

**SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE ON ANTARCTIC RESEARCH LIFE  
SCIENCES STANDING SCIENTIFIC GROUP'S GROUP OF EXPERTS  
ON BIRDS, MINUTES OF MEETING, 18–22 JULY 2004,  
'T HORNTJE, TEXEL, NETHERLANDS**

### 1. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

Attendees were welcomed to the meeting by the convenor, Dr E.J. Woehler. Apologies had been received from Drs E. Chapman, R.J.M. Crawford, J.P. Croxall, W. Dinter, S. Emslie, M. Favero, W.R. Fraser, F. Hertel, P. Hodum, P. Jouventin, S. Olmastroni, S. Poncet, C.A. Ribic, M. Ritz, M. Sander, A. Schiavini, H. Weimerskirch and P. Wilson, and Mss D.L. Blight and D.L. Patterson.

### 2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA AND APPOINTMENT OF RAPPORTEURS

The draft agenda was adopted (Doc. 1). Attendees are listed in Annex 1 and documents in Annex 2. Mr J. Cooper and Ms H. Geisz were appointed rapporteurs.

### 3. FORMATION OF THE SCAR GROUP OF EXPERTS ON BIRDS AND ADOPTION OF TERMS OF REFERENCE

Dr Woehler explained that the SCAR Bird Biology Subcommittee had been replaced by the SCAR Group of Experts on Birds (SCAR–GEB) at the 27th meeting of SCAR, held in Shanghai, China, July 2002, by the Life Sciences Standing Scientific Group (SCAR–LSSSG), itself appointed by the SCAR meeting of national delegates in Shanghai. To form an executive for the group, the SCAR–LSSSG had appointed Dr E.J. Woehler as the first convenor of SCAR–GEB, Dr J.A. van Franeker as alternative convenor and Dr W.R. Fraser as secretary.

It was agreed to consider membership of the group later in the meeting once discussion had been held on the other agenda items. The convenor introduced the draft *Terms of Reference* (TOR) that had been adopted by the SCAR–LSSSG at the Shanghai meeting. The TOR were discussed in detail and revised during the course of the meeting, leading to the adoption of a final version (Annex 3).

It was noted that, whereas the SCAR Bird Biology Subcommittee had essentially restricted its interest to seabirds, the SCAR–LSSSG had specifically requested that the SCAR–GEB consider within its ambit all birds known to occur within the sub-Antarctic and Antarctic regions. The meeting supported that expansion and agreed to consider the implications of covering birds such as anatids and passerines under relevant items of the agenda.

The convenor demonstrated the new SCAR Web site ([www.scar.org](http://www.scar.org)), noting that a section is devoted to the SCAR–GEB. The meeting considered items that it would wish to see added to that section. Those items included details of members; lists of all publications of and sponsored by the SCAR–GEB and its

predecessors, including records of meetings; a short historical account of SCAR's ornithological activities; and a photo gallery of Antarctic and sub-Antarctic birds. It was agreed to request financial support through the SCAR–LSSSG to permit the scanning of meeting documents not available in electronic versions, so that those documents could be added to the Web site for archival purposes.

### 4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE 2002 JENA MEETING OF THE SCAR BIRD BIOLOGY SUBCOMMITTEE

The minutes of the final meeting of the SCAR Bird Biology Subcommittee, held in Jena, Germany, in June 2002, had been circulated and published intersessionally (*Marine Ornithology* 30: 97–106, 2002; [www.marineornithology.org](http://www.marineornithology.org)) and were adopted (Doc. 2).

#### 4.1 Bird banding

It was agreed that the directory of contact persons and national offices of banding schemes (proposed at the previous meeting) be added to the SCAR–GEB's section of the SCAR Web site.

#### 4.2 The conservation status of Southern Ocean islands and the Antarctic Continent

Mr J. Cooper reported on developments of relevance during the last two years to the conservation of sub-Antarctic islands and the Antarctic Continent. For the islands, it was noted with approval that Inaccessible Island (Tristan da Cunha group) has now been made a World Heritage Site as an expansion of the existing Gough Island World Heritage Site, with an extension to 12 nautical miles around both islands; that marine reserves extending to 200 nautical miles have been declared by Australia around Macquarie Island and the Heard and MacDonald Islands; and that South Africa intends to extend formal protection to territorial waters (12 nautical miles) around its Prince Edward Islands. A marine protected area had also been declared around the Auckland Islands by New Zealand. Australia has nominated Macquarie Island to the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Importance. Progress with the production and revision of island management plans was noted by Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and the United Kingdom (for the Tristan–Gough Islands).

