

|   |   |
|---|---|
|  <p>Agreement on the Conservation<br/>of Albatrosses and Petrels</p> | <p><b>Twelfth Meeting of the Seabird Bycatch Working Group</b></p> <p><i>Lima, Peru, 5 – 7 August 2024</i></p> <p><b>Report of pre-meeting workshop on seabird bycatch-related data and at-sea priorities</b></p> <p><b><i>SBWG Convenors, Secretariat, Mike Double &amp; Patricia Serafini</i></b></p> |
|---|---|

## SUMMARY

A Seabird Bycatch Data Workshop was held on 4 August 2024 to continue to find solutions to the challenges experienced in the reporting of ACAP seabird bycatch indicators and to update the ACAP at-sea threats priorities to inform relevant ACAP strategies such as the RFMO Engagement Strategy.

The workshop identified Response indicators as the highest priority for data collection because the data and reporting can be relatively simple and such metrics could perform as reliable, long-term indicators for ACAP. Bycatch rates, fisheries effort and detailed bycatch data should still be reported by Parties whenever possible. Reporting of Response and State indicators could be supported by an ACAP-funded project.

The workshop reviewed the current ACAP 'priority' fisheries and identified conservation actions by ACAP and its Parties that could reduce seabird bycatch in these fisheries. The full list of fisheries needs to be reviewed and updated by Parties before the scoring is completed and a new list of priority conservation actions by fishery is reported to MoP8. Broadly, the workshop had confidence in the prioritisation framework but its performance should be re-assessed after scores are updated.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend Seabird Bycatch Working Group:

1. Consider prioritising the collection of simple Response data on the implementation of seabird bycatch mitigation in domestic and RFMO fisheries.
2. Continue to encourage Parties to report detailed information on seabird bycatch whenever possible and in particular on seabird bycatch rates and total fishing effort.
3. Consider the development of an ACAP-funded project to support data reporting on mitigation implementation, bycatch rates and fisheries effort.

4. Review the at-sea conservation priority actions identified for ACAP and ACAP Parties, and seek their endorsement by the AC.
5. Review and update the full list of fisheries used in the prioritisation framework, update the scores for each fishery, and identify further possible actions for ACAP or ACAP Parties for high priority fisheries.
6. Continue to review and improve the prioritisation process to identify ACAP high-priority fisheries.

## **Informe del taller previo a la reunión sobre datos relacionados con la captura secundaria de aves marinas y las prioridades en el mar**

### **RESUMEN**

El 4 de agosto de 2024 se organizó un taller sobre datos de captura secundaria de aves marinas con el objeto de seguir buscando soluciones a los desafíos enfrentados en el informe de indicadores de captura secundaria de aves marinas del ACAP y actualizar las prioridades de amenazas en el mar del ACAP para que sirvan de base para las estrategias pertinentes del ACAP como la de interacción con las OROP.

El taller identificó los indicadores de Respuesta como la máxima prioridad para la recopilación de datos, porque los datos y los informes pueden ser relativamente sencillos y este tipo de métricas podría funcionar como indicadores confiables a largo plazo para el ACAP. Las Partes deben seguir informando las tasas de captura secundaria, el esfuerzo pesquero y datos detallados sobre la captura secundaria siempre que sea posible. El informe de indicadores de Respuesta y Estado podría recibir apoyo de un proyecto financiado por el ACAP.

El taller analizó las pesquerías consideradas "prioritarias" por el ACAP actualmente e identificó las acciones de conservación del ACAP y sus Partes que podrían reducir la captura secundaria de aves marinas en esas pesquerías. La lista completa de pesquerías debe ser revisada y actualizada por las Partes antes de que se complete la puntuación y se informe una nueva lista de acciones de conservación para cada pesquería a la RdP8. En líneas generales, el taller manifestó su confianza en el marco de priorización, pero su desempeño debe reevaluarse después de que se actualicen las puntuaciones.

### **RECOMENDACIONES**

Recomendamos que el Grupo de Trabajo sobre Captura Secundaria de Aves Marinas:

1. Evalúe priorizar la recopilación de datos de Respuesta sencillos acerca de la implementación de la mitigación de la captura secundaria de aves marinas en las pesquerías nacionales y de las OROP.

