meaningful action for the species' conservation. He also noted the concern expressed by the Secretariat in respect to the inclusion of too many species, given the limited amount of resources available.
- 14.5 The Convenor of SBWG also noted that the incorporation of too many species into the Agreement could be detrimental to the capacity of the Agreement to do its work.
- 14.6 The Secretariat presented [AC7 Doc 20 Rev 1](#) on the process for evaluating and listing species on Annex 1. The Secretariat proposed formalising the process followed for the four species most recently added to the Annex, and formally endorsing the criteria for choosing candidate species previously presented in AC3 Doc 18. The criteria for selecting candidates has been developed by Cooper and Baker in 2006 (AC2 Doc 21) and further refined in 2007 (AC3 Doc 18) but no more revisions were made since then and the Working Groups have agreed to re-examine the selection criteria during the intersessional period. The Secretariat also remarked that the text of the Agreement does not require nominations to have the support of the Working Groups or of the Advisory Committee and that the AC might wish to recommend to the next Meeting of Parties that this requirement be endorsed by the MoP.
- 14.7 Medmaravis acknowledged the work of the PaCSWG, as reported in AC7 Doc 12. Medmaravis welcomed the consideration made by the WG of the Yelkouan Shearwater (Vulnerable under IUCN criteria) as a potentially strong candidate for listing in Annex 1. Medmaravis therefore called on France and/or Spain to lead a process to nominate *Puffinus yelkouan* for ACAP listing. Medmaravis strongly believes that despite current legal protection at national and EU level, the development and implementation of an ACAP Action Plan for the conservation of the Yelkouan Shearwater could make all the difference for reversing its current negative trend.
- 14.8 Document AC7 Inf 04, tabled by Medmaravis and BirdLife International, also proposes consideration of the listing of Scopoli's Shearwater *Calonectris diomedea* in Annex 1. This is a Mediterranean endemic taxon whose taxonomic status is currently under review following its raising to species

rank by various authorities. As a species, this taxon might deserve globally-threatened status given the high level of bycatch of Scopoli's Shearwater in several fisheries and Medmaravis called on the relevant ACAP Parties to consider this as a future candidate for listing by ACAP.

- 14.9 Spain supported the proposal in respect of *P. yelkouan* but noted that as this species may not breed within its territory, France might want to lead on this nomination instead.
- 14.10 France noted that these two species rank as high priority for inclusion in ACAP in the AC3 document (AC3 Doc 18) but indicated that at this stage, it has no formal instructions from its government regarding this.
- 14.11 France also supported the revision of the criteria for the inclusion of new species in the Agreement for a defined list of potential candidate species taking particularly into account the real effectiveness of ACAP in providing conservation measures through international cooperation. France further noted that this criterion is of a particular importance for listing species in CMS appendix, particularly in Appendix 2.
- 14.12 CMS noted that some of the criteria for inclusion on Annex 1 (e.g. 2) have already been considered in CMS documents. It also suggested that if the species is already considered in a CMS appendix, some daughter agreements automatically incorporate it on their agendas.
- 14.13 Brazil remarked that as it has not yet ratified the agreement with CMS, it would not be comfortable with this process of automatic listing without further domestic discussions.
- 14.14 USA and Canada supported the nomination of the Pink-footed Shearwater and their statements regarding this are provided in **ANNEXES 9 and 10**.

15 SPECIES ACTION PLANS

- 15.1 France introduced [AC7 Inf 03](#) on the National Plan of Action for the Amsterdam Albatross. This document provides updates on the work for Amsterdam Albatross led by the National Natural Reserve and the CNRS with the help of the Polar Institute. Six actions have progressed since the last AC meeting. The monitoring of the population has continued, and shows a continuous increase of the population size reaching 38 pairs in 2012. However, the breeding success appears to continue to decline progressively. Since 2011 a comprehensive study of the diseases occurring in the five main seabirds at Amsterdam Island has been carried out. The study shows that avian cholera and Erysipelas were present in all species including Amsterdam albatrosses, Yellow-nosed and Sooty albatrosses, as well as in skuas that commute between Yellow-nosed and Amsterdam albatross colonies. Present studies aim at identifying the reservoirs of the bacteria (environment and/or birds), the disseminators (birds, human, introduced mammals), at genetic characterization of *P. multocida* isolates (MLST), and examining the possibility of vaccination by the production of an auto vaccine.

- 15.2 During the past 2 years an extensive program on the tracking of all the age classes of the population has been made, allowing a complete view of the distribution of the species over seasons, and for all the age classes. It shows that the species range widely over the Indian Ocean north of the sub-tropical front, from the Benguela current to Tasmania. Based on this study, it was possible to measure the extent of overlap between Amsterdam albatross and fisheries: the species overlaps mainly with the Japanese and Taiwanese long line fisheries. Finally, monitoring of colonies using continuously filming cameras, shows that the presence of rats in contact with the species is limited, and is not documented for cats. The past 2 years have seen significant progress in the development of the Amsterdam Albatross National Plan of Action, with major concerns for the risks of a disease outbreak in Amsterdam albatrosses, and an urgent need for further research on this aspect.
- 15.3 The Vice-chair commended France on the outstanding National Plan of Action for this species and the work that has been undertaken to implement it.

16 IMPACTS OF GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

- 16.1 France advised the meeting that over recent years there has been an increasing number of studies on the potential impacts of climate change on ecosystems and species. Recent study syntheses on seabirds show that seabirds, including ACAP species, are affected by climatic changes in addition to fisheries activities. Several studies indicate overall that warm sea-surface temperatures negatively affected demographic parameters, especially breeding success, whereas fisheries affect survival parameters, with only a few species for which fisheries improved breeding success. More recent studies have shown shifts in distribution and breeding phenology related to climate change.
- 16.2 A recent study on Wandering albatrosses showed that climate related changes in winds pattern in the southern ocean have modified the distribution of the population, and resulted in an improvement of the condition and breeding success of the individuals. Climate factors and fisheries bycatch may simultaneously affect demographic parameters in a complex way, which can be integrated in population models to project population trajectories under future climate or fisheries scenarios.
- 16.3 Two other consequences of climate change may have significant influences on ACAP species. The USA delegation provided evidence of the high susceptibility of albatross colonies on low atoll islands in the Pacific Ocean that can be submerged during extreme climatic events, and are therefore highly at risk from increase in overall sea level. Finally, the occurrence of diseases outbreaks are known to increase with increasing temperature, and therefore climate change may favour in the future disease propagation in the range of ACAP species.

- 16.4 Chile thanked France for its work, and hoped that this research on ACAP species will continue. The results are of value to Parties in education and outreach for the conservation of albatrosses and petrels.

17 ELECTION AND APPOINTMENT OF AC OFFICERS

- 17.1 The Chair reminded the AC that all of the Committee officer positions concluded at the end of the current meeting. Elections would be required to elect officers for the next period, which will conclude at end of the AC meeting after the next session of the Meeting of the Parties (AC9). He asked in turn for nominations:
- 17.2 Vice-convenors, Seabird Bycatch Working Group: Spain proposed Igor Debski, Argentina proposed Tatiana Neves. There were no other nominations so Igor Debski and Tatiana Neves were duly elected.
- 17.3 Convenor, Seabird Bycatch Working Group: Chile proposed Anton Wolfaardt. There were no other nominations, so Anton Wolfaardt was elected.
- 17.4 Vice-convenors, Population and Conservation Status Working Group: South Africa proposed Henri Weimerskirch, Peru nominated Flavio Quintana. There were no other nominations, so Henri Weimerskirch and Flavio Quintana were elected.
- 17.5 Convenor, Population and Conservation Status Working Group: Australia proposed Richard Phillips, France proposed Rosemary Gales. There were no other nominations, so Richard Phillips and Rosemary Gales were elected.
- 17.6 Vice-convenor, Taxonomy Working Group: There were no nominations to this post, so the post remains vacant.
- 17.7 Convenor, Taxonomy Working Group: New Zealand proposed Mike Double. There were no other nominations, so Mike Double was elected.
- 17.8 Vice-chair, Advisory Committee: Ecuador proposed Mark Tasker. There were no other nominations, so Mark Tasker was elected.
- 17.9 The Vice-chair then asked for nominations for the Chair of the Advisory Committee: Brazil proposed Marco Favero. There were no other nominations, so Marco Favero was elected.

18 EIGHTH MEETING OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

18.1 Timing and Venue

- 18.1.1 Uruguay offered to host the Eighth Meeting of the Advisory Committee (AC8), and advised that it was most likely going to take place in late August or early September 2014.

18.2 Draft agenda

- 18.2.1 A draft agenda for AC8 was reviewed by the Committee (**ANNEX 6**) and will be forwarded to Parties for their consideration.

19 FIFTH MEETING OF THE PARTIES

19.1 Timing and Venue

- 19.1 There were no offers from Parties to host the Fifth Meeting of Parties (MoP5) in 2015. The Secretariat and AC Chair will work intersessionally with Parties to secure a meeting host for 2015.