Confirmations of the successful removal of feral cats *Felis catus* from Macquarie Island and Norway or Brown Rats *Rattus norvegicus* from Campbell Island (New Zealand) and several small islands around South Georgia (United Kingdom), allowing for recovery or reintroduction of bird populations, were noted. Efforts by France to remove European Rabbits *Oryctolagus cuniculus* and rodents from small islands in the Kerguelen Islands were also noted. The meeting noted that these eradication programmes were

most significant in improving the conservation status of sub-Antarctic seabirds and non-seabirds alike.

Developments with the Antarctic Protected Areas System arising from the last two Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meetings (ATCMs) and the associated Committee on Environmental Protection (CEP) were briefly reported, including the declaration of new Antarctic Specially Protected Areas and the development and adoption of management plans for several of them. Given the continued involvement of SCAR-GEB with the production of an Important Bird Areas (IBA) inventory for the Antarctic Continent (see subsection 4.10), it was agreed that relevant deliberations and decisions of the CEP and the ATCMs needed to be followed with more attention than hitherto by the group's predecessors, so as to lend support to improving the conservation status of birds and their habitats on the continent through the SCAR Standing Committee on the Antarctic Treaty System.

#### 4.3 Recent publications on Antarctic and sub-Antarctic birds

The 2000 compilation was published in *Marine Ornithology* 30: 71–76 (2002). The list compiled for 2001 by Ms C.M. Phillips, Librarian, British Antarctic Survey, had been circulated before the present meeting (Doc. 3). Attendees had been requested to send additions, including titles of theses, to Ms Phillips (cmp@bas.ac.uk) for inclusion. The intent is to publish the 2001 list in *Marine Ornithology*. It was agreed to thank Ms Phillips for her valued services over a number of years in compiling these bibliographies.

The convenor reminded the group that a combined bibliography from 1984 is available on the Web site of the Australian Antarctic Division ([www.aad.gov.au](http://www.aad.gov.au)). It is intended that a link be provided to that site on the SCAR Web site.

#### 4.4 Human-seabird interactions

At the Jena meeting of the SCAR Bird Biology Subcommittee, it was decided to hold a workshop on human-seabird interactions. Funding (US\$5000) for the proposal was granted by SCAR. The original intention was to hold the workshop in Ushuaia, Argentina, in 2004 in association with the Fifth International Penguin Conference. In the end, arrangements were not made for the workshop because of the small number of people who had signalled their intention to attend and because of the limited finances available. It was agreed to search for an alternative venue and date to hold the workshop that would be easier for prospective contributors to attend.

Dr K. de Korte initiated a discussion on Antarctic tourism, referring to the increase in the number of tourists and, thus, the growing need to minimize effects of human disturbance. Matters for consideration included whether emphasis should be placed on restricting the number of visitor sites or the numbers of visitors to sites, and whether some sites should be closed to all tourist visits. It was considered that the IBAs inventory (see subsection 4.10) would aid in selecting sites for such protection. Dr de Korte noted that methods of tourist management elsewhere in the world, such as in the Galapagos Islands, could contribute to future discussions. Sites with limited landing sites for penguins may need to have the numbers of visitors at any one time restricted so as to reduce disturbance. It was noted that visitor statistics were collected by the International Association of Antarctic Tour Operators ([www.iaato.org](http://www.iaato.org)) for individual sites.

Dr J. Valencia gave a summary of discussions on tourism held at the 27th ATCM and at the 5th Meeting of CEP (through a working group on tourism), held in Cape Town, South Africa, in June 2004. The two main matters discussed were regulations to cover tourism activities and assessment of the effects of tourism on the environment.

It was noted that tourism matters were to be covered at the planned SCAR/COMNAP/NSF-GEB human-seabirds interactions workshop. Further, the convenor drew attention to a planned SCAR biological monitoring workshop to be held in 2005, at which human impacts would be considered. It was agreed that a member of the SCAR-GEB might attend and contribute to that workshop.

A working paper, "Guidelines for the Operation of Aircraft near Concentrations of Birds in Antarctica" (Doc. 4), tabled at the CEP by the Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programmes (COMNAP), was adopted by the 27th ATCM. SCAR-GEB had provided input to COMNAP for the document, but the meeting considered that scope existed for further development of the guidelines, based on the original advice provided by the SCAR-GEB.

The meeting agreed that it would be helpful if information would continue to be collected on the effects on Antarctic and sub-Antarctic birds of overflights by national operators and if that information would be made available to SCAR and COMNAP so as to allow for a future revision of the adopted guidelines.