2. Siga alentando a las Partes a presentar, siempre que sea posible, información detallada acerca de la captura secundaria de aves marinas y, en particular, las tasas de captura secundaria de aves marinas y el esfuerzo pesquero total.
3. Evalúe desarrollar un proyecto financiado por el ACAP para apoyar el informe de datos sobre la implementación de la mitigación, las tasas de captura secundaria y el esfuerzo pesquero.
4. Analice las acciones de conservación en el mar prioritarias identificadas para el ACAP y sus Partes, y busque su aprobación por el CA.
5. Revise y actualice la lista completa de pesquerías utilizadas en el marco de priorización, actualice la puntuación de cada una e identifique posibles acciones para el ACAP o sus Partes en las pesquerías de alta prioridad.
6. Siga analizando y mejorando el proceso de priorización para identificar pesquerías de alta prioridad para el ACAP.

## **Rapport sur l'atelier préalable à la réunion sur les données relatives aux captures accessoires d'oiseaux de mer et les priorités en mer**

### **RÉSUMÉ**

Un atelier sur les données relatives aux captures accessoires d'oiseaux de mer s'est tenu le 4 août 2024, dans le but de poursuivre la recherche de solutions aux défis rencontrés dans la déclaration des indicateurs de captures accessoires d'oiseaux de mer de l'ACAP, mais aussi de mettre à jour les priorités de l'ACAP en matière de menaces en mer, afin d'enrichir les stratégies pertinentes de l'ACAP telles que la stratégie d'engagement avec les ORGP.

L'atelier a identifié les indicateurs de réponse comme principale priorité pour la collecte de données. En effet, les données et les rapports peuvent être relativement simples, et ces mesures pourraient servir d'indicateurs fiables et à long terme pour l'ACAP. Les taux de captures accessoires, l'effort de pêche et les données détaillées sur les captures accessoires doivent toujours être communiqués par les Parties dans la mesure du possible. Un projet financé par l'ACAP pourrait venir appuyer les rapports sur les Indicateurs de réponse et de statut.

L'atelier a passé en revue les pêcheries « prioritaires » actuelles de l'ACAP ; il a également identifié les actions de conservation de l'ACAP et de ses Parties qui pourraient réduire les captures accessoires d'oiseaux de mer dans ces pêcheries. La liste complète des pêcheries doit être passée en revue et mise à jour par les Parties avant que la notation ne soit terminée et qu'une nouvelle liste d'actions de conservation prioritaires par pêcherie ne soit communiquée à la RdP8. D'une manière générale, l'atelier s'est montré confiant quant aux performances du cadre de hiérarchisation. Elles devront toutefois être réévaluées après la mise à jour des scores.

## RECOMMANDATIONS

Nous recommandons que le Groupe de travail sur les captures accessoires :

1. Envisage de donner la priorité à la collecte de données de réponse simples sur la mise en œuvre de l'atténuation des captures accessoires d'oiseaux de mer dans les pêcheries nationales et celles des ORGP.
2. Continue à encourager les Parties à communiquer des informations détaillées sur les captures accessoires d'oiseaux de mer chaque fois que cela leur est possible, en particulier sur les taux de captures accessoires et l'effort de pêche total.
3. Envisage le développement d'un projet financé par l'ACAP destiné à soutenir la communication de données sur la mise en œuvre des mesures d'atténuation, les taux de captures accessoires et l'effort de pêche.
4. Examine les actions prioritaires de conservation en mer identifiées pour l'ACAP et les Parties à l'ACAP, et demander leur approbation par le CC.
5. Examine et mette à jour la liste complète des pêcheries comprises dans le cadre de hiérarchisation, mette à jour les scores pour chaque pêcherie, et identifie d'autres actions possibles pour l'ACAP ou les Parties à l'ACAP concernant les pêcheries hautement prioritaires.
6. Poursuive l'examen et l'amélioration du processus de hiérarchisation afin d'identifier les pêcheries prioritaires de l'ACAP.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