20 OTHER BUSINESS

20.1 Publication of meeting documents

- 20.1.1 In [AC7 Doc 21](#) the Secretariat raised the issue of the public availability of documents submitted to ACAP Working Groups or Advisory Committee meetings, noting this might compromise subsequent submission to scientific peer reviewed journals. The Advisory Committee considered the recommendation in document 21 in the light of the views of the Working Groups on these matters (AC7 Doc 14, SBWG report item 15; AC7 Doc 12, PCSWG report item 16) and also their advice on: (a) copyright issues arising from submission of already published papers, and (b) improving the efficiency of procedures for considering documents during the meetings of ACAP Working Groups.
- 20.1.2 Accordingly, the Advisory Committee recommended the following approach be taken with regard to the submission of papers:
- i. Papers submitted to ACAP shall be freely publicly available, except those that shall be accorded password protection because: (a) the submission has already been published or submitted for publication and copyright issues apply or may apply (in these cases a summary of the paper should be provided to ACAP, where it will be freely publicly available), or (b) the author specifically requests password protection because the author intends to publish the paper.
 - ii. Authors submitting papers shall be asked to indicate whether or not they wish to include the current footnote (indicating restrictions on citation or use without dataholder permission).
- 20.1.3 The Advisory Committee noted that details of password protection arrangements shall be provided to designated National Contact Points. The Advisory Committee also indicated a strong preference for allowing submitted documents free circulation in order to promote the efficiency and transparency of the work of the Advisory Committee.
- 20.1.4 With regards to the submission of papers, the Advisory Committee

recommended that:

- i. documents shall clearly indicate any recommendations they wish ACAP to consider (in case the document is for information purposes only, no recommendations will be needed);
- ii. Working Group Convenors should develop a compilation of recommendations from submitted papers, collated in respect to specific agenda items, to help focus discussion where necessary;
- iii. any such compilation should be circulated, in all official languages, with the final version of the annotated agenda prior to the Working Group meeting; and
- iv. the current practice of translating into all official languages summaries of submitted papers should be continued.

20.2 Argentina made an intervention regarding bibliographical references, which is included in **ANNEX 11**. Some AC members expressed their support on the issue put forward by Argentina. Argentina announced that it might present a proposal on this matter for consideration at AC8.

21. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

21.1 The meeting adopted the report of AC7.

22. CLOSING REMARKS

22.1 The Chair concluded the meeting by thanking all participants for their contributions to the meeting, noting that significant progress had been achieved on a range of issues that are essential for the effective implementation of the Agreement. He extended special thanks to the Vice-chair and to the other delegates who had led break-out groups during the course of the meeting, as well as to the Secretariat for its assistance. In this regard, he noted the valuable assistance of Mr Juan Pablo Seco Pon and Ms Mathile Huon, who assisted the Secretariat on a voluntary basis.

22.2 Thanks were extended to the Government of France for hosting the meeting and for providing delegates with a wonderful experience on the field excursion. The interpreters from OnCall, Mr Daniel Jagg from IDIOM and the staff from the Mercure Hotel were also thanked for their excellent support, which ensured the smooth functioning of the meeting.

22.3 A presentation was made to Mr Barry Baker for his outstanding contribution to the Agreement in his role as Convenor of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group and to Prof. John Croxall from BirdLife International who has provided his support and considerable expertise in support of the Agreement's work since its inception.

22.4 The Advisory Committee thanked the Chair for his excellent stewardship during the meeting and strong guidance during the past intersessional

period.

ANNEX 1. LIST OF AC7 MEETING PARTICIPANTS

AC OFFICIALS	
Chair:	Dr Marco FAVERO
Vice-chair:	Mr Mark TASKER
Convenor SBWG:	Mr Barry BAKER
Convenor PCSWG:	Dr Rosemary GALES
Convenor PCSWG:	Dr Richard PHILLIPS

PARTIES	
ARGENTINA	
Member:	Mr Germán PROFFEN Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores y Culto Esmeralda 1212 Buenos Aires, Argentina Tel: +54 11 4819 7414 Email: gep@mrecic.gov.ar
Alternate Member:	Ms Victoria GOBBI Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores y Culto 10 Route de l'Aéroport, 1215 Geneve, Switzerland Tel: +41 22 929 8600 Email: gvt@mrecic.gov.ar
Alternate Member:	Ms Daniela JAITE Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores y Culto Esmeralda 1212 C.A.B.A., Argentina Tel: +54 11 4819 7431 Email: dbj@mrecic.gov.ar
Alternate Member:	Mr Juan Pablo PANIEGO Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores y Culto de la República Argentina Esmeralda N° 1212, Piso 15, of. 1501, (C1007ABR), Buenos Aires, Argentina Tel: +54 11 4819 8008 Email: jpj@cancilleria.gov.ar

Alternate Member:	Ms Maria Laura TOMBESI Secretaria de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sustentable San Martin 451 CP 1004, Argentina Tel: +54 11 4348 8462 Email: mtombesi@ambiente.gov.ar
Advisor:	Dr Marco FAVERO Instituto de Investigaciones Marinas y Costeras CONICET - Universidad Nacional de Mar del Plata Funes 3250 (B7602AYJ) Mar del Plata, Argentina Tel: +54 9 223 5209754 Email: marco.favero.acap@hotmail.com
Advisor:	Dr Flavio QUINTANA Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Cientificas y Tecnicas de Argentina Av. Rivadavia 1917 (C1033AAJ), Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires, Argentina Tel: +54 11 5983 1420 Email: fquintana@wcs.org
AUSTRALIA	
Member:	Mr Jonathon BARRINGTON Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities Australian Antarctic Division, 203 Channel Highway, Kingston Tasmania 7050, Australia Tel: +61 3 6232 3286 Email: Jonathon.Barrington@aad.gov.au
Alternate Member:	Dr Rosemary GALES Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and Environment PO Box 44, Hobart, Tasmania 7001, Australia Tel: + 61 409 002 418 Email: Rosemary.Gales@dpiuwe.tas.gov.au
Advisor:	Ms Jari THORP Embassy of Australia 4 Rue Jean Rey, Australian Embassy, Paris, France Tel: +33 (0) 6 75 21 70 72 Email: jari.havlat-thorp@dfat.gov.au
BRAZIL	
Member:	Mr Thiago MEDEIROS DA CUNHA CAVALCANTI Ministério das Relações Exteriores – MRE (Ministry of External Relations) Palácio Itamaraty, Esplanada dos Ministérios, Bloco H, Anexo I, Sala 439(Divisão do Meio Ambiente – DEMA), CEP: 70.170-900 - Brasília - DF, Brazil Tel: +55 61 2030 8447 Email: thiago.cavalcanti@itamaraty.gov.br

Alternate Member:	Mrs Luciane RODRIGUES LOURENÇO Ministério do Meio Ambiente – MMA (Ministry of the Environment) SEPN - Quadra 505 - Bloco B - Sala 402, Ed. Marie Prendi Cruz - CEP: 70.730-542 - Brasília – DF, Brazil Tel: +55 61 2028 2637 Email: Luciane.lourenco@mma.gov.br
CHILE	
Member:	Mr Marcelo GARCIA ALVARADO Subsecretaria de Pesca Bellavista 168, Piso 14, Valparaiso, Chile Tel: +56 32 2502700 Email: mgarcia@subpesca.cl
Advisor:	Mr Jorge AZÓCAR RANGEL Instituto de Fomento Pesquero (IFOP) Almirante Blanco Encalada 839, Valparaiso, Chile Tel: +56 32 2151500 Email: jorge.azocar@ifop.cl
ECUADOR	
Member:	Mr Santiago TORRES BAEZ Ministerio del Ambiente del Ecuador (MAE) Cda. Kennedy Norte; Av. Francisco de Orellana y Justino Cornejo; Edificio Gobierno Del Litoral; Piso 8; Guayaquil, Ecuador Tel: +593 9 9754 6929; +593 4 2683 995 Email: storres@ambiente.gob.ec
FRANCE	
Member:	Ms Martine BIGAN Ministère de l'Ecologie, du Développement Durable, des Transports et du Logement Grande Arche, Parvis de la Défense, 92055 La Défense cedex, France Tel: +33 1 40 81 32 09 Email: martine.bigan@developpement-durable.gouv.fr
Alternate Member:	Mr Pascal BOLOT Terres Australes et Antarctiques Françaises Rue Gabriel Dejean, 97410 St Pierre de la Réunion – France Tel : 0262 96 78 00 Email : pascal.bolot@taaf.fr