Australia has produced maps detailing flight approaches to areas in which the Australian Antarctic Division works, with buffer zones around bird colonies, for use by pilots of aircraft, including helicopters ([www.aad.gov.au](http://www.aad.gov.au)). That approach was recommended for consideration by other national operators on both the continent and at sub-Antarctic islands.

A discussion was held on the problem of bird strikes—on ships at night and during conditions of poor visibility and strong winds—that can lead to injury or mortality. Information was given on several ship-based incidents (Doc. 5). Several other incidents of bird strikes on ships and at Antarctic and sub-Antarctic bases were also described. Mitigation measures used by several national operators include black-out blinds closed at night on ships while near islands and at bases and field huts, removal of unnecessary aeriels and communication masts at bases, minimization of the use of navigation searchlights on ships, and checks for landed birds the following morning aboard ships and around bases for attempted release after recovery.

Disturbances caused by small-boat visits to inshore waters on the continent and around sub-Antarctic islands were briefly discussed. Records exist of King Penguins *Aptenodytes patagonicus* being wounded by propellers of small boats, and of returning penguins being kept away from landing sites. It was considered that mitigation for such events should be covered by management plans and by the general operating procedures of national operators and tourist companies alike.

It was agreed to refer those problems, and another that arose at the previous meeting (regarding feeding birds), to the SCAR-LSSSG (see Annex 4, Recommendation 1).

#### 4.5 Seabird–fisheries interactions

Much activity continued during the last two years in relation to seabird–fishery interactions. BirdLife International's Save the Albatross campaign (see news reports at [www.birdlife.org](http://www.birdlife.org)) and its national partners in several countries have co-sponsored workshops, conducted innovative funding activities and supported a competition to develop new mitigation measures to reduce seabird mortality caused by longline fishing operations. Support from the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations for a South American regional workshop held in 2004 was noted. The Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR) continued to discuss seabird mortality at its annual meetings ([www.ccamlr.org](http://www.ccamlr.org)). A number of countries have adopted or are developing National Plans of Action for Reducing Seabird Mortality from Longline Fishing (NPOA–Seabirds) following FAO guidelines, but progress continues to be slow, and a number of countries still need to adopt NPOAs. Progress in reducing illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing in the Southern Ocean was also noted, with several nations—especially Australia, France and South Africa—being active in chasing and arresting culprit vessels, often cooperatively. A worrying development is the increasing evidence from several countries that demersal and mid-water trawling activities in the Southern Ocean are killing more seabirds than hitherto thought, with mainly albatrosses being killed in collisions with warp lines. Research and management efforts toward mitigating the damage were noted by several countries, including the Falkland Islands (UK), New Zealand and South Africa.

The meeting agreed to continue to report on developments in relation to all aspects of seabird–fishery interactions in the Southern Ocean and its surrounding seas, and to repeat its call that fishing nations take concerted action to reduce the problem (see Annex 4, Recommendation 2).

#### 4.6 Species compilations

##### 4.6.1 Giant petrels *Macronectes spp.*

The manuscript tabled at the Jena meeting had been brought up-to-date with new information, and the maps had been drawn intersessionally. The manuscript requires only final editing before publication (to be undertaken by Mr J. Cooper). It was noted that this manuscript should be of special interest to the First Meeting of Parties of the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP; see Subsection 7.1).

##### 4.6.2 Storm-petrels

Dr H.U. Peter reported that little new information had been received since the Jena meeting, despite an appeal for information. It was agreed that a manuscript using available information should be prepared intersessionally and circulated for comment.

##### 4.6.3 Cape Petrel *Daption capense*

Dr P. Hodum had produced a new version of the Cape Petrel manuscript for discussion at the meeting (Doc. 6). The convenor agreed to produce the required maps, after which the manuscript will be ready for submission to a scientific journal.

##### 4.6.4 Antarctic Fulmar *Fulmarus glacialis*

Dr J.A. van Franeker agreed to produce a first draft of an Antarctic Fulmar manuscript for consideration at the next meeting of the

SCAR–GEB. It was noted that consideration of at-sea numbers would enhance the value of the manuscript.

##### 4.6.5 Antarctic Prion *Pachyptila desolata*

Dr M. Mayer offered to compile a draft manuscript on the Antarctic Continent population of Antarctic Prions.

##### 4.6.6 Cormorants *Phalacrocorax spp.*

It was noted that new data for cormorants on the Antarctic Peninsula have been collected by Oceanites Inc., but that those data are not yet in the public domain. It was agreed that the convenor will approach Mr R. Naveen of Oceanites Inc. with a view to the possible incorporation of the data set. The taxonomic status of the *P. atriceps* group of cormorants needs to be considered in the planned publication.