A Seabird Bycatch Data Workshop was held on 4 August 2024 to continue to find solutions to the challenges experienced in the reporting of ACAP seabird bycatch indicators and to update the ACAP at-sea threats priorities to inform relevant ACAP strategies such as the RFMO Engagement Strategy. The workshop had the following specific objectives:

1. Review the current ACAP seabird bycatch-related indicators and associated data reporting;
2. Identify ways to refine the indicators to ensure they are useful and practical to report on;
3. Identify options to further refine bycatch-related data reporting to ACAP to ensure it is practical;
4. Consider the use of alternative data sources or approaches, if required, to report on ACAP bycatch-related indicators;
5. Review the process for identifying ACAP at-sea priority conservation actions;
6. Review updated priority fisheries and identify potential actions for ACAP or ACAP Parties to address these priorities; and
7. Consider options for potential improvement of the process to identify at-sea threat priorities.

## 2. ACAP BYCATCH INDICATORS

### 2.1. Background

The seabird bycatch state-pressure-response indicators, agreed at MoP4 ([MoP4 Doc 23](#)), were developed to contribute to the assessment of the success of the Agreement. The ACAP Performance Indicators provide a means to demonstrate the effectiveness of measures to address seabird bycatch. There has been considerable effort in developing ACAP seabird bycatch indicators and a reporting framework on which these indicators are based ([SBWG4 Doc 25 Rev 3](#), [SBWG5 Doc 16](#), [SBWG6 Doc 09](#), [SBWG7 Doc 05](#), [SBWG8 Doc 05](#), [SBWG9 Doc 05 Rev1](#)). Whilst an increase in data reporting has been noted ([SBWG10 Doc 05](#)), and despite renewed efforts to identify challenges faced by Parties in reporting data to inform the current indicators and identifying a number of potential actions to address some of the challenges ([SBWG11 Doc 05](#)), the low level of reporting of seabird bycatch as total estimated mortality or rates per unit effort has prevented full implementation of the indicators.

#### State (S)

State indicators for bycatch measure the currency and accuracy of bycatch estimates for ACAP species. The current state indicators are:

- S1 Availability of data for definition of at-sea ranges of ACAP species
- S2 Availability of bycatch data relevant to ACAP species

If sufficient data was provided through Party reporting, progress would be measured as an increasing number of Parties and/or fleets reporting bycatch estimates over time, and a change in methods used to those producing most robust estimates.

#### Pressure (P)

Pressure indicators for bycatch measure the extent to which bycatch impacts ACAP species. The current pressure indicator is:

- P1 Bycatch rates and levels of ACAP species
  - a) the total number of birds killed (bycaught) per year of ACAP species (by species where possible), and
  - b) their bycatch rate, across each of the fisheries of member Parties.

Ideally this would be reported across all fisheries where ACAP species are bycaught and progress would be measured in changes to both the total number of birds caught, as well as the rate. Even if sufficient data were available there are a number of issues to consider when estimating and interpreting these two measures, such as undetected mortality, uncertainty in estimation, and uncertainty in species identification.

#### Response (R)

Response indicators for bycatch measure the activities taken to address the bycatch of ACAP species in fisheries. The current response indicators are:

- R1 Implementation of seabird bycatch mitigation within EEZs
- R2 Engagement with RFMOs on seabird bycatch issues

- A mechanism has yet to be developed to assess the degree of implementation of seabird conservation measures by tuna and other RFMOs.
- The development and implementation of methods to review the effectiveness of seabird bycatch mitigation measures across tuna and other RFMOs is currently underway.
- The adoption of recommendations, including changes to bycatch mitigation measures, that arise from these reviews has not yet commenced.

R3 Research and development for effective seabird mitigation measures

- The relevance of mitigation research reported to SBWG meetings to be assessed as a measure for this indicator.

Ideally these indicators would measure progress in implementation of improved mitigation measures across all fisheries where ACAP species are caught.