Alternate Member:	Ms Marie-Anne MORTELETTE Ministère des affaires étrangères 25 rue de la convention, 75015 Paris, France Tel: + 33 1 43 17 44 25 Email: marie-anne.mortelette@diplomatie.gouv.fr
Advisor:	Mr Cédric MARTEAU Terres Australes et Antarctiques Françaises Rue Gabriel Dejean, 97410 St Pierre de la Réunion – France Tel : 0692 68 30 65 Email: cedric.martea@taaf.fr
Advisor:	Dr Henri WEIMERSKIRCH CNRS CEBC 79360 Villiers en Bois, France Tel: +33 5 49 09 78 15 Email: henriw@cebc.cnrs.fr
NEW ZEALAND	
Member:	Dr Igor DEBSKI Department of Conservation 18-32 Manners St, Wellington 6143, New Zealand Tel: +64 4 471 3189 Email: idebski@doc.govt.nz
Alternate Member :	Dr Martin CRYER Ministry for Primary Industries PO Box 2526, Wellington, New Zealand Tel: +64 4 819 4253 Email: martin.cryer@mpi.govt.nz
PERU	
Member	Ms Alejandra PAZ Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores del Perú Jirón Lampa N° 545, Lima 1, Peru Tel: +51 204-3245; +51 958792939 Email: apaz@ree.gob.pe
Alternate Member:	Ms Elisa GOYA Instituto del Mar del Perú – IMARPE Esquina Gamarra y Gral. Valle S/N, Chucuito, Callao, Lima, Peru Tel: +51 16250800 (815) Email: egoya@imarpe.gob.pe

Alternate Member:	Mr Ernesto REÁTEGUI VELIT Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores del Perú Embajada del Perú en Paris
SOUTH AFRICA	
Member:	Dr Azwianewi MAKHADO Department of Environmental Affairs Branch Oceans and Coasts, PO Box 52126, Cape Town 8000, South Africa Tel: +27 21 402 3137 Email: amakhado@environment.gov.za
SPAIN	
Member:	Ms Isabel LÓPEZ Ministerio de Agricultura, Alimentación y Medio Ambiente Plaza San Juan de la Cruz S/N (Despacho B-507), 28071, Madrid, Spain Tel: +34 91 597 66 04 Email: milopez@magrama.es
UNITED KINGDOM	
Member:	Mr Mark TASKER Joint Nature Conservation Committee Inverdee House, Baxter Street, Aberdeen, AB11 9QA, Scotland, United Kingdom Tel: +44 1224 266551 Email: mark.tasker@jncc.gov.uk
Advisor:	Mrs Clare HAMILTON Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) Area 8E, 9 Millbank, c/o 17, Smith Square, London SW1P 3JR, United Kingdom Phone: +44 207 238 0533 Email: Clare.Hamilton@defra.gsi.gov.uk
Advisor:	Dr Richard PHILLIPS British Antarctic Survey High Cross, Madingley Road, Cambridge CB3 0ET, United Kingdom Tel: +44 1223 221 610 Email: raphil@bas.ac.uk
Advisor:	Dr Anton WOLFAARDT Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) c/o Inverdee House, Baxter Street, Aberdeen, AB11 9QA, Scotland, United Kingdom Tel: 00 500 54068 Email: anton.wolfaardt@jncc.gov.uk

URUGUAY

Member:	Mr Andrés DOMINGO Dirección Nacional de Recursos Acuáticos Constituyente 1497, CP 11200, Montevideo, Uruguay Tel: +598 2 400 4689 Email: adomingo@dinara.gub.uy
---------	---

RANGE STATES**CANADA**

Observer:	Mr Ken MORGAN Canadian Wildlife Service, Environment Canada Institute of Ocean Sciences, 9860 West Saanich Road, Sidney, British Columbia, V8L 4B2, Canada Tel: +1 250 363 6537 Email: ken.morgan@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
-----------	---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Observer:	Dr Elizabeth FLINT Pacific Reefs National Wildlife Refuge Complex, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 300 Ala Moana Blvd. Suite 5-231, Honolulu, HI 96850 USA Tel: +1 808 792 9553 Email: Beth_Flint@fws.gov
Observer	Ms Mi Ae KIM National Marine Fisheries Service 1315 East-West Hwy (F/IA), Silver Spring, MD 20910, USA Tel: +1 301 427 8365 Email: mi.ae.kim@noaa.gov
Observer	Ms Marlene MENARD U.S. Department of State 2201 C St NW, OES/OMC Room 2758, Washington, DC 20520 Tel: +1-202-262-5561 Email: menardmm@state.gov

OBSERVERS – INTER-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS**CMS SECRETARIAT**

Observer:	Ms Melanie Virtue UN Campus Hermann-Ehlers-Strasse 10, 53113 Bonn, Germany Tel: +49 228 815 2462 Email: MVirtue@cms.int
-----------	---

OBSERVERS – NON-GOVERNMENT ORGANISATIONS**BIRDLIFE INTERNATIONAL**

Observer:	Prof John CROXALL Wellbrook Court, Girton Road, Cambridge, CB3 0NA, United Kingdom Tel: +44 1223 277 318 Email: john.croxall@birdlife.org
-----------	---

CHINESE WILD BIRD FEDERATION

Observer:	Dr Charles CHENG Department of Biology, Kaohsiung Medical University, Kaohsiung 80708, Taiwan, ROC Tel: +886 937 835 100 Email: charlescwbfb@gmail.com
-----------	---

HUMANE SOCIETY INTERNATIONAL, AUSTRALIA

Observer:	Mr Nigel BROTHERS PO Box 439, Avalon, NSW 2107, Australia Tel: +61 2 9973 1728 Email: brothersbone@yahoo.com.au
-----------	---

LPO

Observer:	Dr Thierry MICOL Fonderies Royales, 8 Rue du Dr Pujos 17300 Rochefort, France Tel: +33 (0)6 34 20 50 71 Email: thierry.micol@lpo.fr
-----------	--

MEDMARAVIS

Observer:	Mr Carles CARBONERAS University of Barcelona, Dept. of Animal Biology Av. Diagonal 645, 08028-Barcelona, Spain Tel. +34 615 454 353, Email: carbnectrix@gmail.com
-----------	--

WWF

Observer:	Ms Milena PALKA PO Box 6237, Marion Square, Wellington 6141, New Zealand Tel: +64 4 471 4285 Email: mpalka@wwf.org.nz
-----------	---

SECRETARIAT	
Executive Secretary:	Mr Warren PAPWORTH Tel: +61 439 323 505 Email: warren.papworth@acap.aq
Science Officer :	Dr Wiesława MISIAK Tel: +61 3 6233 5695 Email: wieslawa.misiak@acap.aq ACAP Secretariat 27 Salamanca Square, Battery Point, Tasmania 7004, Australia Tel: +61 3 6233 3123 Fax: +61 3 6233 5497
AC7 Staff:	Mr Juan Pablo SECO PON Universidad Nacional de Mar del Plata, Argentina
AC7 Staff:	Ms Mathilde HUON Université de La Rochelle, France

INTERPRETERS	
Spanish/English:	Ms Sandra HALE Ms Roslyn WALLACE
French/English:	Ms Majorie BOURY Ms Joelle COUSSAERT ONCALL Interpreters & Translators Level 3, 3 Bowen Crescent, Melbourne VIC 3004, Australia Tel: +61 3 9867 3788 Email: Conference@oncallinterpreters.com

TECHNICAL SERVICES	
Audio Technician:	Mr Daniel JÄGG IDIOM 4 Boulevard de Cimiez, 06000 Nice, France www.idiom.fr

ANNEX 2. LIST OF MEETING DOCUMENTS

WORKING DOCUMENTS			
Paper	Title	Agenda Item	Author
AC7 Doc 01 Rev 1	Agenda	2	AC Chair, Secretariat
AC7 Doc 02 Rev 1	Annotated Agenda	2	AC Chair, Secretariat
AC7 Doc 03 Rev 1	Schedule	2	AC Chair, Secretariat
AC7 Doc 04 Rev 2	Participant List	2	Secretariat
AC7 Doc 05 Rev 4	List of Papers	2	AC Chair, Secretariat
AC7 Doc 06	Secretariat Report	5.1	Secretariat
AC7 Doc 07	Depositary Report	4	Australia
AC7 Doc 08 Rev 2	2013 Financial Report	6.1	Secretariat
AC7 Doc 09	Advisory Committee engagement in the work of the Intersessional Committee established by Resolution 4.8	3	AC Chair, Australia
AC7 Doc 10 Rev 1	Proposed guidelines for the further development of the Agreement's Secondment Programme	12.3	Grants Sub-committee, Secretariat
AC7 Doc 11	Report on MoP4	8	AC Chair, Secretariat
AC7 Doc 12 Rev 1	Report of Population and Conservation Status Working Group	9.1	Convenors PaCSWG
AC7 Doc 13 Rev 1	Report of Taxonomy Working Group	10.1	Convenor TWG
AC7 Doc 14 Rev 1	Report of Seabird Bycatch Working Group	11.1	Convenor SBWG
AC7 Doc 15	Advisory Committee Work Programme 2013-2015	12.1	AC Chair, Vice Chair
AC7 Doc 16	Allocation of funds to the AC Work Programme	12.2	Grant Sub-Committee, Secretariat
AC7 Doc 17	Secretariat Work Programme 2013-2015	5.2	Secretariat
AC7 Doc 18	Sponsorship Policy	5.3	Secretariat, AC Chair
AC7 Doc 19 Rev 1	Strategy to engage new Parties	4	Secretariat, AC Chair
AC7 Doc 20 Rev 1	Process for evaluating and listing species on Annex 1	14	Secretariat, AC Chair, Working Group