##### 4.6.7 Larids and sheathbills *Chionis spp.*

A 67-page manuscript on larids and sheathbills had been produced intersessionally by the convenor. It was agreed that this manuscript should be split taxonomically into four separate manuscripts—on gulls, skuas, terns and sheathbills—so as to produce papers of reasonable length for publication. The convenor undertook to pursue that task intersessionally.

##### 4.6.8 Penguins

Extensive new data on penguins had been compiled intersessionally by the convenor into a 40-page manuscript. It was decided that this manuscript should be divided into three separate generic (*Aptenodytes*, *Eudyptes* and *Pygoscelis*) accounts before publication. The convenor agreed to undertake this task intersessionally.

##### 4.6.9 Other species

As reported at previous meetings, quantitative data remain insufficient to justify compilations for burrowing petrels at sub-Antarctic islands—although recent research on the status of White-chinned Petrels *Procellaria aequinoctialis* at Marion Island and at South Georgia was noted. In that regard, information on *Procellaria* species would be of special interest to ACAP.

It was considered likely that the ACAP Meeting of Parties would wish to see a new review of albatross distribution and population information for the species it covers. It was agreed that SCAR–GEB would make its services available if requested to help with such a review by ACAP.

With regard to anatids and passerines, it was pointed out that most were endemic to sub-Antarctic island groups, reducing the need for the production of distribution and population papers beyond existing accounts.

#### 4.7 Seabird population status and trends

A two-day workshop had been held immediately before the SCAR–GEB meeting at the same venue. The workshop examined all new census data made available to participants intersessionally, and it assessed data on population sizes and trends for more than 40 species of seabirds that breed in the Antarctic and on sub-Antarctic islands throughout the Southern Ocean. In some cases, data sets spanned more than 50 years, providing long-term signals on seabird populations in the region.

#### 4.8 Data management

It was agreed that links on the SCAR Web site would be provided to the SCAR-GEB's bibliographic and biodiversity databases housed at the Australian Antarctic Data Centre.

#### 4.9 Diet studies methods workshop

Dr J.A. van Franeker had circulated the minutes of the workshop held in Jena, but had not yet produced the planned review paper. It was requested that a draft manuscript be produced intersessionally in time for the next meeting of the SCAR-GEB.

#### 4.10 Important bird areas of Antarctica

A two-day workshop had been held immediately before the SCAR-GEB meeting at the same venue. The workshop re-examined the preliminary list of candidate IBAs compiled at the Jena workshop in 2002 and finalized the list of sites for which texts and maps would be prepared. Workshop attendees identified potential authors for each IBA. The convenor offered to produce a draft text for one IBA to guide other authors in the preparation of texts.

It was considered that the SCAR-GEB should consider marine protected areas of special relevance to the conservation of birds that fall within the Antarctic Treaty Area as part of its production of an IBA inventory for the continent.

#### 4.11 Impact of acoustics on the Antarctic environment

The convenor reported briefly on the workshop convened by the German Federal Environmental Agency in Berlin immediately after the Jena meeting, at which he and Dr van Franeker had presented papers. Because the workshop report had yet to be published, it was decided to circulate it intersessionally once it became available.

#### 4.12 Specially Protected Species

The meeting noted progress by the ATCM in defining and listing Specially Protected Species as part of a review of Annex II of the Madrid Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty. SCAR had tabled an information paper at the 27th ATCM (Doc. 7) on the subject, which contained advice received from the SCAR-GEB's predecessor on the bird species that might be listed. An information paper that reviewed the status of Antarctic birds (Doc. 8) was also tabled by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). In the end, no decisions on the criteria that would be used to list Specially Protected Species, including birds, were taken by the ATCM at its 2004 meeting; the issue was referred to the next meeting. To aid in the process, SCAR was asked by the 27th ATCM, based on advice received from the CEP, to prepare a working paper that provides an example of how the World Conservation Union criteria can be applied to birds (such as the Southern Giant Petrel *Macronectes giganteus*) to make the case for special protection, and what management tools might be invoked in a recovery plan (Doc. 9). The SCAR Standing Committee on the Antarctic Treaty System (SCAR-SCATS), via the SCAR-LSSSG, had requested the SCAR-GEB to produce a draft of such a working paper for consideration for submission to the 28th ATCM, in Stockholm, Sweden, in July 2005.

The convenor summarized the various data sets available to the SCAR-GEB to support the task, including population and trends data and information from its IBA inventory (see subsections 4.6 and 4.10). It was agreed to take on this task and to accord it a high

priority. The convenor would lead an intersessional group that included Mr J. Cooper, Ms D.L. Patterson and Dr J. Valencia.