### 3. BYCATCH-RELATED DATA COLLECTION AND SOURCES

#### 3.1. Background

Parties and range states have been requested to report bycatch data through a bespoke portal on the ACAP webpages. The structure of the portal is based on the fisheries identified by Parties and the data submission forms are based on considerable feedback over many years of development and refinement. Following the bycatch data workshop prior to SBWG11 ([SBWG11 Doc 05](#)), an intersessional correspondence group was established to discuss key challenges in data collection and reporting. In particular, this group considered ways to provide improved visibility on the use of ACAP Best Practice Advice in fisheries reported to ACAP by Parties and Range States. This led to addition of new, streamlined, questions on the range of mitigation measures required and used in reported fisheries. Despite the simplified nature of the question, they were completed by Parties and Range States for only a limited number of fisheries. The Secretariat presented an overview of the data reported.

#### 3.2. Workshop discussion

The workshop discussed the low response rate and noted two issues in particular that are likely to contribute to this outcome:

1. A lack of capacity within Government agencies to complete the reporting to ACAP when there are often other competing and higher priority tasks
2. Access to the information and data at the fishery level because it is held by another Government agency.

The workshop also acknowledged that Parties, generally, have been unable to report bycatch data across all fisheries in a manner that would allow estimation of total annual seabird bycatch (indicator: P1(a)) and even bycatch rates by fishery (indicator: P1(b)) are rarely reported.

The workshop agreed that reporting of detailed bycatch data, when available, remains valuable and ACAP should continue to seek data on total effort within each fishery and any bycatch rates. However, reporting on the Response indicators should be ACAP's highest priority because:

- Data and reporting questions related to implementation are less complex
- Data collection and reporting would require less effort
- Information on mandatory mitigation measures and implementation may be available from publicly available sources

The option of ‘two-tier’ reporting was discussed where all Parties answer simple questions on Response indicators and provide qualitative data. While those Parties that have more detailed information and greater capacity can report more detailed data on implementation, bycatch rates and estimates of annual bycatch.

It was suggested that collation and reporting of implementation data could be supported by ACAP funding through a project or secondment. The project would compile publicly available implementation data on relevant domestic and RFMO fisheries. The funding could also support ‘interview-style’ reporting by Parties if this is preferred over direct input into the ACAP portal. Such efforts could prioritise data collection from ACAP’s ‘high priority’ fisheries.

### **3.3. Workshop recommendations**

We recommend Seabird Bycatch Working Group:

1. Consider prioritising the collection of simple Response data on the implementation of seabird bycatch mitigation in domestic and RFMO fisheries.
2. Continue to encourage Parties to report detailed information on seabird bycatch whenever possible and in particular on seabird bycatch rates and total fishing effort.
3. Consider the development of an ACAP-funded project to support data reporting on mitigation implementation, bycatch rates and fisheries effort.

## **4. AT-SEA CONSERVATION PRIORITIES**

### **4.1. Background**

In the absence of adequate data on the impact of threats to ACAP species, an expert opinion-based framework was developed by ACAP to set, monitor and report progress on identified priority at-sea conservation actions for ACAP species. This prioritisation framework to identify fisheries for conservation actions ([MoP4 Inf 06 Rev 1](#)) is underpinned by information on fisheries, including those operating outside exclusive economic zones (EEZs), as well as the size and trends of albatross and petrel populations which might be impacted by those fisheries. Twenty-five fisheries and 28 seabird populations were identified as priority targets for action during the latest (2021) iteration of the prioritisation process (Table 3 [AC14 Doc 18](#)).

### **4.2. Workshop discussion**

This workshop agreed the full list of fisheries will need to be comprehensively reviewed and updated by Parties and the SBWG prior to the scoring process. In particular, it was noted that the lists of fisheries for Chile and Ecuador are likely to be incomplete and should be updated. Chilean fisheries should include: purse seine fisheries – all target species (artisanal and industrial); demersal trawl; pelagic longline (Swordfish) and demersal longline (King ling, Austral Hake, Patagonian Toothfish).

The workshop did not identify a process for the review of high seas fisheries or those of non-Party Range-States that ACAP has no or limited engagement with, but agreed this needs consideration.

In reviewing the current list of priority fisheries for conservation actions (**Table 1**) several possible omissions were identified and these will be investigated further by the Secretariat.

The workshop agreed that all ACAP species potentially impacted by a fishery should be listed in the table of 'high priority' fisheries rather than only those species associated with the high-ranking score.