WORKING DOCUMENTS			
Paper	Title	Agenda Item	Author
			Convenors
AC7 Doc 21	Publication of meeting documents	20.1	Secretariat
AC7 Doc 22	Report of Intersessional Committee established by Resolution 4.8	3	Intersessional Committee
AC7 Doc 23	Performance indicators	13	Argentina
AC7 Doc 24 Rev 1	Listing of New Species – Pink-footed Shearwater, <i>Puffinus creatopus</i>	14	Chile
AC7 Doc 25	Addition of a New Species to Annex I of ACAP: the Galápagos Petrel <i>Pterodroma phaeopygia</i>	14	Ecuador
INFORMATION PAPERS			
Paper	Title	Agenda Item	Submitted by
AC7 Inf 01	Summary of Projects Supported in 2012 and Progress Reports – AC Grants Programme	12.2	Grants Sub-Committee, Secretariat
AC7 Inf 02	Parties' AC Reports	5.4	Secretariat
AC7 Inf 03	Plan national d'actions pour l'albatros d'Amsterdam <i>Diomedea amsterdamensis</i> 2011 – 2015 <i>National Plan of Action for the Amsterdam Albatross Diomedea amsterdamensis 2011 - 2015</i>	15	France
AC7 Inf 04	Update on the population status and distribution of Mediterranean shearwaters	14	Medmaravis, BirdLife International
AC7 Inf 05	The Bycatch Mitigation Information System	11.1	Secretariat of the Pacific Community, New Caledonia
AC7 Inf 06	CMS Report to the Seventh Meeting of ACAP's Advisory Committee (AC7)	7.1	UNEP/CMS Secretariat
AC7 Inf 07	ACAP Observer Report to the Thirty-First Meeting of the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR), held in Hobart, Australia, 23 October to 1 November 2012	7.1	New Zealand

ANNEX 3. AC7 AGENDA

AC7 AGENDA
1. Opening Remarks
2. Adoption of the Agenda
3. Rules of Procedure
4. Report of Depositary
5. ACAP Secretariat <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5.1 Activities undertaken in 2012/13 intersessional period 5.2 Secretariat Work Programme 2013-2015 5.3 Agreement Sponsorship Policy 5.4 Parties' AC Reports
6. Agreement's Financial Matters <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6.1 Financial Report
7. Observer Reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.1 Reports from ACAP Observers at International Meetings 7.2 Reports from Observers to AC7
8. Report on the Fourth Meeting of the Parties
9. Conservation and Population Status of Albatrosses and Petrels <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9.1 Report of Working Group 9.2 Future Work Programme
10. Taxonomy of Albatrosses and Petrels <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10.1 Report of Working Group 10.2 Future Work Programme
11. Seabird Bycatch <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 11.1 Report of Working Group 11.2 Future Work Programme

12. Advisory Committee Work Programme 12.1 Advisory Committee Work Programme 2013-2015 12.2 Allocation of AC funds 12.3 Agreement Secondment Programme
13. Indicators to Measure the Success of ACAP
14. Listing of New Species
15. Species Action Plans
16. Impacts of Global Climate Change
17. Election and appointment of AC Officers
18. Eighth Meeting of the Advisory Committee 18.1 Timing and Venue 18.2 Draft Agenda
19. Fifth Meeting of the Parties 19.1 Timing and Venue
20. Other Business 20.1 Publication of meeting documents
21. Adoption of report
22. Closing remarks

ANNEX 4. SECRETARIAT WORK PROGRAMME 2013-2015

Task No.	Topic/Task	Mandate	Officer	2013		2014		2015		Action/Detail
				Time (days)	Funds	Time (days)	Funds	Time (days)	Funds	
1	SUPPORT FOR MOP, ADVISORY COMMITTEE & WORKING GROUP MEETINGS			AC 7	+ WG	AC 8	+ WG	MoP 5		
1.1	Undertake meeting arrangements.	Article X.a								
	- selection of venue		Exec Sec	2	500	2	500	2	500	Travel costs
	- organise contracts, venue/equip		Exec Sec	2		2		2		
	- liaison with host government		Exec Sec	2		2		2		
1.2	Preparation of meeting papers	Article X.a								Within 60 days of meeting
	- writing of meeting documents		Exec Sec	5		5		5		
	- writing of meeting documents		Sci Officer	5		5		5		
	- writing of meeting documents		Tech Advisor	5		5		1		
	- co-ordination of meeting documents		Exec Sec	5		5		5		
	- co-ordination of meeting documents		Sci Officer	5		5		5		
	- co-ordination of meeting documents		Tech Advisor	5		5		1		
	- drafting of implementation report		Exec Sec			5		1		
	- drafting of implementation report		Sci Officer			15		2		
	- drafting of implementation report		Tech Advisor			5		1		
1.3	Support the attendance of sponsored experts and delegates	Article VII 5	Exec Sec	5		5		5		Correspondence, organise travel, acquittal of accounts
1.4	Organise the translation and posting of meeting documents and provision of interpretation services	AC RoP 17 (1)								Within 30 days of meeting
	- Coordination with service provider		Exec Sec	2		2		2		
	- posting of documents		Contract	20	12,000	20	12,000	7	4,200	

Task No.	Topic/Task	Mandate	Officer	2013		2014		2015		Action/Detail
				Time (days)	Funds	Time (days)	Funds	Time (days)	Funds	
1.5	Support & operation of meetings	Article X.a								
	- travel for meetings		Sec. staff x 2	8	6,000	8	6,000	8	6,000	4 days per meeting, airfares
	- travel for meetings		Contract x 2	8	10,800	8	10,800		9,360	airfares, contract costs
	- attendance at meeting		Sec. staff x 2	11	4,400	11	4,400	12	4,400	accomm/allowances x 2
	- attendance at meeting		Contract x 2	22	17,600	22	17,600	14	14,900	contract costs, accomm
1.6	Prepare meeting report and distribute to all Parties	Article X.a	Sec. staff x 1	3		3		3		
2	MANAGEMENT OF SECRETARIAT									
2.1	Administer the budget for the Agreement and the Special Fund provided for in Article VII (3) in accordance with the Agreement's Financial Regulations;	Article X.g								Ongoing
	- payment of accounts		Exec Sec	12		12		12		
	- preparation of invoices and receipts		Exec Sec	4		4		4		
	- preparation of financial statements		Exec Sec	2		2		2		
	- maintain advance & assets registers		Exec Sec	1		1		1		
2.2	Prepare quarterly financial reports for the information of the Parties and the Chair of the Advisory Committee	AC2, MoP2	Exec Sec	8		8		8		
2.3	Provide information to the general public concerning the Agreement and its objectives, and promote the objectives of this Agreement	Article X.h								
	- preparation of <i>ACAP Latest News</i> for website		Info Officer	90		90		90		

Task No.	Topic/Task	Mandate	Officer	2013		2014		2015		Action/Detail
				Time (days)	Funds	Time (days)	Funds	Time (days)	Funds	
	- maintain/update website links, management plans and publications		Info Officer	5		5		5		
	- management of ACAP Facebook page		Info Officer	2		2		2		
	- preparation of scientific material		Sci Officer	5		5		5		
2.5	Update and maintain the ACAP website	Article X.h	Contract	20	11,200	20	11,200	20	11,200	
2.6	Report to the 5th session of the Meeting of the Parties on the effectiveness and efficiency of the Secretariat in terms of the agreed performance indicators	Article X.i	Exec Sec					1		
2.7	Collate as appropriate synthesized information provided by Parties on the implementation and effective functioning of the Agreement with particular reference to the conservation measures undertaken,	Article X.j;	Exec Sec			5				
	- review data, liaise with stakeholders, amend database, collate information and draft consolidated reports	Article VII (1) c); Article VIII (10)	Science off			15				
2.8	Represent the Agreement at meetings of other intergovernmental agreements, as appropriate to facilitate achievement of the Agreement's objective	Article X.d								
	- attendance at CMS, FAO etc meetings	Article XI	Exec Sec	5	4,000	5	4,000	5	4,000	Accomm, fares and allowances
	- attendance at other IGO meetings		Exec Sec	5	3,500	5	3,500	5	3,500	- as above
2.9	Prepare a report on Secretariat activities for AC and MoP meetings	Article X f)	Exec Sec	1		1		1		
2.14	Recruit and manage the Secretariat's staff in accordance with the Staff Regulations and the directions of the Meeting of the Parties	Staff Regs	Exec Sec	6		6		6		