Separately, the SCAR-GEB had been requested by the SCAR-SCATS to consider how to use IUCN guidelines to identify species that are not globally threatened, but that may be under particular threat in the Antarctic (Doc. 9). Included would be non-breeding visitors to the Antarctic Treaty Area as well as breeding species. It was agreed to request US\$5000 from SCAR to hold a small workshop during 2005 with an expert advisor from BirdLife International to deal with this task.

#### 4.13 Penguin banding issues

Three documents were tabled for discussion, including a comprehensive report of a workshop held in South Africa that included a review of literature on the subject that concluded by invoking the precautionary principle that flipper banding of African Penguins *Spheniscus demersus* should be minimized until effects were fully known for the species (Docs. 10-13). It was noted that new evidence continued to show the deleterious effects of metal flipper bands on *Aptenodytes* and *Pygoscelis* penguins, but that no such reports had yet been made for *Eudyptes* penguins. Attention was also drawn to Ainley, D., 2002, *The Adélie: penguin bellwether of climate change*. New York: Columbia University Press, which reported additional mortality from flipper banding Adélie Penguins *Pygoscelis adeliae* in the Ross Sea region.

The meeting considered use of alternative marking devices (such as transponders), but noted that a need still exists for a permanent visual marker that would allow for individual recognition without handling or very close approach to breeding birds. Dr F. Pezzo stated that Adélie Penguins carrying transponders studied by the Italian Antarctic Programme in the Ross Sea had a similar survivorship to Dr Ainley's flipper-banded birds in the same region.

Following discussion, it was agreed that the precautionary principle of avoiding the metal flipper banding of penguins should continue to be followed for Antarctic and sub-Antarctic penguins, especially for long-term demographic studies, in which use of flipper bands could result in biased data. It was therefore agreed to repeat the cautionary recommendation made at the previous meeting (see Annex 4, Recommendation 3).

#### 4.14 Large Antarctic marine ecosystems

At the Jena meeting, the conservation status of the Ross Sea had been discussed, following a request from Dr D.G. Ainley. His paper, then tabled, had subsequently been published in *Marine Ornithology* 31: 55-62 (2002). The SCAR Bird Biology Subcommittee had referred the matter to its parent body for discussion. Dr Ainley had produced a new document that further addresses the issue and emphasizes the unaltered state of the Ross Sea and its value for research on large marine ecosystems (Doc. 14). Dr Ainley also gave an oral presentation on the subject to several attendees of the SCAR-GEB meeting at a preceding workshop on IBAs (see subsection 4.10).

The meeting confirmed its belief that the Ross Sea is worthy of enhanced protection and study. It was considered that Dr Ainley's report could also be referred to other relevant bodies (e.g. CCAMLR, CEP, COMNAP, SCOR and IUCN) for consideration. The meeting noted difficulties in identifying human-related backgrounds of the changing status of Antarctic seabird

populations in comparison with natural change. A major shortcoming, even in the Antarctic region, is that reference of observed trends to those in truly undisturbed marine ecosystems is hardly possible. No area is currently exempted from actual or potential exploitation of natural resources that may affect predator populations and ecosystem functioning. In this respect the meeting supported the initiative of Dr Ainley to propose the Ross Sea as an area in which human interference might be kept to the lowest possible level, with the aim to maintain an ecosystem for reference in all sorts of scientific research. Because the issue goes beyond the level of seabird research, it was suggested that the SCAR-LSSSG takes up the initiative, possibly as a truly international effort in the framework of the International Polar Year.

## 5. NOTIFICATION OF FORTHCOMING MEETINGS OF INTEREST

XXVIII SCAR Open Science Conference; Bremen, Germany; 26–28 July 2004

Several attendees from the present meeting would be attending and presenting papers.

Third International Conference on Albatrosses and Other Petrels; Montevideo, Uruguay; 23–27 August 2004

Mr J. Cooper would be co-convening a session on international policy and research.

Fifth International Penguin Conference; Ushuaia, Argentina; 6–10 September 2004

Of interest is the intention to hold a second Penguin Conservation Assessment and Management Plan (CAMP) workshop immediately after the conference, to which the convenor had been invited to lead a working group on Antarctic penguins. Several papers on effects of flipper banding are to be presented at the conference.

First Meeting of Parties of the ACAP; Hobart, Australia; 8–12 November 2004

It was agreed that SCAR should apply for observer status (see Annex 4, Recommendation 4).