For the current priority fisheries, the workshop identified actions that can be taken by ACAP and its Parties to reduce seabird bycatch in these fisheries (see **Table 1**). Upon completion of the prioritisation process further actions may need to be identified, especially if additional fisheries are ranked as 'high priority for conservation actions'.

Broadly, the workshop had confidence in the prioritisation framework as described by [MoP4 Inf 06 Rev 1](#) but its performance should be re-assessed after scores are updated.

In closing, it was suggested that future workshops use interpretation to improve discussions and, if break-out groups are needed, they can be formed based on factors other than language.

### **4.3. Workshop recommendations**

We recommend Seabird Bycatch Working Group:

1. Review the at-sea conservation priority actions identified for ACAP and ACAP Parties, and seek their endorsement by the AC.
2. Review and update the full list of fisheries used in the prioritisation framework, update the scores for each fishery, and identify further possible actions for ACAP or ACAP Parties for high priority fisheries.
3. Continue to review and improve the prioritisation process to identify ACAP at-sea priority conservation actions by fishery.

Table 1. 2021 ACAP priority at-sea conservation actions by fishery. This table contains only fisheries identified as being the greatest threat to ACAP species (top 10% of all fisheries considered). The complete prioritisation framework only included fisheries that have been reported on by Parties or Range States, and therefore the number of possible fisheries that could be assessed is likely to be higher than those currently included. ACAP High Priority Populations are highlighted.

| Fishery                  | Population (breeding island group) affected               | Actions for ACAP/ Parties/ others  |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| Angola Pelagic LL        | Tristan Albatross Gough Island                            | ACAP to engage with the Benguela Current Commission, with the assistance of South Africa, to raise the issue and advocate mitigation use.                |
| Argentina Demersal trawl | Northern Royal Albatross Chatham Islands                  | ACAP Party to implement BPA.   |
|                          | Southern Giant Petrel Islas de los Estados & Observatorio | Need consideration of improved advice on net monitoring cables. Improve on-board observer coverage and capacity through human and electronic monitoring. |
|                          | Wandering Albatross SG (IGS) <sup>1</sup>                 |  |
| Australia Demersal trawl | Black Petrel Great and Little Barrier Islands             | ACAP Party to implement BPA  |
|                          | Indian yellow-nosed Albatross Amsterdam Island            |  |
|                          | Shy Albatross Albatross Island                            |  |
|                          | Shy Albatross Pedra Branca                                |  |
| Australia Gillnet        | Black Petrel Great and Little Barrier Islands             | ACAP Party to consider time-area closures.   |
|                          | Indian yellow-nosed Albatross Amsterdam Island            | Encourage reporting of seabird bycatch from ACAP Party.  |
|                          | Shy Albatross Pedra Branca                                |  |
|                          | Sooty Albatross Iles Crozet                               | Development of mitigation options and ACAP advice for gillnet fisheries.   |

| Fishery                            | Population (breeding island group) affected      | Actions for ACAP/ Parties/ others   |
|------------------------------------|--|---|
| Australia Pelagic trawl            | Black Petrel Great and Little Barrier Islands    | ACAP Party to implement BPA.  |
| Brazil Demersal LL                 | Northern Royal Albatross Chatham Islands         | ACAP Party to implement BPA, conduct at-sea trials to adapt mitigation measures to fleet's reality, implement on-board monitoring (human and electronic – e.g cameras) and creating regulations to mitigate seabird bycatch.  |
|                                    | Tristan Albatross Gough Island                   |   |
|                                    | Wandering Albatross SG (IGS) <sup>1</sup>        |   |
| Brazil Pelagic LL                  | Atlantic Yellow-nosed Albatross Tristan da Cunha | ACAP Party to implement BPA and on-board monitoring (human and electronic – e.g. cameras), as well as mechanisms for effective compliance monitoring and enforcement with current domestic regulations.   |
|                                    | Northern Royal Albatross Chatham Islands         |   |
|                                    | Tristan Albatross Gough Island                   |   |
|                                    | Wandering Albatross SG (IGS) <sup>1</sup>        |   |
|                                    | White-chinned Petrel SG (IGS) <sup>1</sup>       |   |
| Brazil Pelagic LL (Itaipava fleet) | Tristan Albatross Gough Island                   | Fishery definition to be reviewed and updated. ACAP Party to implement BPA.   |
|                                    | Wandering Albatross SG (IGS) <sup>1</sup>        |   |
|                                    | Atlantic Yellow-nosed Albatross Tristan da Cunha |   |
|                                    | White-chinned Petrel SG (IGS) <sup>1</sup>       |   |
| Namibia Demersal trawl             | Atlantic Yellow-nosed Albatross Tristan da Cunha | <p>ACAP to engage with the Benguela Current Commission, with the assistance of South Africa, to raise the issue and advocate mitigation use.</p> <p>Encourage Namibia to join ACAP and adopt BPA.</p> <p>Encourage BLI to use existing programmes to support further bycatch mitigation implementation.</p> |

| Fishery               | Population (breeding island group) affected   | Actions for ACAP/ Parties/ others   |
|-----------------------|---|---|
| Namibia Pelagic LL    | Shy Albatross Pedra Branca                    | <p>ACAP to engage with the Benguela Current Commission, with the assistance of South Africa, to raise the issue and advocate mitigation use.</p> <p>Encourage Namibia to join ACAP and adopt BPA.</p> <p>Encourage BLI to use existing programmes to support further bycatch mitigation implementation.</p> |
| Namibia Pelagic trawl | Shy Albatross Pedra Branca                    | <p>ACAP to engage with the Benguela Current Commission, with the assistance of South Africa, to raise the issue and advocate mitigation use.</p> <p>Encourage Namibia to join ACAP and adopt BPA.</p> <p>Encourage BLI to use existing programmes to support further bycatch mitigation implementation.</p> |
| Peru Demersal LL      | Black Petrel Great and Little Barrier Islands | <p>ACAP Party to continue development of appropriate mitigation options and implement an on-board observer program and standardized electronic logbooks.</p> <p>ACAP to prioritise support of development and implementation of mitigation, for example through Small Grant process.</p>                    |
| Peru Pelagic LL       | Black Petrel Great and Little Barrier Islands | <p>ACAP Party to continue development of appropriate mitigation options and implement an on-board observer program and standardized electronic logbooks.</p>  |
|                       | Grey Petrel All sites                         |   |

| Fishery                | Population (breeding island group) affected | Actions for ACAP/ Parties/ others  |
|------------------------|---|--|
|                        |   | ACAP to prioritise support of development and implementation of mitigation, for example through Small Grant process.   |
| Spain Demersal LL      | Balearic Shearwater Balearic Archipelago    | ACAP Party to implement BPA.<br>ACAP Party to implement species action plan and MPAs.  |
| Spain Pelagic LL       | Balearic Shearwater Balearic Archipelago    | ACAP Party to implement BPA.<br>ACAP Party to implement species action plan and MPAs.  |
| Spain Purse seine      | Balearic Shearwater Balearic Archipelago    | ACAP Party to implement, and further improve where appropriate, the mitigation advice being developed by ACAP.<br>ACAP Party to implement species action plan and MPAs |
| Spain Trawl            | Balearic Shearwater Balearic Archipelago    | ACAP Party to implement BPA, or develop appropriate mitigation options if BPA is not practical.<br>ACAP Party to implement species action plan and MPAs                |
| Uruguay Demersal trawl | Northern Royal Albatross Chatham Islands    | ACAP Party to implement BPA  |
| <b>RFMOs</b>           |   |  |
| CCSBT Pelagic LL       | Antipodean Albatross Auckland Islands       | ACAP and Parties to implement the ACAP RFMO Engagement Strategy.   |
|                        | Black-browed Albatross Antipodes Islands    |  |