Task No.	Topic/Task	Mandate	Officer	2013		2014		2015		Action/Detail
				Time (days)	Funds	Time (days)	Funds	Time (days)	Funds	
3	FACILITATE THE WORK OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE									
3.1	Assist the Chair of the Advisory Committee as required to facilitate the work of the Advisory Committee	Article X k)								
	- Weekly liaison, assist with co-ordination of AC officials meetings etc		Exec Sec	25		25		25		
3.2	Assist the Chair of the Advisory Committee in preparing a report to the MoP on the activities of the Advisory Committee	Article IX 6.e)	Exec Sec			1				
3.3	Assist the Convenors of the Population and Conservation Status Working Group as required to facilitate the work of the Group	Article X k)								
	- Consider gaps in population, tracking, breeding site management, threats and regulatory protection data submitted to ACAP; request any outstanding data and incorporate changes	AC WP Task 2.2	Sci Officer	25		25		25		
	- Improve data portal structure and queries	AC WP Task 2.3	Sci Officer & Contract	20	5,000	20	5,000	20	5,000	Consultant data programmer / developer
	- Review and refine standardised queries and outputs for analysis and interpretation	AC WP Task 2.4	Sci Officer & Contract	5	2,000	5	2,000	5	1,000	Consultant data programmer / developer
	Accurately assess and update global population trends	AC WP Task 2.5	Sci Officer			10				May require further data portal updates. Progress the assessment of global population trends. Consider alternative

Task No.	Topic/Task	Mandate	Officer	2013		2014		2015		Action/Detail
				Time (days)	Funds	Time (days)	Funds	Time (days)	Funds	
										approaches as required.
	- Update ACAP Species Assessments	AC WP Task 2.6	Sci Officer	20		20		20		
	- Translate updates to Species Assessments and ACAP guidelines into Spanish and French	AC WP Task 2.7	Sci Officer & Contract		3,000		7,500 Core		3,000	No costs if translation can be undertaken in kind by Spanish and French speaking Parties. Minimal costs (AUD 250 per assessment) budgeted to assist in translation.
	- Identity priority species or populations for monitoring of numbers, trends and demography	AC WP Task 2.8	Sci Officer	10		10		10		Review and update priorities and reflect on progress against priorities and provide reports to each AC
	- Review availability of albatross and petrel tracking/distribution data to ensure representativeness of species/age classes. Prioritise gaps and encourage studies to fill gaps	AC WP Task 2.9	Sci Officer	5		5	5,000 Grant	5		Review status at AC8
	- Identity priority species or populations for conservation actions	AC WP Task 2.10	Sci Officer	10		10		10		Review at AC8
	- Review progress and prioritise the threats to breeding sites and identify gaps in knowledge	AC WP Task 2.11	Sci Officer	5		5		5		Annual updating of priorities by Parties, re-run prioritisation as required. Include Balearic Shearwater in terrestrial prioritisation

Task No.	Topic/Task	Mandate	Officer	2013		2014		2015		Action/Detail
				Time (days)	Funds	Time (days)	Funds	Time (days)	Funds	
	- Develop, review and update best-practice guidelines to mitigate selected threats to breeding sites (including updates for eradication and biosecurity protocols)	AC WP Task 2.12	Sci Officer	15	\$500 Core	15	\$500 core	15	\$500 core	Update eradication guidelines by AC8. Translate updated document. Update biosecurity guidelines to ensure adequate for disease issues.
	- Develop best-practice guidelines for monitoring of numbers and trends	AC WP Task 2.13	Sci Officer	5			\$1,000 core			Production complete Costs for translation
	- Review evidence for impacts of pathogens and parasites on ACAP species and effectiveness of mitigation measures	AC WP Task 2.14	Sci Officer			5				Update review of pathogens and parasites. Gain input from pathologists and wildlife vets.
	Develop/update database of biosecurity plans for ACAP breeding sites	AC WP Task 2.a2	Sci Officer			5				Parties may also need to develop/implement biosecurity plans at breeding sites
	Post web links on biological sampling guidelines following disease outbreak	AC WP Task 2.15	Sci Officer			1				PaCSWG members to provide links/material. Ongoing.
	Produce centralised catalogue of plastic rings used on ACAP species and contact list, and addresses of ringing authorities	AC WP Task 2.16				5				A summary table will be provided by the Science Officer. Parties will check gaps and update by AC8.
3.4	Assist the Convenor of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group as required to facilitate the work of the Group	Article X k)								Ongoing

Task No.	Topic/Task	Mandate	Officer	2013		2014		2015		Action/Detail
				Time (days)	Funds	Time (days)	Funds	Time (days)	Funds	
3.5	Continue to implement the RFMO interaction plan for ACAP (AC5 Doc 29) and relevant Parties to engage and assist RFMOs and other relevant international bodies in assessing and minimising bycatch of albatrosses and petrels	AC WP Task 3.1	Exec Sec, Technical Advisor	40	15,000 core	40	15,000 core	40	15,000 core	a) Travel etc costs for attendance at selected RFMO meetings (less if Party can contribute directly) c) Review of process and recommend changes (SBWG)
	- as above	AC WP Task 3.1	Technical Advisory/contract	20	15,000	20	15,000	20	15,000	b) RFMO co-ordinator activities
	- Continue to develop materials (both generic and specific) to assist RFMOs and other relevant international and national bodies in reducing seabird bycatch and to maximise effective participation and consideration of issues relevant to ACAP	AC WP Task 3.4	Sci Officer	5		5		5		
	- Maintain bibliography of relevant bycatch information	AC WP Task 3.6	Sci Officer	5		5		5		
3.6	Assist the Convenor of the Taxonomy Working Group as required to facilitate the work of the Group	Article X k)								Ongoing
	- Continue the establishment of a morphometric and plumage database	AC WP Task 1.2	Sci Officer	10						
3.7	Develop and harmonise conservation strategies or plans for particular species or groups of species of albatrosses and petrels	AC WP Task 5.2	Sci Officer	5		5		5		Precise definition of what is needed difficult at this stage. Action paused as definition not clear

Task No.	Topic/Task	Mandate	Officer	2013		2014		2015		Action/Detail
				Time (days)	Funds	Time (days)	Funds	Time (days)	Funds	
3.8	Implement system of indicators for the success of the ACAP Agreement	AC WP Task 5.4	Sci Officer	5		5		5		
3.8a	Review ACAP performance indicators	AC WP 5.a6	Sci Officer			2				2 Date stamp input parameters as far as practicable, hindcast to 2004, and assess indicators at AC8. Consider tracking data indicators, consider composite Red List Indicator index options
3.9	Continue to develop and maintain the ACAP database and web portal so that it provides effective support for the work of the Agreement.	AC WP Task 2.3, 2.4, 5.2	Sci Officer & contract	10	10,000	10	10,000	10	10,000	Ongoing
3.10	Manage database of relevant scientific literature	AC WP Task 5.5	Sci Officer	5		5		5		Secretariat will examine option of making database available on line, Forward scientific literature to Secretariat (all Members)
3.11	Manage directory of relevant legislation	AC WP Task 5.6	Sci Officer	3		3		3		Parties to supply further information, as available
3.12	Develop a list of authorities, research centres, scientists and non-government organisations relevant to ACAP	AC WP Task 5.8	Sci Officer & Info Officer	3		3		3		Parties and AC to supply further information, as available
4	IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AGREEMENT									

Task No.	Topic/Task	Mandate	Officer	2013		2014		2015		Action/Detail
				Time (days)	Funds	Time (days)	Funds	Time (days)	Funds	
4.1	Assist Parties in providing training, technical and financial support to other Parties on a multilateral or bilateral basis to facilitate implementation of the Agreement.	Article VIII (14)	Sci Officer & Exec Sec	5		5		5		Ongoing
4.2	Promote and coordinate activities under the Agreement, including the Action Plan, in accordance with decisions of the Meeting of the Parties	Article X c)	Exec Sec	2		2		2		Ongoing
4.3	Liaise with non-Party Range States and regional economic integration organisations to facilitate coordination between Parties and non-Party Range States, and international and national organisations and institutions whose activities are directly or indirectly relevant to the conservation of albatrosses and petrels.	Article X d)	Exec Sec	10	5,000	10	5,000	10	5,000	Airfares, accomm, allowances
4.4	Consult with and enter into arrangements, with the approval of the Meeting of Parties, with other organisations and institutions, and as appropriate exchange information and data.	Article XI 2c), 3 & 4	Exec Sec	1		1		1		Ongoing
4.5	Facilitate the accession of non-Party Range States to the Agreement		Exec Sec	2		2		2		
4.6	Liaise with and encourage the participation and accession of non-Party Range States	Article X d), k)	Exec Sec	3		3		3		
4.7	Review, refine and standardise criteria to include new species on Annex 1.	AC WP 5.a2	Sci Officer			5				Document for consideration at AC8
4.8	Complete ID guide for bycaught seabirds	AC WG 5.a3	Exec Sec Sci Officer			10	15,000 core	5		Draft document for AC8, complete by MoP5
4.9	Further develop best-practice de-hooking guide	AC WP 5.a4				1	1,000 core			Funds required for graphic design and translation

Task No.	Topic/Task	Mandate	Officer	2013		2014		2015		Action/Detail
				Time (days)	Funds	Time (days)	Funds	Time (days)	Funds	
4.10	Develop best practice guidelines for acquisition of biological samples for genetic analyses	AC WP 5.a5	Sci Officer			2				
5	CAPACITY BUILDING									
5.1	Assist the Advisory Committee and Parties with technical cooperation and capacity building	Article IV (2)								
	- Liaise with relevant stakeholders, facilitate capacity building initiatives	AC Work Programme 5.1	Exec Sec & Sci Officer	5		5		5		
5.2	Support secondments to the Secretariat to aid capacity building	MoP2	Exec Sec & Sci Officer	5	22,000	5	22,000	5	22,000	Airfares, accomm, allowances for secondees

ANNEX 5. ADVISORY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2013-2015

	Topic/Task	Responsible group	Timeframe	Resources			Action detail
				Time	Funds for AC	Grant/core	
1. Taxonomy and Annex 1 review							
1.1	Keep the Taxonomy Working Group's bibliographic database updated	TWG led by Convenor	2013-2015	0.5 week p.a. (per annum)	AUD 0		
1.2	Continue the establishment of a morphometric and plumage database	TWG led by Convenor, Science Officer	2013-2015	2 weeks	AUD 0		This will facilitate the taxonomic process, the identification of bycatch specimens, and the long-term storage of valuable data
1.a1	Develop a database of site-specific information on the availability of samples relevant to studies of population genetics of ACAP species	TWG	2013-2015	2 months	?	Core	This will require input from PaCSWG (for a list of ACAP populations) and once developed, the output should be of use to SBWG in understanding the origins of bycaught birds. The initial database will be useful in identifying gaps in knowledge. Possible student project
1.3	Consider taxonomic issues relating to species proposed for addition to Annex 1 of the Agreement	Parties and AC	2013-2015	0.5 week p.a.	AUD 0		Development of papers as required, using species assessment template. <i>Spain to develop document on Balearic shearwater for AC5</i>
1.4	Respond to queries on taxonomic issues relating to ACAP species	TWG led by Convenor	2013-2015	1-2 weeks p.a.	AUD 0		<i>In 2011-2012, consider status of possible Black-footed albatross sub-species</i>

	Topic/Task	Responsible group	Timeframe	Resources			Action detail
				Time	Funds for AC	Grant/core	
2. Information on status, trends and breeding sites							
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 0	-	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, Vice Convenors, PaCSWG	2013-2015	3 weeks p.a.	AUD 0	-	Priority for refining queries and outputs. Outputs to be performed 3 months after each AC if required, and before each AC.
2.5	Accurately assess and update global population trends	PaCSWG Convenors, data holders, Science Officer and BirdLife International, other experts as required	By end 2014	3 weeks	AUD 5,000	Core	May require further data portal updates. Progress the assessment of global population trends. Consider alternative approaches as required.
2.6	Update ACAP Species Assessments	PaCSWG Convenors, members, Science Officer, experts, BirdLife International (maps)	2013-2015	6 weeks p.a.	AUD 4000	Core	Updated by AC8 with a 3-year working plan for future updates and reviews. Costs for Birdlife to update maps.

	Topic/Task	Responsible group	Timeframe	Resources			Action detail
				Time	Funds for AC	Grant/core	
2.7	Translate updates to Species Assessments and ACAP guidelines into Spanish and French.	Science Officer, Spanish and French speaking Parties	2013-2015		(AUD 7,500)	Core	No costs if translation can be undertaken in kind by Spanish and French speaking Parties. Minimal costs (AUD 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.
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	Grant	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
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	Core	Update eradication guidelines by AC8. Translate updated document. Update biosecurity guidelines to ensure adequate for disease issues.
2.a1	Develop a translocation best practice guidelines for ACAP species	PaCSWG, Lead NZ and US	2013-2015		AUD 1000	Core	Document to be presented at AC8. Costs for translation

	Topic/Task	Responsible group	Timeframe	Resources			Action detail
				Time	Funds for AC	Grant/core	
2.13	Develop best-practice guidelines for monitoring of numbers and trends	PaCSWG, Lead UK, Science Officer	By MoP4, AC7	4 weeks	AUD 1000	Core	Production complete of two documents (one by MoP4, other by AC7) . Costs for translation
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. Gain input from pathologists and wildlife vets.
2.a2	Develop/update database of biosecurity plans for ACAP breeding sites	Members, PaCSWG, Science Officer	Ongoing	1 week	AUD 0	-	Parties may also need to develop/implement biosecurity plans at breeding sites
2.15	Post web links on biological sampling guidelines following disease outbreaks	Science Officer, PaCSWG	2013-2015	1 day	AUD 0	-	PaCSWG members to provide links/material. Ongoing.
2.16	Produce centralised catalogue of plastic rings used on ACAP species and contact list, and addresses of ringing authorities	Science Officer, PaCSWG, Lead France?	By 2013?4	1 week	AUD 0	-	A summary table will be provided by the Science Officer. Parties will check gaps and update by AC8.
2.17	Provide reports on activities to AC meetings	PaCSWG, Science Officer	As needed	12 weeks	AUD 0	-	
3. Seabird Bycatch							
3.1	Continue to implement the RFMO interaction plan for ACAP (AC5 Doc 29) and relevant Parties to engage and assist RFMOs and other relevant international bodies in assessing and minimising bycatch of albatrosses and petrels	Individual RFMO co-ordinators, Secretariat, SBWG and AC	2013-2015	a) 18 weeks p.a. b) 18 week p.a. c) 2 week p.a.	a+b) AUD 30,000 each pa AUD 0	Core	a) Travel etc costs for attendance at selected RFMO meetings (less if Party can contribute directly) b) RFMO co-ordinator activities c) Review of process and recommend changes (SBWG)

	Topic/Task	Responsible group	Timeframe	Resources			Action detail
				Time	Funds for AC	Grant/core	
3.2	Update analysis of overlaps of distributions and albatrosses and petrels with fisheries managed by RFMOs	BirdLife / ACAP	2013	4 weeks	AUD 20,000	Grant	
3.3	Continue to develop materials (both generic and specific) to assist RFMOs and other relevant international and national bodies in reducing seabird bycatch and to maximise effective participation and consideration of issues relevant to ACAP	SBWG Convenor with other SBWG consultation to review needs (Secretariat)	2013-2015	1) 1 week p.a. 2) 8 weeks	AUD 0	Grant/ Core	
3.a1	Provide guidance to RFMOs for the identification of minimum elements and appropriate methods and indicators to review the effectiveness of seabird bycatch mitigation measures	SBWG	2014				Work will be advanced by a small intersessional WG
3.4	Continue to review and utilise available information on foraging distribution, fisheries and seabird bycatch to aid prioritisation of actions to reduce the risk of fishing operations to ACAP species in waters subject to national jurisdiction.	SBWG and Parties	2013-2015	1) 8 weeks 2) 2 weeks	AUD 0	-	1) Commission initial report on knowledge of fisheries, status of any bycatch mitigation, knowledge of relevant seabird distribution for AC5. Note overlap with 4.4. NPOA seabirds also can be used. (AUD 0) 2) Assess needs for waters subject to national jurisdiction and any capacity building requirements
3.5	Maintain bibliography of relevant bycatch information	BirdLife/SBWG Science Officer	2013-2015	1 week pa	AUD 0	-	Includes both published and unpublished literature

	Topic/Task	Responsible group	Timeframe	Resources			Action detail
				Time	Funds for AC	Grant/core	
3.6	Based on new information, update ACAP/BirdLife fact sheets on mitigation measures for fishing methods known to impact albatrosses and petrels (trawl, pelagic longline, demersal longline)	SBWG/BirdLife	2013-2015	1 week per fact sheet	AUD 5,000	Core	Costs are for translation. Leads - Trawl: New Zealand Pelagic longline: Australia Demersal longline: UK General: BirdLife
3.7	Produce report on lessons from mitigation success stories in commercial fisheries	BirdLife/ Australia/ Convenor SBWG/WWF	2013-2015	3 weeks	AUD 0	-	Target audience is fisheries managers
3.8	Prepare review of knowledge on deliberate take/killing of ACAP species at sea	Australia/ Brazil/ New Zealand/ Peru/ UK/ WWF/ SBWG	2015	4 weeks	AUD 0	-	Review to describe current knowledge (much from unpublished literature) and causes of any deliberate take and to consider possible take reduction strategies. Could use secondee [to Secretariat]
3.9	Review results of any research on seabird bycatch issues, particularly that funded by ACAP	SBWG	2013-2015	2 weeks pa	AUD 0	-	Draw conclusions and make recommendations to AC as appropriate
3.10	Maintain review of research needs and priorities for bycatch research and mitigation development	SBWG	2013-2015	2 weeks	AUD 0	-	
3.a2	Assemble and review all evidence on line-weighting in pelagic long-line fisheries	SBWG	2013-14	3 months		Grant	Would be suitable for a secondee
3.a3	Recommend priority actions to advance implementation of line-weighting in pelagic longline fisheries	SBWG	2014 – ideally immediately prior to AC8	1 day			

	Topic/Task	Responsible group	Timeframe	Resources			Action detail
				Time	Funds for AC	Grant/core	
3.a4	Undertake further research on necessary practical actions relating to line-weighting in key pelagic longline fisheries	SBWG	2013-2015		AUD 10,000	Grant	
3.a5	Improve estimates of bycatch of ACAP species in trawl fisheries through research	SBWG	2014-15		(Party funding)		Recent studies have indicated higher rates of trawl warp collision than previously thought; further studies would help understanding of the scale (and variability) of trawl bycatch.
3.11	Provide recommendations to the AC on measures to address at-sea threats identified as conservation priorities	SBWG	2013-2015	1 week	AUD 0	-	
3.12	Review and update the prioritisation framework for at-sea threats	SBWG	2014 Ideally immediately prior to AC8	1 week	AUD 10,000	Core	One workshop and some analysis and update of data relating to threats and mitigation
3.13	Review and consider seabird bycatch issues as they relate to smaller vessels (including issues of defining "smaller vessels")	SBWG	at SBWG6	1 week	AUD 0	-	
3.a6	Review the definition of, and legislation pertinent to, artisanal and small-scale fisheries	SBWG	2014-15	3 months	?	Grant	Might be suitable for a secondee
3.a7	Assemble and review evidence of injuries sustained by fishers in the course of using weighted lines in pelagic longline fisheries	SBWG	2014/2015			Grant	Possible secondee

	Topic/Task	Responsible group	Timeframe	Resources			Action detail
				Time	Funds for AC	Grant/core	
3.14	Consider which data would be appropriate as baselines for assessing trends in bycatch levels and rates and formulate suitable indicators	SBWG, BirdLife	2012-2013	1 week	AUD 0	-	Data is described in the global review of seabird bycatch in longline fisheries (AC6 Doc 30)
3.15	Estimate mortality in previously unobserved fisheries in range of Waved albatross	Ecuador and Peru, BirdLife, AC, American Bird Conservancy	2013-2015	4 weeks	AUD 20,000 over triennium	Grant	Part of implementation from Waved Albatross Action Plan (for net fisheries)
3.a8	Engage in processes that are developing electronic monitoring of catch/bycatch to ensure that the needs to monitor seabird bycatch are taken into account	SBWG	2013-14		AUD 10,000	Grant	Contribution to ISSF research proposal for testing of e-monitoring in tuna pelagic longline fisheries. Possible further funding after AC8
3.16	Improve access to relevant data (e.g. from observers) held by others	SBWG	2013-2015			Grant	Need compilation of meta-data e.g. observer data. Will be included in the bycatch data reporting process
3.17	Analyse bycatch data in collaboration with Japanese researchers	SBWG	2013-2015	6 months	AUD 50,000	Grant	Might be best done by an appropriate experienced secondee. Costings difficult to estimate accurately. Needs further discussion
3.18	Analyse bycatch data from other fishing nations as information becomes available	SBWG	2013-2015	6 months	AUD 50,000	Grant	This is a contingency cost; we are not yet sure how much and when data might become available. Needs further discussion

	Topic/Task	Responsible group	Timeframe	Resources			Action detail
				Time	Funds for AC	Grant/core	
3.19	Identify hot spots for temporal/spatial management	RFMO coordinators/ Canada/ BirdLife/ SBWG	2013-2014	Post-doctorate for 2 years	AUD 10,000 + AUD 50,000 Needs further discussion	Grant	AUD 10,000 is a contribution to a potential Canadian/BirdLife/ACAP project in the North Pacific that could be done in the 2010-12 triennium. A total global cost might be in the order of AUD 50,000 (Deleted as project has gone ahead without ACAP funding)
3.20	Provide draft advice on suitable analyses of bycatch data and further develop the bycatch data reporting and assessment framework	SBWG	2013-2015	3 months	AUD 20,000	Grant	Statistical advice provided at SBWG5. Further work needed to progress the development of the bycatch data and assessment framework.
3.21	Provide reports on activities to AC meetings	SBWG and AC	2013-2015	1 week	AUD 0		
4. Capacity building, New Parties, Organisation of Work							
4.1	Provide assistance and capacity building to ensure drafting and implementation of NPOA-Seabirds	AC ,Parties and BirdLife to consider	2013-2015	10 weeks	AUD 0		Capacity building in accordance with the needs identified by interested Parties in order to encourage implementation, particularly in Ecuador, France, Peru, South Africa, (Mozambique, Madagascar), Tristan da Cunha (UK), and EC external fisheries
4.a1	Develop and implement a strategy for adding further Parties, and engaging with States not Party to ACAP	AC, Parties	2013-2015		AUD 0	-	Initial work carried out at AC7, further work intersessionally

	Topic/Task	Responsible group	Timeframe	Resources			Action detail
				Time	Funds for AC	Grant/core	
4.a2	Consider Working Group structure and function, including role and participation of members and experts	WGs, AC	2013-2015		AUD 0	-	Ongoing
4.a3	Develop and implement a strategy for secondments	AC	2013-2014		AUD 0	-	Ongoing
5. Indicators, priorities, reviews and collective conservation action							
5.1	Review data inputs to breeding sites and at-sea prioritisation frameworks agreed at MoP4, revise conservation priorities and identify actions required to address these priority threats.	WG Convenors and ad-hoc group, lead New Zealand	2013-2015	4 weeks 2013	AUD 10,000	Grant	Report outcomes at AC8. Funds are for any intersessional workshops required for such revision.
5.2	Develop and harmonise conservation strategies or plans for particular species or groups of species of albatrosses and petrels	WGs, AC (Secretariat)	2013-2015	2 weeks p.a.	AUD 0	-	Precise definition of what is needed difficult at this stage. Action paused as definition not clear
5.a1	Review existing Action Plans (for National Plans, when asked by relevant Party), and advise on new Action Plans for ACAP species	WGs, AC, Parties	2013-2015		AUD 0	-	Existing plans: Waved Albatross (Peru/Ecuador), Amsterdam Albatross (France), Southern Giant Petrel (Argentina), Balearic Shearwater (Spain)
5.3	Implement conservation strategies for particular species or groups of species of albatrosses and petrels	Parties, AC	2013-2015	unknown weeks	AUD 0	-	Precise definition of what needed is difficult at this stage
5.a2	Review, refine and standardise criteria to include new species on Annex 1.	WGs, Science Officer	By AC8	1 week p.a.	AUD 0	-	Document for consideration at AC8
5.a3	Complete ID guide for bycaught seabirds	PaCSWG, SBWG. TWG, Secretariat,	2014-15	3 weeks	AUD 15000	Core	Draft document for AC8, complete by MoP5

	Topic/Task	Responsible group	Timeframe	Resources			Action detail
				Time	Funds for AC	Grant/core	
5.a4	Further develop best-practice de-hooking guide	SBWG, PaCSWG, Secretariat	2014		AUD 1000	Core	Funds required for graphic design and translation
5.a5	Develop best practice guidelines for acquisition of biological samples for genetic analyses	PaCSWG, TWG, Secretariat	2014-2015		AUD 0	-	
5.4	Implement system of indicators for the success of the ACAP Agreement	Parties, Secretariat, BirdLife and AC	2013-2015	1 week pa	AUD 0	-	Review in time for MoP5
5.a6	Review ACAP performance indicators	PaCSWG, SBWG Convenors, Science Officer and BirdLife International	2013-2015	3 weeks	AUD 0	-	Date stamp input parameters as far as practicable, hindcast to 2004, and assess indicators at AC8. Consider tracking data indicators, consider composite Red List Indicator index options
5.5	Manage database of relevant scientific literature	Secretariat	2013-2015	4 weeks	AUD 0	-	Secretariat will examine option of making database available on line, further scientific literature from all.
5.6	Manage directory of relevant legislation	Secretariat	2013-2015		AUD 0	-	Parties to supply further information, as available
5.7	Develop a list of authorities, research centres, scientists and non-governmental organisations relevant to ACAP	Secretariat	2013-2015		AUD 0	-	Parties and AC to supply further information, as available
6. Management of AC work, secretariat oversight and liaison, and interaction of ACAP bodies							
6.1	Consider and advise on budget matters as needed	AC	2013-2015	2 weeks pa	AUD 0		Shorter-term advice provided by the AC Chair
6.2	Consider and advise on Staff matters as needed	AC	2013-2015	1 week pa	AUD 0		Shorter-term advice provided by the AC Chair

	Topic/Task	Responsible group	Timeframe	Resources			Action detail
				Time	Funds for AC	Grant/core	
6.3	Oversee, advise and guide Secretariat in relation to database, web portal	Convenors, Chair and Vice-chair	2013-2015	6 weeks pa	AUD 0		
6.4	Manage work of Advisory Committee	Chair, Vice-chair and Convenors	2013-2015	18 weeks pa	AUD 0		Regular teleconferences and email conversations

ANNEX 6. DRAFT AC8 AGENDA

AC8 – DRAFT AGENDA
1. Opening Remarks
2. Adoption of the Agenda
3. Rules of Procedure 3.1 Intersessional Committee Established by Resolution 4.8 3.2 Proposed Amendments to Rule 20
4. Depositary Matters 4.1 Report of Depositary 4.2 Progress with Strategy to Engage New Parties
5. ACAP Secretariat 5.1 Activities undertaken in 2013-14 intersessional period 5.2 Secretariat Work Programme 2014-2015 5.3 Secretariat Work Programme 2016-2018
6. Agreement's Financial Matters 6.1 Financial Report 6.2 Agreement budget 2016-2018 6.3 Scale of Contributions
7. Observer Reports 7.1 Reports from ACAP Observers at International Meetings 7.2 Reports from Observers to AC8
8. Review of Conservation Priorities for ACAP
9. Population and Conservation Status 9.1 Report of Working Group 9.2 Future Work Programme
10. Seabird Bycatch 10.1 Report of Working Group 10.2 Future Work Programme
11. Taxonomy of Albatrosses and Petrels 11.1 Report of Working Group 11.2 Future Work Programme
12. Advisory Committee Work Programme 12.1 Advisory Committee Work Programme 2014-2015 12.2 Advisory Committee Work Programme 2016-2018 12.3 Process for the allocation of funds 12.4 Outcomes of projects supported in 2012 and summary of projects funded in 2013 12.5 Agreement secondment programme

13. Report on the Implementation of the Agreement
14. Advisory Committee Report to the Fifth Meeting of Parties
15. Developing Indicators to Measure the Success of ACAP
16. Listing of New Species
17. Species Action Plans
18. Impacts of Global Climate Change
19. Fifth Meeting of Parties 20.1 Timing and venue 20.2 Draft Agenda
20. Ninth Meeting of the Advisory Committee 21.1 Timing and Venue
21. Other Business
22. Closing remarks
23. Adoption of report

ANNEX 7. BRAZIL UPDATE ON PLANACAP

In October 2012, Brazil promoted the review of its National Action Plan for the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (PLANACAP). One of the main goals of this review was to adjust PLANACAP in order to better reflect ACAP's premises. As a result, PLANACAP's actions and goals now follow more accurately what is recommended by ACAP. PLANACAP also includes conservation actions regarding breeding sites of the Trindade Petrel (*Pterodroma arminjoniana*) and the Audubon Shearwater (*Puffinus lherminieri*), two species that breed in Brazil and are not included in the ACAP Annex I.

PLANACAP's Executive Summary in English^[1] can be accessed at the following electronic address:

<http://www.icmbio.gov.br/portal/images/stories/docs-plano-de-acao/pan-albatrozes/sumario-ingles-albatrozes-petreis.pdf>

The next meeting for monitoring the implementation of PLANACAP is scheduled for June 2013.

[1] Due to some editorial problems, there were some mistakes in table "Conservation Status of the PLANACAP Species" (page 3) of the first printed edition of the referred Executive Summary, distributed during the Seabird Bycatch Working Group meeting held in La Rochelle, from 1 - 3 May, 2013. Those mistakes were corrected in the online version of the document and in further printed versions.

ANNEX 8. USA UPDATE ON EVENTS AT BREEDING SITES

1. Severe winter storms and a tsunami during the 2010/2011 breeding season resulted in the loss of more than 254,000 Laysan and 30,000 Black-footed Albatross chicks (about 41% and 56% respectively of that year's total production) were lost during these events. At least 2000 adults were also killed.

2. Counts during the following breeding season (hatch year 2012) revealed a drop in number of nesting pairs of Laysan Albatross at Midway Atoll from 482,000 pairs to 388,000 pairs but counts done at Midway Atoll for hatch year 2013 showed numbers of nests had rebounded to pre-tsunami levels (479,000 pairs). A similar pattern was observed in Black-footed Albatross nest counts.

3. The USA reported at AC6 the first successful fledging of a Short-tailed albatross chick on Midway Atoll National Wildlife Refuge outside of Asia. This eight-year old female and a 24-year old male pair bred again at the same site in 2012 and fledged a second chick. Both birds returned for the 2013 breeding season but an egg was not detected. A total of four short-tailed albatrosses spent the winter on Midway atoll in 2012/2013. In addition to the breeding pair on Eastern Island, one additional adult and one subadult spent time on different parts of Sand Island.

4. A severe storm at Tern Island, French Frigate Shoals on 9 December 2012 resulted in the destruction of a field station at which Laysan and black-footed albatross population size and reproductive performance have been monitored for over 30 years. This site has also been used for investigation of adult survival rates and at-sea movements. Personnel were evacuated safely but the future of this facility as a base for winter operations is undecided at this time.

ANNEX 9. USA STATEMENT ON THE PROPOSAL TO NOMINATE THE PINK-FOOTED SHEARWATER TO ANNEX 1

As a range state, the USA supports the inclusion of Pink-footed Shearwater on Annex 1 of ACAP for all the reasons so excellently laid out in the species assessment document submitted by Chile. The species is currently assigned conservation status in a number of national and international listings including being designated as “High Concern” under the Waterbird Conservation Plan for the Americas and American Bird Conservancy and Audubon’s Red List as a watch list species. The species’ non-breeding range overlaps with U.S. commercial fisheries along the West coast of the continental United States as well as the fisheries of several other nations. The Pink-footed Shearwater is a focal species for the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation’s Pacific Seabird Program which has targeted work on both terrestrial and marine threats. The American Bird Conservancy in partnership with partners Oikonos/Juan Fernandez Islands Conservancy has active projects addressing varied terrestrial threats in the nesting colonies on 3 Chilean Islands. American Bird Conservancy has also funded a multi-lateral effort to characterize the threat posed by fisheries in Chile, Peru, and Ecuador as we heard about at the SBWG-5 meeting in the results presented by Jeff Mangel (ProDelphinus). The Pink-footed Shearwater is a species that could directly benefit from the kinds of conservation efforts that ACAP is best at delivering and we support its listing under the Agreement.

ANNEX 10. CANADA STATEMENT ON THE PROPOSAL TO NOMINATE THE PINK-FOOTED SHEARWATER TO ANNEX 1

Canada as a range state supports Chile's proposal for the addition of the Pink-footed Shearwater to Annex 1 of the Agreement. In 2005, the species was listed as Threatened under Canada's *Species at Risk Act*, and in 2008, Canada released *The Recovery Strategy for the Short-tailed Albatross and the Pink-footed Shearwater in Canada*. In the Strategy, it noted that Canada's conservation objectives for the Pink-footed Shearwater would best be achieved by working collaboratively with Chile and with other countries and entities throughout the species' range. Under the *Canada-Chile Agreement on Environmental Cooperation*, Chile and Canada, plus the USA and several NGO's (including the American Bird Conservancy, Island Conservation, Oikonos and ProDelphinus) have been working on projects to evaluate and to reduce threats to the Pink-footed Shearwater at their breeding colonies and at sea. Because of the collective knowledge and expertise of many members of and observers to ACAP, it is very likely that the conservation of the Pink-footed Shearwater will benefit from its inclusion under Annex 1 of the Agreement.

ANNEX 11. ARGENTINA DISCLAIMER AMENDMENT PROPOSAL

"Argentina manifiesta que, atento que actualmente se está trabajando en la posibilidad de incorporar nuevas partes y observadores al Acuerdo, en cuanto a las referencias bibliográficas, sería importante que las partes consideraran agregar en la leyenda que figura en la portada de los documentos que se circulan en el marco del Acuerdo y que hace al resguardo de los derechos de autor, una oración que opere como eventual descargo para las partes en lo relativo a cuestiones que vayan más allá de lo estrictamente científico. De este modo, pensamos que se contribuiría a garantizar la circulación de documentos científicos de vanguardia que aporten a la temática de fondo del Acuerdo, sin que se pueda prejuzgar la posición de las partes sobre otras cuestiones. De aceptarse trabajar en esta línea, la Argentina podría redactar dicha frase, y ponerla a consideración de las demás partes del Acuerdo".

Unofficial translation

"Argentina states that, since there is currently being analysed the possibility to incorporate new parties and observers to the Agreement, as to the bibliographical references, it would be important that the parties consider adding in the disclaimer that safeguards copyrights contained on the cover of the documents that are circulated under the Agreement, a phrase that operates as an eventual disclaimer for the parties with regard to issues that go beyond strictly scientific matters.

Thus, we think it would help to ensure the circulation of cutting-edge scientific documents related to the subject of the Agreement, without prejudicing about the position of the parties on other issues.

If this proposal is accepted, Argentina could write that sentence, and put it for consideration of the other parties to the Agreement."