19th Annual Meeting of the Society for Conservation Biology; Universidade de Brasília, Brasília, Brazil; 15–19 July 2005

Ninth SCAR Biology Symposium on Evolution and Biodiversity in Antarctica; Curitiba, Brazil; 25–29 July 2005

22nd International Polar Conference of the German Society of Polar Research; Jena, Germany; 18–23 September 2005

Third International Conference on the Oceanography of the Ross Sea, Antarctica; Venice, Italy; 10–15 October 2005

24th International Ornithological Congress; Hamburg, Germany; 13–19 August 2006

## 6. FUTURE RESEARCH PROGRAMMES

The SCAR-GEB considered previous (Doc. 2) and new suggestions for future research programmes.

It was again noted that completion of the series of population and trends manuscripts (see subsection 4.6) would allow for a terrestrial atlas of Antarctic breeding birds to be produced. It was agreed to continue to work towards this new project intersessionally, with a view to its commencement after the next meeting of the SCAR-GEB.

New genetic and biochemical methods are allowing a more detailed investigation of the systematics and population structures of Antarctic and sub-Antarctic birds. Such investigations are closely related to an understanding of climatic history and environmental changes on the Antarctic Continent and at adjacent islands. For this purpose, samples of blood, feather and oil are necessary. An additional reason for the collection of blood and preen oil is to investigate the pollution status of southern seabirds. Investigation of the pollution levels in birds from remote and relatively undisturbed Antarctica will contribute to an assessment of global trends in levels of contaminants. The SCAR-GEB agreed to give support for the coordination of sampling for such purposes.

## 7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

### 7.1 The Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels

Mr Cooper gave some background (see [www.acap.aq](http://www.acap.aq)) on the ACAP, stating that the agreement had now come into force with six current members (Australia, Ecuador, New Zealand, South Africa, Spain and the United Kingdom), and would hold the first session of its Meeting of Parties in Hobart, Australia, in November 2004. The meeting agreed that this development was most significant, expected both to enhance research on the species covered and to improve their conservation status.

The SCAR-GEB agreed that it should offer its services, through its parent body, to ACAP, noting that several of its activities and products should be of interest to the agreement (e.g. distribution, population and trend data for ACAP species such as the giant petrels). To improve communication between SCAR and ACAP, it was agreed to recommend to the SCAR-LSSSG that it support a proposal that SCAR seek observer status at ACAP Meetings of Parties and on the ACAP Advisory Committee (see Annex 4, Recommendation 4). If such a status is achieved, it was recommended that a member of the SCAR-GEB would best represent SCAR.

### 7.2 International Polar Year

An International Polar Year (IPY) is being planned for the year 2007/08, under the broad aegis of SCAR and the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU). It was agreed that the SCAR-GEB should keep itself informed of developments by the IPY Planning Group via the SCAR-LSSSG, with a view to considering whether it might contribute to the IPY (and if so, how).

### 7.3 Presentations

Attendees gave seven informal presentations on aspects of their research of interest to the meeting, as listed below. Several of these were to be presented to the SCAR Open Science Symposium that immediately followed the meeting (see section 5.1).

- A. Barbosa: Geographic variation in immune response in three species of penguins

- J. Cooper: Conserving migratory marine birds with the Bonn Convention and its daughter agreements
- J. Creuwels: How do fulmarine petrels manage to breed during short summers in Antarctica?
- H. Geisz: Aspects of biological research conducted on Southern Giant Petrels *Macronectes giganteus* on the Antarctic Peninsula
- H.U. Peter: Risk assessment for the Fildes Peninsula and Ardley Island and the development of management plans for designations of Antarctic Specially Protected or Managed Areas
- F. Pezzo: Ecology of the Adélie Penguin *Pygoscelis adeliae* at Edmondson Point, Victoria Land, Antarctica
- J. Valencia: Satellite-tracking Black-browed *Thalassarche melanophrys* and Grey-headed *T. chrysostoma* Albatrosses on Gonzalo Island, Diego Ramirez, Chile

## 8. RECOMMENDATIONS AND FINANCES

### 8.1 Recommendations

Four recommendations were adopted by the meeting for presentation to the SCAR-LSSSG (Annex 4).

### 8.2 Financial requests

Financial requests are summarized in Annex 4.

## 9. MEMBERSHIP

The meeting proposed the following persons to be co-opted as members of the SCAR-GEB: Drs J.P. Croxall, M. Favero, M. Gavrilo, H.U. Peter, F. Pezzo and J. Valencia, Mr J. Cooper and Ms D.L. Patterson. It was agreed that a number of other

ornithologists active within the SCAR area of interest be invited to attend and contribute to the next meeting.