| Fishery          | Population (breeding island group) affected    | Actions for ACAP/ Parties/ others                                |  |
|------------------|--|--|--|
|                  | Black-browed Albatross Campbell Island         |  |  |
|                  | Black-browed Albatross Iles Crozet             |  |  |
|                  | Black-browed Albatross SG (IGS) <sup>1</sup>   |  |  |
|                  | Black Petrel Great and Little Barrier Islands  |  |  |
|                  | Grey-headed Albatross SG (IGS) <sup>1</sup>    |  |  |
|                  | Grey Petrel All sites                          |  |  |
|                  | Indian yellow-nosed Albatross Amsterdam Island |  |  |
|                  | Indian yellow-nosed Albatross Crozet Island    |  |  |
|                  | Northern Giant Petrel Prince Edward Islands    |  |  |
|                  | Northern Royal Albatross Chatham Islands       |  |  |
|                  | Sooty Albatross Iles Crozet                    |  | ACAP and Parties to implement the ACAP RFMO Engagement Strategy. |
|                  | Sooty Albatross Prince Edward Islands          |  |  |
|                  | Southern Giant Petrel Prince Edward Islands    |  |  |
|                  | Tristan Albatross Gough Island                 |  |  |
|                  | Wandering Albatross Iles Kerguelen             |  |  |
|                  | Wandering Albatross SG (IGS) <sup>1</sup>      |  |  |
|                  | White-chinned Petrel SG (IGS) <sup>1</sup>     |  |  |
| IATTC Pelagic LL | Laysan Albatross Central Pacific - Laysan      | ACAP and Parties to implement the ACAP RFMO Engagement Strategy. |  |
|                  | Waved Albatross Islas Galapagos                |  |  |

| Fishery          | Population (breeding island group) affected        | Actions for ACAP/ Parties/ others                                |
|------------------|--|--|
| ICCAT Pelagic LL | Atlantic Yellow-nosed Albatross Tristan da Cunha   | ACAP and Parties to implement the ACAP RFMO Engagement Strategy. |
|                  | Black-browed Albatross SG (IGS) <sup>1</sup>       |  |
|                  | Grey-headed Albatross SG (IGS) <sup>1</sup>        |  |
|                  | Grey Petrel All sites                              |  |
|                  | Northern Royal Albatross Chatham Islands           |  |
|                  | Tristan Albatross Gough Island                     |  |
|                  | Wandering Albatross SG (IGS) <sup>1</sup>          |  |
|                  | White-chinned Petrel SG (IGS) <sup>1</sup>         |  |
| IOTC Pelagic LL  | Grey-headed Albatross SG (IGS) <sup>1</sup>        | ACAP and Parties to implement the ACAP RFMO Engagement Strategy. |
|                  | Grey Petrel All sites                              |  |
|                  | Indian yellow-nosed Albatross Amsterdam Island     |  |
|                  | Indian yellow-nosed Albatross Crozet Island        |  |
|                  | Indian yellow-nosed Albatross Prince Edward Island |  |
|                  | Northern Giant Petrel Prince Edward Islands        |  |
|                  | Shy Albatross Pedra Branca                         |  |
|                  | Sooty Albatross Iles Crozet                        |  |
|                  | Sooty Albatross Prince Edward Islands              |  |
|                  | Southern Giant Petrel Prince Edward Islands        |  |
|                  | Tristan Albatross Gough Island                     |  |

| Fishery               | Population (breeding island group) affected   | Actions for ACAP/ Parties/ others                                |
|-----------------------|---|--|
|                       | Wandering Albatross Iles Kerguelen            |  |
| SEAFO Demersal trawl  | Black-browed Albatross SG (IGS) <sup>1</sup>  | ACAP and Parties to implement the ACAP RFMO Engagement Strategy. |
| SPRFMO Demersal trawl | Black Petrel Great and Little Barrier Islands | ACAP and Parties to implement the ACAP RFMO Engagement Strategy. |
|                       | Northern Royal Albatross Chatham Islands      |  |
| WCPFC Pelagic LL      | Antipodean Albatross Antipodes Islands        | ACAP and Parties to implement the ACAP RFMO Engagement Strategy. |
|                       | Antipodean Albatross Auckland Islands         |  |
|                       | Black-browed Albatross Antipodes Islands      |  |
|                       | Black-browed Albatross Campbell Island        |  |
|                       | Black Petrel Great and Little Barrier Islands |  |
|                       | Grey Petrel All sites                         |  |
|                       | Laysan Albatross Central Pacific - Laysan     |  |
|                       | Northern Royal Albatross Chatham Islands      |  |

<sup>1</sup> A dispute exists between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland concerning sovereignty of 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.