## 10. DATE AND PLACE OF THE NEXT MEETING AND PLANNED WORKSHOPS

The convenor suggested that the second meeting of SCAR-GEB could be held in Hobart, Australia in July 2006, in association with the next round of SCAR biennial meetings. Dr F. Pezzo also offered his university's facilities to host the next meeting in Siena, Italy, in 2006. It was decided to choose between the two offers at a later stage. Mr J. Cooper offered to host a workshop in the first few months of 2005 in Cape Town, South Africa, to apply IUCN category-of-threat data to Antarctic regional populations of seabirds, in response to SCAR's request on the subject (see section 4.4). Holding that workshop would depend on receipt of the necessary funding from SCAR.

## 11. CLOSURE AND THANKS

The SCAR-GEB expressed its thanks to Dr J.A. van Franeker for his excellent hosting of its first meeting. Thanks were also expressed for hospitality and facilities offered at Alterra and to the Netherlands Foundation for International Bird Protection, Netherlands Polar Programme, SCAR, and the Vogelbescherming Nederland (BirdLife International partner) for financial support that enabled several attendees to travel to the Netherlands for the meeting and attendant workshops. Attendees thanked the convenor, Dr E.J. Woehler, for his work intersessionally and in chairing the meeting, and the rapporteurs for producing minutes in time for their formal adoption during the meeting.

---

## ANNEX 1

### ATTENDEES, FIRST MEETING OF THE SCAR GROUP OF EXPERTS ON BIRDS, 'T HORNTJE, TEXEL, NETHERLANDS

#### Executive

Eric J. Woehler, Convenor  
c/o Australian Antarctic Division  
Channel Highway  
Kingston, Tasmania 7050, Australia  
eric.woehler@aad.gov.au

Jan A. van Franeker, Alternative Convenor  
P.O. Box 167, Alterra  
1790 Den Burg (Texel) Netherlands  
jan.vanfraneker@wur.nl

#### Attendees

Andrés Barbosa (part attendance)  
Estación Experimental Zonas Aridas  
CSIC  
c/o General Segura 1, E-04001 Almeria, Spain  
barbosa@eeza.csic.es

John Cooper  
Avian Demography Unit  
Department of Statistical Sciences  
University of Cape Town  
Rondebosch 7701, South Africa  
jcooper@adu.uct.ac.za

Jeroen Creuwels (part attendance)  
Department of Marine Biology  
University of Groningen  
PO Box 14  
9750 AA Haren, Netherlands  
jeroen@creuwels.nl

Dr Ko de Korte (part attendance)  
Oceanwide Expeditions  
Donker Curtiusstraat 7-513  
1051 JL Amsterdam, Netherlands  
kdekorte@xs4all.nl

Heidi Geisz  
Biological Sciences  
Virginia Institute of Marine Science  
1208 Greate Road  
Gloucester Point, Virginia 23061, USA  
heidig@vims.edu

Michaela Mayer (part attendance)  
Gauss mbH, Werdestrasse 73  
28799 Bremen, Germany  
gauss@gauss.org

Hans-Ulrich Peter  
Polar and Bird Ecology Group  
Institute of Ecology  
Friedrich-Schiller Universität  
Dornburger Strasse 159  
D-07743 Jena, Germany  
hans-ulrich.peter@uni-jena.de

Francesco Pezzo  
Dipartimento Scienze Ambientali  
Università di Siena  
Via P.A. Mattioli 4  
53100 Siena, Italy  
pezzo@unisi.it

Kathrin Schuster (part attendance)  
FB Biologie/Zoologie  
AG Beck, Philipps-Universität  
Karl-von-Frisch Strasse  
D-35032 Marburg, Germany  
Schuster@students.uni-marburg.de

José Valencia  
Instituto Antártico Chileno  
Plaza Muñoz Gamero 1055  
Punta Arenas, Chile  
jvalenci@inach.cl

---

## ANNEX 2

### DOCUMENTS TABLED AT THE 2004 MEETING OF THE SCAR GROUP OF EXPERTS ON BIRDS

1. Agenda. 2 pp.
2. SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE ON ANTARCTIC RESEARCH WORKING GROUP ON BIOLOGY BIRD BIOLOGY SUBCOMMITTEE. Minutes of Meeting; 9–13 July 2002; Jena, Germany. *Marine Ornithology* 30: 97–106.
3. PHILLIPS, C.M. Manuscript. Publications and theses on Antarctic and sub-Antarctic birds, 2001. 9 pp.
4. COMNAP 2004. Working paper on guidelines for the operation of aircraft near concentrations of birds in Antarctica. ATCM XVIII/WP10. 4 pp.
5. BLACK, A. Manuscript. A major light induced bird strike on research vessel operating within South Georgia waters. 4 pp.
6. HODUM, P., CROXALL, J.P., PONCET, S. & WOehler, E.J. Manuscript. Breeding distribution of the Cape Petrel *Daption capense*. 22 pp.
7. SCAR 2004. Antarctic Specially Protected Species XVII Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting information paper IP073. 3 pp.
8. UNEP 2004. A review of the conservation status of Antarctic mammals and birds. XVII Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting information paper IP088. 20 pp.
9. SCAR Standing Committee on the Antarctic Treaty System 2004. Report to SCAR Executive Committee on XVIII ATCM; Cape Town, South Africa; 24 May – 4 June 2004. 6 pp.
10. FROGET, G., GAUTHIER-CLERC, M., LE MAHO, Y. & HANDRICH, Y. 1998. Is penguin banding harmless? *Polar Biology* 20: 409–413.
11. JACKSON, S. & WILSON, R.P. 2002. The potential costs of flipper-bands to penguins. *Functional Ecology* 16: 141–148.
12. GAUTHIER-CLERC, M., GENDNER, J.P., RIBIC, C.A., FRASER, W.R., WOehler, E.J., DESCAMPS, S., GILLY, C., LE BOHEC, C. & LE MAHO, Y. 2004. Long-term effects of flipper bands on penguins. *Biology Letters. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B (Suppl.)*. [www.journals.royalsoc.ac.uk]
13. PETERSEN, S.L. & BRANCH, G.M. 2004. Final report. Workshop on penguin flipper banding and other forms of marking. Cape Town: BirdLife South Africa. 32 pp.
14. AINLEY, D. Manuscript. Acquiring a “base datum of normality” for a marine ecosystem: the Ross Sea, Antarctica. 18 pp.

## ANNEX 3

## TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE SCAR GROUP OF EXPERTS ON BIRDS

1. Encourage, coordinate and support pure and applied research on Antarctic and sub-Antarctic birds, including by fostering the entry of young scientists to these research efforts.
2. Undertake the on-going compilations and syntheses of existing long-term and broad-scale data on the distribution and abundance of Antarctic and sub-Antarctic birds.
3. Contribute to the conservation and management of Antarctic and sub-Antarctic birds through the appropriate utilization and interpretation of all available scientific data.
4. Provide scientific advice, information and recommendations to SCAR and other fora, including Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meetings, its Committee for Environmental Protection, and CCAMLR, in relation to all aspects of Antarctic and sub-Antarctic ornithological matters.

## ANNEX 4

## RECOMMENDATIONS SUBMITTED TO THE SCAR LIFE SCIENCES STANDING SCIENTIFIC GROUP

**Funding and workshops**

1. The sum of US\$500 to support the scanning of pre-electronic meeting reports and other selected documents of the SCAR-GEB's predecessors, so as to make them available on the SCAR Web site for archival purposes.
2. The sum of US\$5000 to enable the holding of a workshop to assess the threatened status of regional populations of Antarctic birds, to be held in early 2005.
3. The sum of US\$2500 a year to support the Antarctic and sub-Antarctic bird data base hosted at the Australian Antarctic Data Centre, to continue the development of an Antarctic Important Bird Area inventory, and to produce a terrestrial atlas of Antarctic breeding birds.

**Internal recommendations**

1. SCAR XVII-Biol 4 and SCAR XVII-LSSSG 17 requested that birds should not be allowed to feed on kitchen wastes from scientific bases. The SCAR-GEB endorses this recommendation and further recommends that SCAR requests National Committees to continue to address through suitable fora the problems that can be caused to seabirds by such Antarctic and sub-Antarctic activities and operational procedures as the use of small boats near seabird colonies,

external lights at night both at bases and on ships, and aircraft approach routes. Further, the SCAR-GEB recommends the removal of redundant communication masts and aerials that can cause bird mortality.

2. Recollecting Rec. XXV-Biol 3, XXVI-Biol 8, SCAR XXVII-Biol 1 and SCAR XXVII-LSSSG 13, covering threats to Southern Ocean seabirds due to mortality from fishing operations, the SCAR-GEB recommends that SCAR request relevant National Committees of countries that have not yet produced a FAO National Plan of Action—Seabirds and/or ratified the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels to do so.
3. The SCAR-GEB endorses its previous recommendation (SCAR XXVII-Biol 2 and SCAR XXVII-LSSSG 14) that caution should be taken when designing research programmes that require the external marking of penguins, especially when using current designs of metal flipper bands for demographic and other long-term studies, and that this caution be passed to SCAR National Committees.
4. The SCAR-GEB recommends that SCAR seeks observer status to the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels.