

Draft Minutes of the Third Meeting of the AEWA Technical Committee

27 – 28 May 2002, Arusha, Tanzania

1. Opening

1. Mr Bert Lenten, Executive Secretary of the AEWA, opened the meeting, welcoming all participants and thanking the Government of Tanzania and in particular the Wildlife Research Centre, host of the meeting, for the excellent venue. On behalf of all participants, he thanked Dr Charles Mlingwa for organising the excellent excursion on the previous day, which was a good opportunity to see a great diversity of animals and birds.

2. Mr Lenten mentioned the names of the TC members who could not attend, Mr Sheriff Baha-el-Din (Northern Africa), Mr Seyni Seydou (Western Africa) and Mr Jesper Madsen (expert on game management) as well as Mr Nick Davidson (Ramsar Bureau) who previously informed the Secretariat that he was unable to participate at this meeting but that he had requested Mr David Pritchard (BirdLife International), being a member of the Standing Committee, to represent the Ramsar Convention. Furthermore, he welcomed the following observers from Contracting Parties: Mr Sten Asbirk (Denmark), Mr Gerhard Adams Germany, Mr Jan-Willem Sneep (The Netherlands), Mr Charles Mlingwa (Tanzania), Mr David Stroud (UK) and Mr Robert Vagg (UK).

3. Mr Lenten gave the word to Charles Mlingwa, who greeted all the participants and delivered a speech in the name of the Wildlife Conservation Authorities (see Annex 1). One of the most remarkable points addressed in the speech was the establishment of an AEWA National Committee.

4. Mr Lenten emphasized that Tanzania is the first Contracting Party that has established an AEWA National Committee and hoped that other countries would follow this example.

5. Mr Lars Dinesen (DANIDA) gave a brief overview on the implementation of the Ramsar Convention in Tanzania and the establishment of the National AEWA Committee. He informed the meeting that Tanzania joined the Ramsar Convention in 2000 and that the implementation of the Convention in Tanzania had been funded by DANIDA (Denmark). He informed the meeting on the huge sites that have been designated as Ramsar sites or are in the process of being designated in the nearby future. As a technical advisor on wetlands he was involved in this work.

The second part of his introduction dealt with the AEWA National Committee, which was established in January 2002. This Committee is the first subcommittee under the National Ramsar Committee.

6. Ms Rachelle Adams raised the question, why two different Committees should exist for Ramsar and AEWA and what their legal status in Tanzania was.

7. Mr Dinesen said that although there is some overlap, the scope of the Ramsar Committee was much broader than dealing with only technical matters as the AEWA sub-committee does.

8. Bert Lenten said that it was important that AEWA and Ramsar should work together not only at international level but also at national level. After gaining some experience in the coming years perhaps the committees could be merged in one committee at national level.

9. Mr Neil Baker informed the meeting via a presentation on the work that has been done by him, his wife and 20 other volunteers regarding the Bird Atlas of Tanzania. He made clear that the database contains 0.5 million

data. However, taking into account the size of Tanzania being comparable with the size of Germany and France together a lot of work has still to be done.

After the presentation of Mr Baker, Mr Lenten thanked him and said that he was very impressed by their work.

2. Welcome address

10. Bert Lenten invited Mr. Jan Willem Sneep, the representative of the Depositary, to present his report. Mr Sneep thanked Tanzania for their invitation to host the meeting and said that he was very impressed of the great diversity. He reported that the number of Contracting Parties since last meeting had grown to 33.

3. Adoption of the Rules of Procedure

11. Bert Lenten explained that the Doc 3 “Rules of Procedure” based on the discussion at the TC 2 meeting had been amended and should be approved by the TC in order to forward it to the MOP for its formal adoption.

12. The proposal of Mr Oliver Biber to amend rule 30, para. 2, by inclusion of the following sentence: *Region, and vice versa, the Contracting Parties are invited to contact the representative of their region for any questions they have or input to propose concerning the agenda of the forthcoming TC meeting;* was approved by the Meeting.

13. David Pritchard raised two points regarding rule 7. Firstly, this rule describes an approach in the case a regional representative or a representative of one of the organisation steps down, but he was not sure if it also covered the case when an expert steps down. The second point dealt with the situation that a member or alternate steps down a vacancy will occur. The rule does not make clear that the alternate automatically will fill up the vacancy if the member steps down.

14. Bert Lenten explained that when the member stands down he/ she should be replaced by the alternate and that there is no decision in the cases when the alternate stands down, he also said that the paragraph should be reworded and asked David Pritchard, as English native speaker, that together with the expert on environmental law to work on that point later that evening in order to modify the document.

15. Another point raised by David Pritchard was the attendance at the TC meetings. The experiences gained so far is that rule 5 and 8 are too restrictive and not clear on how to deal with e.g. the Host Government, UNON, UNEP, etc.

16. Bert Lenten clarified that according to the Article VII paragraph 1 the Chairman may admit 4 observers from specialized international inter-governmental and non-governmental organisations to attend the TC meeting. So far no provision has been made for UN/ UNEP organisations, which could be seen as extended part of the Secretariat.

17. Mr Paul Chabeda informed the meeting that at meetings of other UNEP administered Conventions representatives of UNEP/ UNON are seen as part of the extended Secretariat.

18. A working group was established consisting of David Pritchard and Rachel Adams. The Chairman requested this working group to review the Rules of Procedure and to come back with amendments the following day.

19. On the second day David Pritchard presented on behalf of the other members of his working group, Rachel Adams and Robert Vagg, the amended Rules of Procedure (doc. AEWA/ TC 3.3). He explained that it had been a rough revision done in limited time. The working group proposed to amend Rule 4 to distinguish better the categories of participants to the TC. Furthermore amendment of Rule 7 was proposed to tackle the problems if the Member and Alternate simultaneous step down. Another point raised in the discussion of the working group was the role of the TC members regarding dissemination of information to the national technical focal points. Finally the participation of UNEP/ UNON organisations was discussed; the outcome of this is that the working group sees these organisations as part of the extended Agreement

Secretariat. Therefore it is proposed not to embody this in one of the Rules but record the conclusion in the minutes of this meeting. The meeting agreed with all proposals of the working group. The revised version of the Rules of Procedure is attached hereto as Annex 2.

4. Election of a new Chairman of the Technical Committee

20. Bert Lenten, made mention of the decision of Mr Barry Taylor to stand down of his position as Chairman / member of the Technical Committee. In the past months Mr Lenten proposed to the TC members Mr Yousoof Mungroo as replacement of Mr Taylor. On Mr. Lenten's request, the Meeting elected Mr Mungroo (representative of Southern Africa) as the new Chairman.

21. Mr Mungroo thanked the members of the TC for their confidence and asked their full cooperation in order to go through the long agenda as smoothly as possible and being this the last meeting before the MOP he suggested to make all the necessary in order to adopt the resolutions.

5 Adoption of the Agenda and Work Programme

22. The Chairman pointed out that it was his intention to finish all items as indicated on the work programme and if time was leftover item 22 on Institutional Arrangements should also be discussed at the end of the day.

23. Gerard Adams mentioned that he had a presentation on an Action Plan for the Golden Plover and requested if he could present it. This presentation was accepted by the Meeting under agenda item 25. After this the amendments of the agenda and work programme were adopted.

6. Admission of Observers

24. The Chairman welcomed Mr John Swift (FACE), Mr Guy-Nöel Olivier (OMPO), Mr David Pritchard (BirdLife International) and Mr Klaus Riede (GROMS). Gerard Adams clarified that Mr. Riede was part of the German delegation as in previous meetings.

25. Bert Lenten apologised for the misunderstanding and promised that the list of participants of both meetings would be amended.

7. Adoption of the Minutes of the second Meeting of the Technical Committee

26. Mr Lenten explained that the delay in delivering this document had been due to the workload of the Secretariat, he apologised for this.

27. After the discussion on GROMS in the previous meeting Mr Lenten requested Mr Mariano Gimenez-Dixon to take the lead in the intersessional working group. Later on it turned out that Mr Gimenez-Dixon, according to the minutes had not been part of this working group. To avoid this kind of misunderstandings the meeting requested the Secretariat to produce a list with action points, which would clarify, which actions should be taken and who would be involved.

28. Mr Ward Hagemeyer suggested that the word minutes should be included in the title and that the outcome of each issue discussed should be placed together in the minutes in order to avoid confusion also to include the information that had been presented to the meeting. The Meeting agreed on this.

29. The TC approved the minutes.

30. Mr Lenten asked the committee who volunteered to continue with the work that had been left undone. As nobody volunteered the discussion was postponed to the next TC meeting.

8. Report by the Chairman

31. Due to the fact the TC had been for some time without a Chairman, Mr Lenten was requested to report on this. Since TC2 the Chairman had not undertaken any activities.

32. Mr Lenten informed the Meeting that it was expected that the Chairman of the TC would report to the MOP2. He promised to produce as soon as possible a written report on the activities of the TC. This report would be sent to the TC members for approval before it is submitted to MOP2. The Meeting agreed that Mr Mungroo would introduce this report during MOP2.

9. Report by the Depositary

33. Mr Mungroo invited Mr Jan-Willem Sneep to report orally on behalf of the Depositary. Mr Sneep reported briefly on behalf of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands, the number of Contracting Parties to AEWA has grown to 33 Parties; namely 19 from the Eurasian region and 14 from the African region. The full report is attached hereto as Annex 3.

10 Report by the Secretariat

34. Bert Lenten commented that since the last TC meeting in Arles only 5 months had passed and therefore he had decided to update the previous report.

35. He started to make emphasis to the first paragraph on page 2 on financial and administrative matters. The closure of the books took a long time, as it was necessary to revise carefully the report from UNON. The Executive Secretary worked together with Ms Jasmin Kanza in order to improve this report. He made clear that the administrative and financial part is a big burden for the Secretariat.

36. Then he passed to revised page 3 on assistance for the Secretariat. He commented on the temporary recruitment of the consultant Ms Heike Grelka (Germany) as Information Assistant. She would support the Secretariat for a period of six months on information management and on secretarial assistance. Furthermore, Ms Nienke Beintema, based in the Netherlands, had been recruited to work during a period of four months on the non-toxic shot issue e.g. to draft a special newsletter on this issues. Also Wetlands International has been contracted to update the International Implementation Priorities Plan. The latter has quite some overlap with the GEF project and therefore, the project coordinator Dr Chris Baker from Wetlands International would be involved in this work.

37. Later he passed to pages 5, 6 and 7 and explained that the following projects since TC 2 have been contracted out:

- Drafting of Guidelines on National Legislation to IUCN-ELC;
- Development of International Species Action Plan for the Great Snipe to BirdLife International-European Division;
- Drafting of a guideline on avoidance of introduction of non-native migratory waterbird species to Just Ecology (UK);
- Study on potential impact of Marine Fisheries on migratory waterbirds to the University of Cape Town;
- Drafting a guideline on Colonial Waterbirds to Tour-du-Valat;
- Exchange of know-how on traditional approaches of wetland and waterbird management in Africa to IUCN-ELC;
- Rehabilitation of important sites for migratory waterbirds, which have been degraded by invasive species of aquatic weeds to IUCN-ELC.

38. Besides paying attention to the projects mentioned above the Executive Secretary informed the meeting on his activities regarding conservation of southern African coastal breeding birds. Together with Mr Gerard C. Boere (Wetlands International) he attended a workshop on this issue in Cape Town. Although the original idea was to develop a MoU under CMS, at this meeting it was decided to propose the species involved for inclusion in Annex 2 of AEWA.

39. Rachelle Adams wanted to know if the TC would be able to see the draft of the guidelines on national legislation before MOP2.

40. Bert Lenten promised to send the draft guideline to the TC members but pointed out that the time schedule was very tight. The deadline for finalization of the guidelines is 15 July; afterwards the text needs to be translated into French. Submission of the final documents to the MOP2 will be 15 of August.

41. David Pritchard raised his concern regarding two points that were discussed in the last meeting and which not appear in the report or the agenda.

1. The progress on the discussion on the Environmental Law Centre coordinated sources on information regarding the legislation case law as mentioned in paragraph 84 of the previous minutes.
2. The promise of the circulation of a proposal to the members of the Committee from Jesper Madsen on monitoring and review of the project paragraph 152 of the previous minutes.

42. On response to this two issues Bert Lenten mentioned that on the Environmental Law Centre, there had been no time to work on this issue but that he would try to do it before MOP2.

On the second point Mr Lenten was expecting a proposal from Jesper Madsen but unfortunately he had not presented any up to that moment and that it was difficult to contact him as he had changed jobs. Mr Lenten suggested that somebody else should take over to draft this proposal.

43. David Pritchard wondered if we could take the opportunity of informal consultations and maybe could come with a proposal by the end of the meeting.

44. On the request of who would volunteer to work on this issue Mr Stroud responded that he had been involved in this working group but in his view the group should be lead by a committee member. David Stroud recalled that Rachelle Adams and Jesper Madsen had been part of this working group, the Chairman requested Mr. Stroud to take the lead.

45. On the second day of the meeting the Chairman called Mr Stroud to report on the working group on project evaluation and review as mentioned on page 16 of the minutes. Mr Stroud reported that as decided in France the idea was to enhance the involvement of TC members in the work being funded under the auspices of the Agreement. By doing this, the TC would assist the Secretariat with technical input for the development of projects and the evaluation of projects and their outputs. Mr Madsen offered to take this forwards, it was apparent that other skills were required and that it was necessary to assign determined TC members to projects. Unfortunately as Mr Madsen stepped down there was no possibility to go further developing proposals for projects evaluation process, which had not been done. These points remain to be taken forward. The Chairman requested to submit the draft of the text to the Secretariat.

11. Report on the activities of the working group

46. The Chairman mentioned that there was no document for this point but that the Secretariat would orally report on the progress made since November 2001 on the Brent Goose Management Plan, on the development of a format for Species Action Plans and finally on the Species Action Plans in Africa.

47. Bert Lenten started with the first point the Brent Goose Management plan. As reported by the Chairman of this working group Jesper Madsen, the first meeting took place in October 2001 in Denmark. Since then the draft version of the Management Plan was sent to the key countries, which are Russian Federation, Denmark, Germany, Netherlands, France and UK, with the request to provide the Secretariat with comments and remarks.

Unfortunately, up to now comments have been received except from FACE. The Secretariat is still waiting for the feed back, and in the mean time the working group has requested Mr Bart Ebbinge to replace Mr Madsen as Chairman of the working group. It also hopes that Denmark could appoint another representative to take a seat in the working group. Mr Lenten requested the countries involved to provide the Secretariat with their feedback as soon as possible, to enable him to convene a meeting of the working group to discuss the comments and remarks and to finalise the draft Plan for submission to MOP2 for its adoption.

48. Mr Herby Kalchreuter, said that since 1997 in the meeting in Texel, it had been decided to design a population model and that this had been confirmed in the meeting in Cape Town, so far no outcome has appeared since then, he wanted to know if there were any problems to create this population model.

49. Mr Lenten explained that there were no problems; the European Union had decided to fund the model, which at the moment is ongoing but that it would take from 3 to 4 years to be ready.

50. The Chairman suggested to set a deadline to receive the comments from the key countries, the Executive Secretary proposed 15 June 2002.

51. Referring to item 46 of the previous minutes Mr Hagemeyer enquired who would represent AEWA in the users group linked to the population model now that Mr Madsen had stepped down.

52. Bert Lenten explained that since Mr Madsen was the link at the moment there was no information on the progress of this project and that it would be necessary to select a member of the TC to represent AEWA. He promised to follow up on this.

53. Jan-Willem Sneep enquired if this Action Plan had been sent to the member of the ORNIS Committee and if it would be discussed at the next meeting of this Committee on 14 June 2002.

54. Mr Lenten responded that he did not have direct contact with the ORNIS Committee of the EU, but that he had already discussed with Mr O' Brien (DG Env.) if AEWA could present this Action Plan. Unfortunately, he did not come back to the Secretariat on this.

55. Bert Lenten passed to the following point on this item of the agenda, the Development of a format for Species Action Plans, he explained that BirdLife International had been contracted to work on the development of a model for Species Action Plans to be ready before MOP2. He requested David Pritchard to comment on that.

56. Mr Pritchard said that as discussed in the previous meeting the model of the Brent Goose was being used as starting point to create this format for species action plans. Also the AEWA conservation guidelines would be used as basis for further elaboration of a model. The project is of interest for BirdLife because the outcome could be used for species action plans to be developed for other organisations. Therefore BirdLife decided to contribute in kind to this project. A first draft would be circulated the following week. A point to discuss was what form the MOP would take on board and if a resolution was needed.

57. Bert Lenten agreed that this issue should be discussed during the meeting, as it is stated in the contract that BirdLife International should come out with a resolution.

58. Gerard Adams recalled the intensive discussion during MOP1 on this issue and proposed not to draft a resolution but to include the model in one of the conservation guidelines.

59. Mr Christoph Zöckler said that he had not seen a draft of a format yet but that there were a few samples of species action plans as the Brent Goose or the Great Snipe, which showed that each species needs its own approach. Therefore he requested that the format for Action Plan should be as flexible as possible.

60. Mr Oliver Biber agreed with Mr Zöckler but suggested that instead of a very tight format a checklist should be more useful.

61. Mr Gimenez-Dixon, said that the matter was not to discuss what should be done for the conservation of certain species but to allow comparison through description, using the same terminology for harmonization with flexibility for recommendation of conservation.
62. Mr Ward Hagemeyer suggested that the format to make an action plan should be an appendix or an explanation to the chapter included in the conservation guidelines but not in a way that it could become later a second stand alone document on the same issue but that it appeared a unity saying how to proceed in the conservation guidelines.
63. The Executive Secretary agreed with this last idea and proposed to discuss with David Pritchard if there was really a need for a resolution. Inclusion of a model for Species Action Plans in the conservation guidelines would be easy because of the idea of the Secretariat to make a binder for the Conservation Guidelines, so that whenever needed it would be easy to update them.
64. Summarizing the discussion, the Chairman acknowledged that although harmonization is desired the difference between species should be taken into consideration as well as the inclusion of the model in the Conservation Guidelines.
65. Bert Lenten introduced the last issue of this point of the agenda, Species Action Plans in Africa. It was decided at the first TC meeting to create an intersessional working group on the lead of Mr Barry Taylor but no activities had been undertaken, he asked the TC members if this point should be added to the activities of the TC and if someone was willing to take the lead or if this point should be deleted.
66. The Chairman mentioned that the problem AEWA had was continuity, as some people overtook some projects and then left, as was the case of this project.
67. David Stroud said that the discussion on the previous point regarding the development of a model for future International Species Action Plans could perhaps cover this point too.
68. Mr Danso was concerned about the work BirdLife International was doing regarding International Species Action Plans and if that also included inter-African species. In case not more information on how it had been done should be provided and requested that the point should not be stricken out.
69. Mr Lenten said that Actions Plans would be discussed during the MOP2. He proposed that the African delegates should look for an intra African migrant for which in the next three years an Action Plan could be developed. Furthermore he proposed that BirdLife International and AEWA should do the same. Probably by the time a suitable species had been identified the model for Species Action Plan would be ready and could be used.
70. The meeting agreed that the working group on Species Action Plans in Africa could be deleted from the TC task list.

12. Update on the GEF Flyway project

71. After a brief introduction of the GEF project Ward Hagemeyer explained that the GEF project was currently in a crucial phase. In particular the matching funds of roundabout US \$ 6 million was a point of concern. The GEF Secretariat would look at this carefully and expect from AEWA and Ramsar Convention, who would significantly benefit, a substantial contribution to the project.
72. Several components are still under development and Chris Baker is doing his utmost to meet the deadline for submission of the project brief for the full size project.
73. Ward Hagemeyer raised a few points of importance to discuss during this meeting whereas:
- How could AEWA contribute making cash to this project and how AEWA could secure additional co-funding to this project;
 - Implementation arrangement (flyway scale activities, regional activities and local activities)

74. The first point discussed was the funding of the GEF project. The Chairman reiterated that a total amount of US \$ 6 million is needed as matching fund and that it is expected that AEWA as well as the Ramsar Convention would contribute to this.

75. Mr Lenten explained that he had looked into his budget for the next triennium to allocate some matching funds for the project. By matching up some foreseen activities e.g. regional meetings to promote the Agreement with regional meeting under the GEF project not only synergies would be gained but also a 'win-win' situation for both parties. Furthermore, the Secretariat applied for a Junior Professional Information Officer who could work for 50 % of his time for the GEF project. By linking up several activities from the Secretariat to the GEF project AEWA could probably raise an amount of US \$ 1-1,5 million in the next five years.

76. Olivier Biber stressed that richer countries like Switzerland have a threefold problem regarding contribution to this kind of projects. There are three options to contribute to this project namely:

1. Directly channelling of funds to the Secretariat;
2. Direct funding of parts of the project;
3. Providing funds to the GEF.

77. The practice in Switzerland is that the same project cannot be financed more than once by using different sources. Mr Biber expressed his concern regarding the amount of matching funds that have to be raised.

78. Mr Hagemeyer clarified that in particular the demonstration project already secured a significant amount of matching funds of roundabout US \$ 2 million. If it is taken into account the calculation made by Mr Lenten that AEWA could raise up US \$ 1.5 million then the remaining amount to be covered would be US \$ 2.5 million. The amount of other funds allocated already to this project is approximately US \$ 1 million. This means that there would still be a gap to be bridged. Therefore he requested some support from the TC members to seek additional funds.

79. Mariano Gimenez-Dixon enquired if the Ramsar Convention committed itself to contribute to this project. Mr Hagemeyer informed the meeting that this was unfortunately not the case so far but that it was still under consideration within the Ramsar Bureau

80. Mr Biber as well as Mr Pritchard stated that in the recent budget discussion in the Ramsar Standing Committee no provisions have been made to contribute to this project. Perhaps the Ramsar Bureau could contribute in kind and the question was if this would be accepted.

81. Mr Lenten responded to this saying that GEF expected some cash co-funding and that therefore AEWA had put a modest amount of US \$ 50,000 per year as matching fund to the project in the budget for the next triennium. Furthermore he informed the meeting that, there was a need to produce some information material on this project and that hopefully in due course a special issue of the AEWA Newsletter could be drafted and published.

82. Finally Ms Kanza mentioned that if Wetlands International expected some co-funding for CMS she would appreciate to receive some facts during this meeting to enable her to add them to the CMS budget proposal for 2003-2005.

83. The Chairman closed the discussion on the matching funds and went on the point of regional offices.

84. The discussion that followed made clear that the term 'regional offices' lead to misunderstandings. Mr Hagemeyer as well as Mr Lenten tried to clarify what was meant by regional office. In practice this would mean that for a specific region a local staff member would be recruited to coordinate the activities in that region. The question was, what would happen with these officers and their offices after the project expired. The GEF Secretariat is interested in the sustainability of these activities beyond the project life.

85. During a lively discussion the TC members exchanged their views on the future need for AEWA for regional offices. In general it was felt that it was too early to decide on this. More thought on this is needed although most of the TC acknowledged that for implementation of the Agreement in specific regions there might be a need to have a regional officer.

86. Mr Lenten made clear that the AEWA Secretariat from a management point of view is in principle not in favour of having regional offices and would prefer on the long term to build a similar structure as the one in place in the Ramsar Bureau.

87. The meeting also felt that GEF could not request for a guarantee at this stage that AEWA or Ramsar would take over the offices after the project expired. These offices might prove to be very useful and if that was the case this could be discussed in one of the following sessions of the Meeting of the Parties again it was too early to decide on this issue.

88. After several opinions from participants the Chairman resumed that there was a need to separate the issue of the need of regional offices for the GEF project and the future structure of AEWA. He created a working group and requested Mr Gimenez-Dixon to take the lead. The working group consisted of Jasmin Kanza, Rachel Adams, Elijah Danso and Olivier Biber. Later on a discussion arose on the mandate of this working group and it was felt that it would not be feasible to come up in a concrete proposal for the structure AEWA would need in the future for the following day.

89. Mr Biber proposed that the working group should come up with a Resolution on the GEF project, which would clarify budget needed for this project. The MOP2 may decide on the regional offices amongst other things. This was agreed by the Meeting.

90. At the beginning of the second day Mr Gimenez-Dixon reported on the activities of the working group. Due to time limitation the working group had not been able to discuss the issue of regional offices. It was discussed by the working group that the project brief for the full size GEF project should be submitted in time to the MOP2. The working group furthermore requested AEWA to explore during the GEF project what kind of structure was needed for regional implementation of AEWA.

13. Implementation of the International Implementation Priorities 2000-2004

91. The Executive Secretary reported that since this point was discussed in France little progress had been made. The projects that had been contracted out were already reported under agenda item 10.

92. Taking into account that since the Implementation Priorities 2004-2004 were adopted by MOP1 a number of projects had been executed, there is a need to update the current Plan and to add some new projects.

93. In addition to this Mr Hagemeijer explained that Wetlands International had been contracted to do this work. In close cooperation with the Secretariat all Range States and the main international NGOs were approached with the request to come up with some proposals. So far response have been received from Tour-du-Valat, Congo, Lebanon, Togo and Burundi. Unfortunately most of those comments do not refer to the international implementation priorities, but focus on national projects. Wetlands International hopes that they will receive some more concrete proposals very soon.

94. Jasmin Kanza raised a complete different point. She commented that the lesson learnt on the International Implementation Priorities were not only to look at the proposals but also to the manpower requirements to implement the proposals. She suggested that the number of staff members should be taken into consideration.

95. The Executive Secretary as well as Mr Hagemeijer replied to this matter that in their view it would not be right to reduce the number of projects to the capacity of the Secretariat.

96. Mr Sneep stressed the importance of not only coming up with a report on implementation of the International Implementation Plan but also of drafting a Resolution to stimulate Parties to support these

activities. Mr Lenten clarified that this would be the case and that a Resolution on this matter would be submitted to the MOP2. Mr Mungroo requested Mr Gimenez-Dixon for a written report of the working group.

97. Ward Hagemeyer promised that the members of the TC would receive more information on the GEF project, as it became obvious during the discussion on the previous day that there was a lack of information on this project.

14. Proposal for a Resolution on phasing out lead shot for hunting in wetlands

98. The Executive Secretary explained that Ms Nienke Beintema had been contracted to draft a resolution, a special issue of the AEWA Newsletter and a number of articles to be submitted to National Hunters Magazines. According to the Agreement text paragraph 4.1.4, Parties should endeavour to phase out the use of lead shot for hunting in wetlands for the year 2000. Currently only 6 AEWA range states had phase out the use of lead shot: Canada, Norway, Finland, Denmark, The Netherlands and Switzerland. And as Guy-Nöel Oliver informed the Meeting earlier France could also be added to the list soon. So it was clear that there was a need to promote phasing out of lead shot for hunting in wetlands. Therefore the Secretariat is planning to organise a second workshop on non-toxic shot next year.

99. The Executive Secretariat introduced the draft Resolution and the proposal for amendment of the International Implementation Priorities, afterwards the discussion started.

100. After David Pritchard's intervention, it was agreed that the amendment of the International Implementation Priorities should be taken into account during the updating of these Priorities and that therefore there was no need to come back to it in this resolution.

101. Mr Pritchard also emphasized that all Parties should come up with their own deadline for phasing out lead shot instead of changing deadlines as mentioned in the Action Plan. The meeting agreed with this and it was decided to add a paragraph to the resolution. Furthermore the meeting agreed not to treat EU countries differently than African countries.

102. Rachel Adams inquired if any work was being done on economic incentives to stimulate the use of non-toxic shot. The Executive Secretary answered that as far as he knew this was not the case. In the view of Mr Biber taxes on lead shot would be difficult to implement due to the fact that phasing out lead shot was only foreseen for hunting in wetlands.

103. Then the text of the Resolution was discussed paragraph by paragraph and a number of proposals were made for improvement of the text.

104. After summarizing the discussion, Mr Mungroo established a small working group consisting of Mr John Swift and Mr Lenten to review the draft Resolution and to come back with a revised version the following day.

105. On the second day John Swift reported on the activities of this working group and introduced the revised version of draft Resolution (doc: AEWA/ TC 3.8 rev 1), which was approved afterwards by the Meeting.

15. Review and approval of new projects for inclusion in the Register of International Projects

106. The Executive Secretary presented document TC 3.9 informing the meeting that MOP1 adopted Resolution 1.5 on the Register of International Projects. He explained that according to the resolution at each meeting of the TC the register should be revised. He pointed out that many of the projects included in the report were not projects but programmes and he proposed to delete the programmes. AEWA Range States and International Organisations have been approached by the Secretariat with the request to provide new proposals for inclusion in the register.

107. In the last month a small number of proposals had been received, e.g. from OMPO and Tour-du-Valat. Taking into account the limited response, Mr Lenten asked the meeting if they considered the register a useful tool.

108. During the discussion on the issue if programmes should be deleted from the list, it became clear that there was a need to clarify the difference between programmes and projects. It was noted that programmes could also contribute to the implementation of the Agreement. In particular the specialist groups should not be deleted. Mr Gimenez-Dixon proposed as a compromise that the Secretariat should develop a directory of organisations and programmes. The Meeting agreed to delete the Conventions from the list.

109. On the second question of how useful this list was David Pritchard answered that it was hard to perceive the usefulness of the list. He proposed to set up a procedure for endorsement of projects by AEWA instead of having a rolling document. This would reduce the workload on this issue.

110. The view of Mr Biber was that the aim of this list was to provide contact details and that this was in particular useful for the AEWA Secretariat. However, for this the list should always be updated. He doubted if the TC should review the list. The Secretariat made clear that the TC by Resolution 1.5 requested to review the list.

111. Mr Gimenez-Dixon found very strange the fact that the TC meeting should approve new project proposals; he said that if a project met the criteria there should be no need for approval. He also suggested making the report electronically available through Internet with the option that it could be directly update by the project proponents.

112. The Chairman summarized that this was an important list and should be kept as it was, that it should be made available to the public through the web page and that at a later stage the Secretariat should create a directory of programmes.

16. Guidelines for acceptance of contributions in cash and contributions in kind

113. Mr Lenten presented doc TC 3.10, he explained that this document had been revised built on the discussion at the TC 2 meeting. He recalled the discussion in the last TC meeting in France where it was said that a minimum amount of US \$ 1,000 a year should be set. He made an analysis and found a number of Parties could meet the criteria of this amount. He asked the meeting if the minimum should be increased to US \$ 5,000 to limit the number of countries that could apply for this possibility.

114. Mr Hagemeyer requested how many countries would meet the criteria of US \$ 1,000 and how many for US \$ 5,000. The Executive Secretary informed the meeting that taken into account the current budget a number of East European countries would meet these criteria and regarding the level of US \$ 5,000 probably only the Russian Federation would meet this criteria.

115. Rachelle Adams made reference to the text of the Agreement article 5 section 2 where it is stated that parties should contribute to the Agreement according to the UN scale assessment and asked how free MOP was in this regard.

116. Mr Lenten said that the point of contribution in kind had been discussed during the Negotiation Meeting in The Hague in 1995. In the final act of this meeting it is laid down that the Secretariat has to come up with a proposal on this issue. At MOP1 Resolution 1.6 was adopted and requested the Secretariat in close cooperation with the TC to examine the possibilities of payment of contribution in kind in lieu of cash and to submit a proposal to MOP2.

117. Rachelle Adams said that if Parties are allowed to pay their contribution in kind the Agreement needed to be amended.

118. In the view of the Executive Secretary there is no need to amend the Agreement because the text of that specific paragraph states only that Parties should contribute to the Agreement but it does not say in which form.

119. Mr Biber stressed that there was no need to set a minimum level because as written in the Resolution the Standing Committee in close coordination with the Secretariat should review if the nature of a contribution met the needs of the Agreement.

120. After this the Resolution was discussed paragraph by paragraph. Points that were raised were: if this provision also applies for those countries that want to pay their contribution partly in kind and partly in cash, the difference between page 2 contributions to the running cost and page 3 contribution to other activities needed some clarification, if in the criteria used there were sometimes more procedural points, etc.

121. After this discussion the Resolution was approved by the TC and it was decided not to propose a minimum level regarding contributions.

17 Establishment of a small grant fund

122. Bert Lenten said that Small Grant Fund could be a useful tool to promote the Agreement. From the experiences of the Ramsar Bureau, he knew due to the fact that replenishment of the SGF takes place through voluntary contribution and that this could differ from year to year, therefore it was very hard to predict how much money would be available for projects. Every year good projects have to be turned down due to lack of funds. The Ramsar Bureau proposed to their Standing Committee to establish a Trust Fund consisting of an endowment fund and a sinking fund. Through the interest accrued by this Trust Fund the SGF could be replenish yearly. However, in the view of Mr Lenten it would be very difficult to fill this Trust Fund with an amount of US \$ 4 million because not many countries would be willing to provide the necessary funds. At the Ramsar Standing Committee, last year, the Executive Secretary requested to consider establishing a joint Trust Fund for Ramsar and AEWA.

123. On the request of the Executive Secretary, David Pritchard reported back from the Ramsar Standing Committee. He informed the Meeting that the Standing Committee approved in principle the establishment of an endowment fund. However, a number of countries have expressed their reservation on this matter. Others have indicated that if COP would approve the endowment funds they would not be able to contribute to this. Regarding the joint Ramsar-AEWA fund the view of the Ramsar Bureau is that although super visually this seems to be an attractive option they foresee some problems in e.g. governance of such a fund. This has not been analysed in depth.

124. Gerard Adams supported the idea of the Secretariat to try to develop a joint Trust Fund for Ramsar and AEWA. Taking into account that the restructuring of the Ramsar SGF takes place now a proposal should tabled as soon as possible before Ramsar COP.

125. The meeting agreed that a Resolution would be drafted in which the Ramsar Convention would be invited to take in consideration the establishment of a joint Trust Fund.

18. Amendments to the Action Plan

126. The Executive Secretary started this point by mentioning that according to the Agreement text article 4 para. 2 the Action Plan should be revised at each ordinary session of the meeting of the Parties. Therefore Wetlands International had been contracted to update the action plan and it would be ready to be submitted to MOP2.

127. At the beginning of the year he attended a meeting in Cape Town to discuss the development of a MOU for coastal breeding birds in southern Africa. During the meeting it became clear that some species are already included in AEWA and that others could be also included. Therefore it was decided not to develop a new MOU but to draft a proposal for amendment of Annex II of AEWA. South Africa has submitted these proposals to the Agreement Secretariat.

128. Some countries approached the Secretariat with the request if species e.g. Aquatic Warbler could be included in AEWA. Other wanted to know why certain species were not included. The question is if all migratory waterbird species should be included.

129. Gerhard Adams said that in 1994 Germany proposed the inclusion of all the migratory waterbird species in appendix 2 of the Bonn Convention. Unfortunately at that time that was not possible. Germany would support the idea of including all migratory waterbird species. Regarding other species, he made clear that his country would not be in favour to conclude new MOUs if the species could be included in an existing Agreement. Therefore he would welcome the inclusion the *Crex crex* and the Aquatic Warbler into AEWA.

130. Mr Stroud pointed out that some species with good conservation status have been included in Annex II and others have not, this was not very consistent. Therefore he also proposed to include all species of migratory waterbird. In his view the Aquatic Warbler would also fit under the criteria of AEWA.

131. Christoph Zöckler expressed his concern including species as the Aquatic Warbler because although the species fulfil the criteria of AEWA the door was left open for all other species of other taxonomic groups.

132. Mr Munteanu said that the *Crex crex* should not be included in AEWA as this is less aquatic than the Aquatic Warbler and that this would open doors to include in the AEWA species which were not really waterbirds.

133. In the view of Ward Hagemeyer a taxonomic approach should not be followed but focus on birds that are ecological dependent on wetlands as given in the Agreement text.

134. The Meeting agreed to come up with a proposal to include all migratory waterbirds in Annex II. Regarding inclusion of other birds that could qualify to be included the Executive Secretary proposed to make a recommendation to MOP2 that the TC would analyse this in depth and would submit a proposal to MOP3.

135. Another proposal coming from the meeting on coastal breeding birds in South Africa was to amend the Action Plan to add a possibility to develop multi-species action plans.

136. The general feeling of the Meeting was that in the current Action Plan all points were covered regarding conservation of species and that even for a multi-species action plan the problems species are facing should be approached species by species. Therefore the meeting agreed that there was no need to amend the Action Plan. It was also agreed that the possibility to combine single species action plans to a multi species action plan should be clarified in the conservation guidelines.

137. David Stroud pointed out that in the current Action Plan four species of ibises with a high conservation concern were missing. He requested to consider, this for the new Action Plan to be submitted to MOP2.

19. Review of the Conservation Guidelines

138. The Executive Secretary said that the revised version of the Guidelines had been already sent to the TC and that he considered that there was no need to discuss them.

139. David Stroud raised a point related to appendix 1 where a population was mentioned that was taken of by MOP1 and therefore did not appear any more on the Action Plan. Furthermore the document was written before MOP1 talking about possible amendments of the Action Plan that had happened during MOP1. Therefore there was a need to go through the document again and change it.

140. Mr Lenten thanked Mr Pritchard for his comments and requested him to give them to him later. He said that Heike Grelka would work on the up date of the Guidelines and all details would be considered.

141. Mr Adams requested that it should be possible to detect where the amendments had occurred in the version that would be presented to the MOP. Mr Lenten agreed with this and promised to send the document with the track changes.

20. Developments on the Global Register for Migratory Species (GROMS)

142. The Chairman requested the leader of the working group to report on its activities.

143. Mariano Gimenez-Dixon referred to the decision taken by TC 2 to establish a working group consisting of the main data holders being: WCMC, Birdlife International and Wetlands International. Later on he was requested by the Secretariat to join the group. He introduced the report of the working group (see annex 4). First of all he clarified that the group had strictly stuck to the mandate being to investigate the added value of GROMS for AEWA. Therefore the GROMS had been compared to other existing databases, which were already partners of AEWA. The finding was that GROMS did not store any information that did not exist already in the other databases and that although GROMS contained information about species or groups of species this was not the case for waterbirds. The other point that was considered was the added value of a centralized database as GROMS. Although there are some advantages in having a centralized database there are also some disadvantages in particular if it only compiles existing information. Regarding the latter GROMS is duplicating the activities of Biodiversity Conservation Information System. In terms of costs involved the group thought that it was not worthwhile for AEWA to join the GROMS.

144. Gerard Adams said that there was a lot to say from the German side on the GROMS as they had developed the database. He explained its background and why the German Government invested DM 1 million in the development of this database. CMS has committed itself to take over the database after the initial phase. In his view it was too premature to decide on GROMS at this moment because the future maintenance should be clarified by CMS. Unfortunately it was not very clear what the CMS Secretariat will do with this system and therefore he propose to wait until CMS had taken a decision. Finally he regretted that nor representatives of the German Government neither Mr Klaus Riede had been involved in the discussion of the working group, as they would certainly could have provided the working group with more information on GROMS.

145. Klaus Riede added that it already existed cooperation with AEWA regarding digitalising some of the maps of the Anatidae Atlas to be used for the AEWA Website. The second point he mentioned was that the existing systems that are available at the Web do not provide information on CD-rom, GROMS does. The CD allows countries that have no access to the Internet to get the information. The CD is also a PR tool that could be useful for AEWA to distribute to other sectors. The last point he raised was connecting other databases. He referred to the discussion on the GEF project of the previous day where the need of connecting existing databases was foreseen, as GROMS does.

146. Mr Lenten observed that the working group, consisting of experts on data management, had made clear that GROMS had no added value for AEWA. It was also noted that CMS had not made clear how they would maintain the database and what they will do with it after taking over at COP7. Because of these uncertainties GROMS will not be tabled at the MOP. Therefore he proposed to postpone the discussion on GROMS to the next TC meeting in 2003.

147. On behalf of CMS Ms Jasmin Kanza said that the German Government was ready to hand over the database to CMS and that they would manage it. In her view AEWA should decide in this meeting if they would become involved in GROMS.

148. The Executive Secretary responded to this that if a decision was taken in that moment, based on the outcome of the working group, it would be negative regarding becoming involved in GROMS.

149. The meeting agreed to postpone the discussion on the GROMS to 2003. It was also agreed that not only the current GROMS but also future development of GROMS should be taken into account. The TC would like to be consulted by CMS regarding future development of GROMS. It was decided to send the minutes of this TC meeting and the report of the working group to CMS. Furthermore the meeting invited CMS to come up with a concrete proposal for GROMS including business plan.

150. Finally it was decided that the previous working group would present a proposal to the next TC meeting for future needs of AEWA regarding GROMS. Mariano Gimenez-Dixon decided to step down of the group. On request of Mr Adams it was agreed that Klaus Riede would be added to the working group.

21. Joint work Programme Ramsar/ CMS and AEWA

151. The Executive Secretary introduced the document and explained that before AEWA was integrated in the Agreement Unit in Bonn, CMS had already worked for two years on a joint work programme with Ramsar. Unfortunately, not much progress had been made at that time and therefore the AEWA Secretariat decided to take up this programme and to make contact with the Ramsar Convention. The existing document had been revised including more AEWA issues and was sent to the Ramsar Bureau in April 2001. Since then Mr Lenten communicated regularly with the Deputy Executive Secretary of the Ramsar Convention. The latest information was that the Ramsar Bureau would like to modify and restructure the document. The Executive Secretary hoped that an agreement could be reached on the joint work programme before MOP/ COP.

152. Mr Pritchard confirmed from the Ramsar side that there was great willingness to combine efforts. BirdLife is also involved and has similar comments on the need of restructuring the document.

153. Robert Vagg commented on page 3, point 3 of the draft joint work programme, he thought it was becoming bureaucratic, if sites would be designated under CMS and/ or its related Agreements in addition to sites that had been designated e.g. the UK as Ramsar sites, national sites of scientific interest, habitats sites, etc. Nevertheless this did not mean that the UK does not support the idea of creating network of protective sites relevant to CMS.

154. David Stroud wanted to clarify on page 2 where reference is made to the endorsement of guidelines by respective decision-making bodies and he wanted to know if the AEWA conservation guidelines would be submitted to the Ramsar COP8 for endorsement.

155. Mr Lenten explained that the idea was to avoid duplication and that therefore the respective decision-making bodies would be requested to endorse e.g. guidelines that are also of interest for that specific Agreement. Taking into account the current stage of the AEWA conservation guidelines he did not expect that it would be possible to submit them to the Ramsar COP8 for endorsement.

22. Adoption of Institutional Arrangements

a) Draft Resolution on the Technical Committee

156. The Executive Secretary introduced document TC 3.15 and explained that it was based on the discussion at the last meeting in France.

157. Ward Hagemeyer wanted to know what the real goal of the resolution would be. If it would be to restrict the working area of the TC or to provide a starting point for the discussions on a Standing Committee.

158. Mr Lenten explained that at each MOP a decision had to be taken on appointment of new members. Thus at every MOP a similar document would be tabled. In this case the tasks of the TC would also be made clear.

159. The Chairman started revising the preamble together with the meeting and a number of linguistic comments were made, therefore the text would be amended accordingly (see Annex 5). Afterwards the preamble part was approved.

160. Ward Hagemeyer questioned if it was necessary to mention in the preamble something on the growing number of Parties and that this could have an impact on logistic and financial arrangements or if that should be part of the Secretariat's report.

161. Mr Lenten said that this was important because it would reflect the impact of decisions taken by the MOP1 regarding attendance to the TC meetings of Contracting Parties as observers.

162. Gerard Adams commented on the usefulness to reiterate the text of the Agreement regarding the tasks of the TC. The meeting decided to leave this out and just to refer to Article VII.

163. Before the operational part, the sentence: The meeting of the Parties: was added.

164. David Pritchard was not in favour of keeping paragraph 1 as article VII, which had already been mentioned before, did not restrict the TC to scientific and Technical matters he though the paragraph was unnecessary.

165. Bert Lenten said that the problem was that it was not sure if the Resolution on the Standing Committee would be adopted. He proposed to put the Resolution on the Standing Committee on the Agenda of MOP before this Resolution. If the Resolution on the Standing Committee would be adopted this paragraph would become redundant.

166. The meeting agreed to keep paragraph 1.

167. There was some discussion regarding the possibility that the TC could decide to limit itself to some tasks. In accordance to Article VII the MOP could request the TC to pick up any task they considered necessary to be carried out. Finally, it was agreed to change the wording: *the TC shall concentrated itself on providing scientific and technical advice.*

168. The next point discussed was the operational paragraph 3. It was agreed to change the sentence dealing with participation of Contracting Parties at TC meetings as follows: *Decides that the Contracting Parties can at their own expenses be represented at the meetings of the Technical Committee by one observer.*

169. Furthermore, it was agreed that paragraph 6 should read as follows: *Appoint to the TC, taking into account terms of office in accordance with Rules of Procedure for meetings of the TC, the members and alternates named in annex II to the present Resolution.*

170. Mr Stroud inquired if the appointment of the technical focal points was time limited. The Executive Secretary explained that this is not the case but unfortunately only one Contracting Party so far had nominated a focal point. It was agreed that paragraph 7 should be re-written in order to encourage Parties to nominate a technical focal point.

171. Finally the document with the necessary amendments made during the discussion, was approved.

b) Draft Resolution on the establishment of a Standing Committee.

172. The Executive Secretary presented document TC/3.16. From the consultation with Mr Gerard C. Boere it became clear that the point on the establishment of a Standing Committee had been thoroughly discussed during the Negotiation Meeting in The Hague. At that time it was decided not to mention the Standing Committee in one of the Articles of the Agreement but to make a provision in the Agreement in a way that whenever such a Committee would be needed it could be established.

173. Regarding the proposal for the establishment of the Standing Committee Mr Lenten made clear that at the beginning the number of Committee members should be limited to 7. He proposed to have 5 representatives from the following regions: Europe, Central Asia and Russian Federation, Middle East and Northern Africa, Western and Central Africa and one for Eastern and Southern Africa. This division was mainly based on languages. In addition to these 5 representatives the Committee should also comprise a representative of the host country and the depositary for the next MOP.

174. There was some discussion on the name of this new Committee, however at the end of this discussion the meeting agreed to use the name Standing Committee.

175. Furthermore it was agreed that the Contracting Parties and on invitation some international organisations would be entitled at their own expenses to attend the meetings of the Standing Committee as observers. It was also agreed that the Chairman of the Technical Committee should be entitled to be represented at the Standing Committee meeting as an observer.

176. Mr Biber enquired if both committees would report directly to MOP and if so who would coordinate this to avoid duplication.

177. Bert Lenten responded that both committees would report directly to MOP but that there was a need that the Secretariat coordinated dividends of the work among these committees as well as avoided duplication but moreover that contradictory opinions were submitted to the MOP.

178. Other document: Draft resolution for the acceptance of contributions in kind. David Pritchard reported on the work done with the assistance of Mr Chabeda and presented the document they had prepared. The revisions combined elements included in the draft resolution they did not review the covering note and if the amendments were agreed the text of the note should be also modified. The purpose of the revision was mainly to simplify the approach of the previous draft and to re-order it. The meeting approved the revised version of the draft Resolution (see Annex 6).

23. Adoption of the draft proposal regarding Budget 2003-2005

179. Doc. TC/3.17 was presented by the Executive Secretary who said that since the last discussion in Arles there had been some changes. He revised the budget again in order to look for mistakes or possible savings. For example the salary of the Executive Secretary as agreed during the previous meeting the TC would recommend to the MOP2 to agree to upgrade this post to a P4 level. Meanwhile UNON confirmed that the original job description would qualify for a P4 level. He discovered that the costs would be slightly higher than mentioned in the budget proposal tabled at TC 2.

180. He emphasized that taking into consideration the workload of the Agreement Secretariat there was a serious need to increase the number of staff. However due to budget limitation he proposed to postpone the recruitment to mid 2004.

181. In comparison with the general staff working for the UNEP/ CMS Secretariat there may be a need to reclassify the post of the Assistant. Taking into account the responsibilities of the Assistant it is foreseen that the post after reclassification in 2004 might qualify for G5 or even G6 level.

182. To mitigate problems Germany would face regarding the increase of their annual contribution a withdrawal of the Trust Fund of US \$ 50,000 in 2003 and in 2004 as well as in 2005 an amount of US \$ 100,000 is foreseen. To replenish the Trust Fund the Secretariat proposed to frieze the contributions of all Contracting Parties for the triennium based on the adoption of Annex 9 to the Budget proposal. This will mean that recruitment of new Parties during this period would not lead to a reduction of the annual contribution for each existing Contracting Party but will flow directly into the Trust Fund. These funds would be used as mentioned before to mitigate some problems. The meeting agreed with this proposal.

183. Gerard Adams said that he would try to convince his Government to agree with the increase of the budget for the Agreement, however he could not guarantee any success.

184. As the meeting had no more comments or questions the Chairman confirmed that the budget would be taken to the MOP for its adoption.

24. Development of the Action Plan for the Central Asian-Indian Flyway

185. The Executive Secretary presented documents 18 and 19 and started by explaining that the draft action plan had been developed by Wetlands International with a subsidy from the Dutch Government. Unfortunately,

the process on further development of the Action Plan was hampered by Wetlands International financial situation. He hoped these problems could be solved soon in order to continue with the activities.

186. Doc. 18 was written by the Secretariat, it is dealing with 3 options for future concerted conservation action in the CAIF region. This document gives some background information on pros and cons of each option. Mr Lenten asked the TC if they wished to propose a recommendation on this for MOP2.

187. Ward Hagemeyer doubted that the TC was in the position to make a recommendation. In his view the region should make such recommendation. Furthermore, he thought that it was too early to say what the best option for the region would be.

188. The view of Mr Biber was that this item should be on the agenda of the CMS COP. Ms Kanza confirmed that during the COP a side event on the CAIF had been planned, however, as far as she knew the item had not been placed on the COP agenda.

189. Mr Adams expressed his concerns regarding expanding the AEWA Agreement Area. In his view this should be carefully examined, as the AEWA exists now for two years and a half and it is still in the developing phase, perhaps it would be too much to include at this stage the CAIF region. Mr Biber supported the view of Germany and expressed that in his view the three options should be reviewed thoroughly, however a positive response should be sent to countries that are willing to cooperate with AEWA.

190. After summarizing the discussion the Chairman invited the meeting to come up with a decision.

191. David Pritchard responded to this by saying that the TC should express that it welcomes and supports the initiatives that have been undertaken, to start activities for the CAIF region. Furthermore, he thought that AEWA should develop some views on extending the Agreement area and therefore further analysis of the pros and cons was needed.

192. Ward Hagemeyer reiterated what had already been agreed during the TC 2 meeting that AEWA should stay involved in the further development of CAIF.

193. Taking into account that probably a consultative meeting on the CAIF would take place during COP7 and later on in 2003 a formal meeting in the region, Bert Lenten thought that further discussion could be postponed to the next TC meeting.

194. Ward Hagemeyer requested the TC to get involved in the further elaboration of the note on the three options.

195. The meeting agreed to establish a working group, for which WCMC and Switzerland volunteered. Wetlands International and the Secretariat would also be involved.

25. Development of International Species Actions Plans

196. The Executive Secretary presented the docs 20, 21, 22 and 23, which are being executed by BirdLife International. The latter would be very pleased to receive any additional comments, which should be sent to the project coordinator Mr Umberto Gallo-Orsi.

197. The Secretariat is still waiting for comments from range states on the Action Plan on Brent Goose.

198. In relation to the comments that should be provided to BirdLife, David Pritchard said that it would be particularly helpful if the TC members would give comments on their views. He took the opportunity to invite the participants to a meeting of bird experts under the auspices of the Bern Convention that would take place the following month. This meeting would have as a key part of its agenda the continuing discussions about the establishment of a common system for monitoring and reviews of species action plans mostly in Europe aiming to engage not only the Bern Convention and NGO's but also the European Commission, CMS and AEWA, which participation is expected at the meeting.

199. Here Mr Adams presented briefly the National Action Plan on the Golden plover. The main problem this small population is facing is that during migration it mixes up with other populations in Southern Europe. During wintering in these areas they are being hunted which could be detrimental for the future of the small population in lower Saxony. Mr. Adams requested the TC to provide him with some advice on how to detect the migration route of this population. He also requested for some suggestions on how to deal with the problem of mixing up of this small population and the hunting issue. Although the Agreement provides a possibility to prohibit hunting on endangered population it is not clear if this is feasible.

200. Herby Kalchreuter commented that he had sincere doubts whether the little population in lower Saxony was a population by itself; as it seems to be the southwest end of the Scandinavian population. Only because the habitat that is relative favourable the species is breeding there. The second point he raised was that lost of habitats could never be compensated by a hunting ban. Hunting in the wintering areas may seem to be a significant threat, as long as there is no statistic available on how many Golden Plovers are being shot it will be hard to proof the threat. In his view if this population mixed up with a meta-population the chance is very low that a bird from lower Saxony to be shot. He gave the advice to start finding out the bag statistics, harvest rates and other measurements before starting to request a hunting ban.

201. John Swift said that from the UK's point of view the issue of the Golden Plover was directly linked to land use. He thought that it would be to premature to request a hunting ban at this moment, he offered to provide a platform to present the information from Germany to FACE and to the appropriate audience so that a good response to Germany could be considered.

202. Christoph Zöckler commented more generally on the species Action Plans. He said that it was to early to make some speculation on reasons for possible decline of population, this should be much more elaborated with decent background information. Regarding the BirdLife Action Plans he thought they are too much based on the World BirdLife database and that the scope should be broader.

203. The Executive Secretary proposed that instead of sending their comments individually to BirdLife International, they should send them directly to the Secretariat and that he would present them to BirdLife on behalf of the TC so that their input could be recognized as a whole. He gave a deadline of three weeks as from the coming Friday.

26. Arrangements for the Second session of the Meeting of the Parties

204. Gerard Adams gave a presentation on MOP2 showing the premises where the meeting will take place and explained the logistical details for the meeting.

27. Draft Agenda for MOP2

205. Bert Lenten introduced doc 24, which looked similar to the agenda of the TC meeting. Regarding the agenda point dealing with Party reports he informed the meeting that currently he had only received two reports and hoped that more will follow soon.

28. Proposals regarding MOP3

206. No proposals had been received to host the next MOP3 but Mr Lenten invited countries from outside Europe to make proposals and he offered to provide information on the requirements.

29. Date and venue of the next meeting of the Technical Committee

207. Bert Lenten commented that UK had proposed to host the TC5 meeting in early 2004 and he suggested linking this meeting with the conference on International Flyways, which will take place in Edinburgh.

208. Up to that moment there was no offer to host the TC meeting in 2003. Mr Chabeda, on behalf of UNEP, offered to host the meeting in Nairobi in case nobody made an offer.

30. Any other business

209. Ward Hagemeyer mentioned that Gerard Boere was preparing a conference on global flyways, which would take place in 2004. He suggested that a member of the TC and specifically an African colleague should represent Africa at this meeting, and he asked for volunteers.

210. The Chairman proposed Mr Mlingwa, who accepted, this proposal was seconded by Mr Mokoko.

211. Mr Biber wanted to raise an issue regarding the conservation guidelines, as in Switzerland they had performed an analysis aiming to identify possible gaps in their legislation assessing the needs for action and also looking at the implementation of AEWA in Switzerland. The analysis exists in German language and it will be translated into French, in case any Party would be interested it could be translated into English and be distributed at the MOP in Bonn. Mr Lenten said that it would be really useful to have the document in English for Parties.

212. Ms Angela Mwakatobe gave a presentation on the activities of TAWIRI.

213. Mr Lenten informed the meeting that AEWA had produced two new posters, one on the Dark-bellied Brent Goose and one on Flamingos. These posters would be distributed soon.

214. Doc. 3.25, the Tasks List of the TC was not discussed. Bert Lenten proposed to revise it and to submit it to the next TC.

215. Mr Lenten raised the point on the need for interpretation from English into French and vice versa during TC meetings. Mr Mokoko responded that he could agree that no interpretation service should be provided for TC meetings. Mr Lenten promised that he would translate the documents into French as much as possible.

31. Closure

216. The Chairman thanked all the delegates for their cooperation.

217. The Executive Secretary thanked the Government of Tanzania for hosting this meeting and for organising the excellent excursion on Sunday.

ANNEX 1:

OPENING REMARKS BY THE DIRECTOR OF WILDLIFE AT THE OFFICIAL OPENING OF THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING OF THE AFRICAN-EURASIAN MIGRATORY WATERBIRD AGREEMENT (AEWA)

Date: 27 May 2002, TAUSI ROOM, AICC, Arusha

Honourable Members of the AEWA Secretariat, Members of the Technical Committee, Director General of the Tanzania Wildlife Research Institute, invited Participants, Ladies and Gentlemen.

It is with great pleasure that I take this opportunity to welcome you to Tanzania. Meanwhile I would like to use the same opportunity to welcome you to this AEWA Technical Committee meeting.

Since Tanzania became Party to the Agreement it is clear that there were no dreams of hosting such a big and important meeting pertaining to birdlife in Tanzania. In light of this experience therefore, all Tanzanians particularly members of the wildlife conservation authorities today are feeling very proud and honoured to have such a meeting here in Arusha, the number one tourist destination.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I would like to inform you that the idea for Tanzania to host this meeting proposed during the last AEWA Technical Committee meeting in Arles, France. Arrangements regarding the preparations for this meeting would not be possible without the commitment and tireless devotion of the Tanzania Wildlife Research Institute, in particular Dr. Charles Mlingwa and his team, the national AEWA Committee, the Management of Arusha International Conference Centre, Tanzania National Parks and above all, my Division, which is the custodian of AEWA in Tanzania. On Behalf of the Government of Tanzania and on my own behalf, I would like to express our heartfelt gratitude to all who made this meeting possible.

Since the African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbird Agreement (AEWA) is not well understood to some participants of this meeting with regard to Tanzania, in my view I feel this is a proper forum to provide to you with some tips on the Agreement and related issues.

- In 1999 Tanzania became member to the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (Bonn Convention). Being a member to the Bonn Convention entails the member country to undertake AEWA responsibilities, to which Tanzania is a Party.
- In 2000 the Government of Tanzania ratified the Convention on Wetlands popularly known as Ramsar Convention,
- To ensure proper implementation of the Bonn Convention as well as AEWA, a forum for exchanging experiences on matters concerning wetlands conservation and management was formed in June 2001. The forum known as Informal Wetlands Working Group (IWWG) under the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, the Wildlife Division being the custodian.

In developing ways to implement the Bonn and Ramsar Conventions and AEWA IWWG formed a waterbirds committee and given the responsibilities on technical matters regarding AEWA. This subcommittee is therefore known as the national AEWA Committee and draws members from government institutions, non-governmental organisations, research institutions and the private sector. Im am happy to note that some of the AEWA Committee members are present here today to witness at least the opening of the Technical Committee meeting.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is worth-mentioning that since it was formed, the national AEWA Committee participated in the flamingo counting in the Tanzania Rift Valley Lakes in January 2002, and is now developing national species action plans for waterbirds including those under AEWA.

With these few remarks, may I conclude by

WISHING YOU GOODLUCK AND FRUITFUL DISCUSSIONS AND DELIBERATIONS

I now declare the meeting open.

Thank you.

ANNEX 2:

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR MEETINGS OF THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE OF THE AGREEMENT ON THE CONSERVATION OF AFRICAN-EURASIAN MIGRATORY WATERBIRDS (AEWA)

General functions

Rule 1

The Technical Committee, established in accordance with Article VII of the Agreement, provides scientific and technical advice and information, to the Meeting of the Parties and, through the Agreement Secretariat to the Parties. Its functions are defined in Article VII paragraph 3.

Rule 2

In particular, it makes recommendations to the Meeting of the Parties concerning the Action Plan, implementation of the Agreement and further research to be carried out.

Rule 3

In the event of an emergency the Technical Committee may request the Agreement Secretariat to urgently convene a Meeting of Parties concerned, to avoid deterioration of the conservation status of one or more migratory waterbird species.

Representation and attendance

Rule 4

1. In accordance with Article VII paragraph 1, the Committee membership shall comprise:
 - (a) nine experts representing the different regions of the Agreement Area (north & south west Europe, central Europe, eastern Europe, south-western Asia, north Africa, central Africa, west Africa, east and south Africa) elected among all the Parties on the recommendation of the Parties of the region in question;
 - (b) one representative appointed by each of the following organisations: the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN), Wetlands International, the International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC); and
 - (c) one expert from each of the following fields: rural economics, game management, and environmental law; elected by the Parties.
1. Any Party has the right to recommend an expert in the fields of rural economics, game management and environmental law for nomination by the Meeting of the Parties.
2. With exception of the experts in the field of rural economics, game management and environmental law all the above-mentioned representatives, shall name an Alternate Member for each position to be approved by the Meeting of the Parties.

Rule 5

Except as provided for in Rule 8, attendance at meetings of the Technical Committee shall be limited to members of the Technical Committee or their Alternates and observers of the Parties.

Rule 6

Only Members shall exercise the voting rights. In his/her absence, the Alternate shall act in his or her place.

Rule 7

1. The term of office of the members shall expire at the close of the second ordinary Meeting following that at which they were elected. At each ordinary meeting of the Meeting of the Parties, elections shall be held only for those regional members whose term of office will have expired at the close of the meeting and for any regional member who indicates a desire to stand down without completing a full term of office. The same provisions shall apply with respect to the alternate members nominated in accordance with rule 4.

2. In the instance a Member and/ his Alternate stands down simultaneously without completing a full term of office the Chair of the Technical Committee in close cooperation with the region/ organisation involved and in consultation with the Agreement Secretariat is permitted to nominate an expert of the region or organisation involved to replace the Member and Alternate intersessionally with full voting rights. The term of office of the replacement member alternate shall expire at the close of the next ordinary Meeting of the Parties with the possibility that the Meeting appoints him/ her as a representative or alternate.

Rule 8

1. The Chairperson may invite observers of non-contracting Parties and invite or admit a maximum of four observers from specialized international inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations.
2. In addition, at each meeting of the Technical Committee, the Chairperson may invite guests to contribute to specific agenda items.

Officers

Rule 9

The members of the Committee shall elect a Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson from their regional representatives of the Parties, for terms corresponding to those of the Meetings of the Parties. This election will normally take place immediately before the Meeting of the Parties, and the newly elected officers shall assume their functions at the conclusion of the corresponding Meeting of the Parties.

Rule 10

The Chairperson shall preside at meetings of the Committee, approve the provisional agenda prepared by the Secretariat for circulation, and liaise with committees between meetings of the Committee. The Chairperson may represent the Committee as required within the limits of the Committee mandate, and shall carry out such other functions as may be entrusted to him/her by the Committee

Rule 11

The Vice-Chairperson shall assist in the execution of the Chairperson's duties, and shall preside at meetings in the absence of the Chairperson.

Rule 12

The Agreement Secretariat shall serve the meetings of the Committee.

Elections

Rule 13

If in an election to fill one place no candidate obtains an overall majority in the first ballot, a second ballot shall be taken, restricted to the two candidates obtaining the largest number of votes. If the second ballot the votes are equally divided, the presiding officer shall decide between the candidates by drawing lots.

Rule 14

If in the first ballot there is a tie amongst candidates obtaining the second largest number of votes, a special ballot shall be held amongst them to reduce the number of candidates to two.

Rule 15

In the case of a tie amongst three or more candidates obtaining the largest number of votes in the first ballot, a special ballot shall be held amongst them to reduce the number of candidates to two. If a tie then results amongst two or more candidates, the presiding officer shall reduce the number to two by drawing lots, and a further ballot shall be held in accordance with Rule 13.

Meetings

Rule 16

Meetings of the Committee shall be convened by the Agreement Secretariat in conjunction with each ordinary session of the Meeting of the Parties and at least once between ordinary sessions of the Meeting of the Parties.

Rule 17

Where in the opinion of the Committee an emergency has arisen, which requires the adoption of immediate measures to avoid deterioration of the conservation status of one or more migratory waterbird species, the Chairperson may request the Agreement Secretariat to urgently convene a meeting of the Parties concerned.

Rule 18

Notice of meetings, including date and venue, shall be sent to all Parties by the Secretariat at least 45 days in advance and, in the case of extraordinary meetings, at least 14 days in advance.

Rule 19

A quorum for a meeting shall consist of half of the members of the Committee. No decision shall be taken at a meeting in the absence of a quorum.

Rule 20

Decisions of the Committee shall be taken by consensus unless a vote is requested by the Chairperson or by three members.

Rule 21

Decisions of the Committee by voting (pursuant to Rule 20) shall be passed by a simple majority vote of the members present. In the case of a tie, the motion shall be considered rejected.

Rule 22

A summary record of each meeting shall be prepared by the Secretariat as soon as possible and shall be communicated to all members of the Technical Committee..

Working groups

Rule 23

The Committee may establish such ad hoc working groups as may be necessary to deal with specific tasks. It shall define the terms of reference and composition of each working group.

Rule 24

Insofar as they are applicable, these Rules shall apply *mutatis mutandis* to the proceedings of working groups.

Rule 25

The Committee shall receive reports from other committees and working groups established under the Agreement, as necessary.

Communication procedure

Rule 26

Any member or the Technical Committee, or the Secretariat, may submit a proposal to the Chairperson of the Technical Committee for a decision by correspondence. Upon request by the Chairperson the Secretariat shall communicate the proposal to the members for comments within 60 days of the date of communication. Any comments received within these limits shall also be so communicated.

Rule 27

If, by the date on which comments on a proposal were due to be communicated, the Secretariat has not received any objection from a member, the proposal shall be adopted, and notice of the adoption shall be given to all members.

Rule 28

If any member objects to a proposal within the applicable time limit, the proposal shall be referred to the next meeting of the Committee.

Rule 29

The Secretariat shall inform the Contracting Parties on the date and venue of the next Meeting of the Technical Committee. For each Meeting of the Technical Committee the Contracting Parties will receive at least the provisional agenda and draft minutes of the previous meeting. All other documents to be discussed will be made available through the Agreement's website.

Rule 30

The regional representative shall endeavour to ensure a flow of information between the Technical Committee and the Contracting Parties in their region..

Other functions

Rule 31

The Chairperson shall submit a written report on the Committee's work since the previous ordinary meeting to each ordinary Meeting of the Parties.

Final provisions

Rule 32

These Rules shall be applied at the first meeting of the Committee following their approval by the Meeting of the Parties, and may be amended by the Committee as required, in accordance with the provisions of the Agreement and decisions.

Agreement on the conservation of African-Eurasian
migratory waterbirds
The Hague, 15 August 1996

The Agreement was signed for the following States:

Germany ¹⁾	15 August 1996
the Kingdom of the Netherlands	15 August 1996
Ireland ¹⁾	27 August 1996
the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland ¹⁾	23 September 1996
Switzerland	15 October 1996
Sudan	31 December 1996
Jordan.....	12 March 1997
Egypt ¹⁾	20 August 1997
the European Community ²⁾	1 September 1997
Mali ¹⁾	25 September 1997
Luxemburg ¹⁾	27 October 1997
Morocco ¹⁾	19 November 1997
Togo ¹⁾	2 February 1998
Spain ¹⁾	20 February 1998
Greece ¹⁾	14 May 1998
Romania ¹⁾	7 August 1998
Sweden ³⁾	5 October 1998
Ukraine ¹⁾	16 October 1998
France ¹⁾	25 November 1998
Finland ⁴⁾	3 February 1999
Guinea.....	4 March 1999
Monaco ¹⁾	10 March 1999
Gambia ¹⁾	12 March 1999
Niger ²⁾	27 April 1999
Senegal.....	27 April 1999
Bulgaria ¹⁾	5 July 1999
the Republic of Congo ¹⁾	30 August 1999
Tanzania ¹⁾	31 August 1999
Belgium ¹⁾⁵⁾	29 October 1999
Benin.....	26 October 1999
Denmark ²⁾	29 October 1999
South Africa ¹⁾	29 October 1999

¹⁾ Subject to ratification

²⁾ Subject to approval

³⁾ The Government of Sweden declared the following:

"... in accordance with Article V 1(a) and (b) of the Agreement Sweden hereby designates as implementing authority of the Agreement and contact point for the other Parties The Swedish National Environmental Protection Agency, (Statens naturvårdsverk), S-106 48 Stockholm, Sweden. Tel. + 46-8-698 10 00, Fax +46-8-20 29 25."

⁴⁾ Subject to acceptance

⁵⁾ Also for "le Gouvernement de Région wallone" and "le Gouvernement de Région de Bruxelles-Capitale".

Signed for “le Gouvernement de la Région flamande” by the Attaché de la Communauté flamande.

The following States ratified (R), accepted (A) or approved (a) the Agreement:

Germany (R).....	9 December 1998
the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland ¹⁾ (R).....	22 February 1999
Egypt (R).....	4 March 1999
Gambia (R).....	12 March 1999
Togo (A).....	22 March 1999
Spain (R).....	30 March 1999
Monaco (R).....	15 June 1999
the Republic of Congo (R).....	30 August 1999
Niger (a).....	31 August 1999
Tanzania (R).....	31 August 1999
Mali (R).....	18 October 1999
Denmark ²⁾ (a).....	29 October 1999
Finland ³⁾ (A).....	29 October 1999
Bulgaria ⁴⁾ (R).....	23 November 1999
Romania (R).....	4 July 2000
South Africa (R).....	1 January 2002

¹⁾ Also for the Bailiwick of Guernsey, the Bailiwick of Jersey, Isle of Man, Gibraltar and St. Helena and Dependencies.

²⁾ With a reservation for the application to Greenland.

³⁾ With the following reservations:

"1. In accordance with Article XV and Annex 3, paragraph 2.1.2, Finland declares that the provisions contained in the said paragraph do not apply to the Åland Islands as regards two species, Velvet Scoter (*Melanitta fusca*) and Common Scoter (*Melanitta nigra*), mentioned in Table 1 column B, and the taking of these species is allowed in the Åland Islands.

2. The provisions contained in Annex 3, paragraphs 2.1.2 and 2.1.3 do not apply to those species which are subject to spring taking in the Åland Islands.

3. The provisions contained in Annex 3, paragraphs 4.1.4, endeavouring to phase out the use of lead shot, do not apply to the Åland Islands."

⁴⁾ By note of 22 November 1999 the Embassy of Bulgaria at The Hague communicated the following: "... the competent institutions for Bulgaria for the Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds are:

Ministry of Environment and Water
National Nature Protection Service
67, William Gladstone Str.
1000 Sofia, Bulgaria
tel.: 003592 84 72 62 53
fax: 003592 52 16 34 .

Ministry of Justice and Legal Eurointegration
Department "Legal Eurointegration and International Legal Cooperation"
1, "Slavianska" Str.
1000 Sofia, Bulgaria
tel.: 003592 988 45 89; 980 92 22
fax: 003592 980 92 23; 981 10 96."

The following States acceded to the Agreement:

the Macedonian Republic.....	1 November 1999
Croatia	26 June 2000
Uganda.....	22 September 2000
Mauritius.....	26 October 2000
Moldova ¹⁾	17 January 2001
Kenya.....	9 March 2001
the Slovak Republic ²⁾	23 April 2001
Georgia	28 May 2001
Albania	20 June 2001

¹⁾ With the following declaration:

“Responsible authority of the Republic of Moldova in accordance with the provisions of Article V paragraph (b) of the Agreement on the conservation of african- Eurasian migratory waterbirds is the Ministry of Environment and Territorial Development of the Republic of Moldova.

postal address:

9 Cosmonautilor str.,
Chinsinau, MD-2005, Republic of Moldova
phone + 373 2 22 62 73
fax +373 2 22 07 48

Contact person: Mr. Ion Bejenaru
chief of the Section on the bio-diversity conservation
and management of protected areas
e-mail: Biodiver@mediu.moldavo.md”.

²⁾ With the following declaration:

“[The] Slovak Republic shall not be bound by the provisions of article 4.1.4 of the Action Plan and will not phase out the use of lead shot for hunting in wetlands.”.

Entry into force

In accordance with Article XIV, first paragraph, the Agreement entered into force on 1 November 1999 for the Republic of Congo, Egypt, Gambia, Germany, Guinea, Jordan, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, Monaco, Niger, Senegal, Spain, Sweden, Sudan, Switzerland, Tanzania, Togo and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Entry into force for:

Benin.....	1 January 2000
Denmark	1 January 2000
Finland.....	1 January 2000
Mali.....	1 January 2000
the Macedonian Republic.....	1 February 2000
Bulgaria	1 February 2000
Croatia	1 September 2000
Romania.....	1 October 2000
Uganda.....	1 December 2000
Mauritius.....	1 January 2001
Moldova.....	1 April 2001
Kenya.....	1 June 2001
the Slovak Republic.....	1 July 2001
Georgia	1 August 2001
Albania	1 September 2001
South Africa.....	1 April 2002

**Report on the Status and Use of GROMS for the AEWA
(for discussion at the third AEWA Technical Committee meeting, May 2002)**

Background

To date the Global Register on Migratory Species (GROMS) has been developed with support of the German Government which provided funding. Since the beginning of the project around DM 1 million have been invested to develop this database. The last phase of the project will expire soon and the German Government has indicated that the funding of this project will stop too. It has been foreseen that the project would be handed over to CMS. The question is how to maintain and further expand the dbase. One of the options is that a data manager will be contracted by CMS. Informally CMS made a proposal to the Agreement's Secretariats for the maintenance of this database. The idea is that all Secretariats will financially contribute to the maintenance of GROMS.

At the 2nd meeting of the Technical Committee of AEWA (nov.2001) Agenda item: 20 (Doc: AEWA/ TC2.13; 9 October 2001) discussed support to the development and implementation of GROMS. Dr Klaus Riede introduced the GROMS. The AEWA Secretariat opened the discussion requesting, that before AEWA joins this project and contributes to the maintenance and further development of GROMS, all pros and cons be identified. No definitive conclusion resulted from the debate, for which the Executive Secretary suggested to establish a working group "with data holders and others to investigate the added value for AEWA of GROMS, compared to existing databases, and also the cost involved in terms of money and effort." The group was set up with representatives of Wetlands International; WCMC and BirdLife International, with the mandate to report back at the next meeting of the TC with guidance. In Mid-April 2002, IUCN was asked to join the working group.

The Working Group was formed by: Christoph Zockler and Gerardo Fragoso (UNEP-WCMC); David Pritchard and John O'Sullivan (RSPB-BirdLife); Ward Hagemeijer (Wetlands Int.) and Mariano Gimenez Dixon (IUCN). The Working Group communicated, exchanged comments and opinions, mainly via e-mail. The following paragraphs report the Group's conclusions:

The Report:

It is first necessary to clarify that the Group does not emit opinion on the GROMS database as such. Its characteristics and quality are not the concern of the Working Group and the comments that follow do not imply any position (positive or negative) towards the database itself. This report only contains the opinions of the members of the Working Group regarding the added value of GROMS for AEWA, compared to existing databases, and also the cost involved in terms of money and effort. In this respect the Working Group believes that:

1- Added value FOR AEWA of GROMS, compared to existing databases?

AEWA has not yet had needs for information that are not available within the information systems of its member parties and/or "partner" organizations. Most notably:

- Species Conservation Database – Animals (UNEP-WCMC)
- IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (IUCN)
- Specialists Groups' databases – Goose, Wader, Herons, Divers (IUCN and Wetlands International)
- IWC – International Waterbird Census (Wetlands International)
- Important Bird Areas (BirdLife International)
- Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF)
- European Ornithological Atlas Database (European Bird Census Council)
- etc.

The Working Group does not see that GROMS stores information that is not (or cannot) already be stored by existing databases within the organizations with which AEWA can work/form partnerships. Though GROMS

may now contain information of species/groups of species that are not currently in other databases, this is not the case of water birds (i.e. AEWA's concern).

It has been mentioned that one of the advantages of GROMS is that it "centralized" into one database information that is otherwise dispersed in various sources. It is our opinion that even if the "communication" between these systems is far from ideal, centralizing it all into GROMS would not necessarily solve them and would have a series of problems involving intellectual property and copy-rights; maintenance and updating, etc. Additionally, various of the organizations mentioned in the above list are part of the Biodiversity Conservation Information System (BCIS), a consortium of ten international conservation organizations and programs of IUCN which collectively represent the single greatest global source of bio-diversity conservation information in the world. One of the aims of the BCIS is precisely to allow interconnectivity amongst different databases.

2 "Cost involved in terms of money and effort"

The German Government has reiterated that they will not continue funding the database. This means that new funds would have to be provided by those who decide to support it. Should these be the CMS and its Agreements (Eurobats; CWSS; ACCOBAMS; ASCOBANS, AEWA) this would mean a significant financial commitment per year.

It is apparent that AEWA has no need to invest financial resources to maintain information that is already maintained by the other organizations. If AEWA has a specific need for compilation in a study or evaluation, the services could be obtained at a lower cost by paying only the necessary marginal costs incurred by the given project.

3- A last consideration: It is our understanding that UNEP is developing its information management "hub" (for itself and to serve the Multilateral Environmental Agreements -including CMS and AEWA). This being the case, we believe that it should be up to UNEP's information/database structures to evaluate how to best maintain the information it manages. What is important is that the information is maintained and accessible. This could be achieved by establishing interconnectivity between existing databases.

Conclusion:

In conclusion, when it is compared to existing databases and costs involved in funds and effort, the Working Group does not believe that the GROMS database provides added value for AEWA. The prior statement does not imply an opinion on the GROMS database in terms of its intrinsic quality or usefulness for other purposes including other CMS Agreements. The Working Group encourages the AEWA-Secretariat to support, within available resources, the establishment of interconnectivity between existing databases and information sources of its interest.

A workshop in Bonn last May raised a number of opportunities for the future of GROMS. It is recommended that these are explored further and assessed carefully to identify the role that GROMS may play in a wider framework of integration with the various specialised information facilities that currently support the work of AEWA.

DRAFT RESOLUTION 2.6

INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS: TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

Recalling that pursuant Article VII of the Agreement, the First Meeting of the Parties, through Resolution 1.8 established and determined the composition of the Technical Committee,

Further recalling the decision of the First session of the Meeting of the Parties, as laid down in Resolution 1.8, that Parties are entitled to attend the Meetings of the Technical Committee as observer;

Noting that the composition of the Technical Committee according to the Agreement shall comprise of 9 regional representatives, one representative from IUCN, one from Wetlands International, one from the International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC) and one expert from each of the following fields: rural economics, game management and environmental law,

Noting that the Chairman may admit a maximum of four observers from specialized international inter-governmental and non-governmental organisations to attend the meeting,

Further noting that although Resolutions 1.8, paragraph 5, requested each Contracting Party to appoint by the end of April 2000 a suitably qualified expert in that country to act as a focal point for Technical Committee matters, etc., so far only a few focal points have been appointed;

Bearing in mind that no provisions have been made for payment of travel costs for observers from developing countries or from countries with economies in transition,

Further bearing in mind that the number of Contracting Parties is steadily growing and that this might lead to increasing number of Parties wishing to attend the Technical Committee Meetings as observer, which would have an impact on logistical and financial arrangements,

Conscious of the need to improve the communication between the Technical Committee and all Range States and in particular with the Contracting Parties,

Recalling that Article VII of the Agreement describes the tasks of the Technical Committee,

Acknowledging with appreciation that the Technical Committee has taken up its role by e.g. providing scientific and technical advice and information to the Meeting of the Parties and, through the Agreement Secretariat to the Parties,

Aware of the concerns of the Technical Committee, that besides involvement in scientific and technical issues, the Technical Committee has been requested to provide advice to the Meeting of the Parties, through the Agreement Secretariat on administrative and financial matters, without having the necessary expertise,

Aware that the members and alternates, as mentioned in Annex II of Resolution 1.8 have been appointed in the first instance until the second Session of the Meeting of the Parties,

The Meeting of the Parties:

1. Agrees that the Technical Committee concentrates on providing scientific and technical advice;

2. Instructs the Technical Committee, through regional representatives and in close cooperation with the Agreement Secretariat, to improve the communication with all Range States and in particular with the Contracting Parties;
3. Decides that Contracting Parties can at their own expenses be represented at meetings of the Technical Committee by one observer;
4. Adopts the revised Rules of Procedure for the meetings of the Technical Committee, as attached hereto in Annex 1;
5. Instructs the Secretariat to provide the necessary support to the Technical Committee in accordance with Article VII of the Agreement, the provisions in the budget for the Agreement and the activities of the Technical Committee or the Agreement Secretariat as adopted by Resolution 2.9;
6. Appoints to the Technical Committee, taking into account terms of office in accordance with Rule 7 of the Rules of Procedure for meetings of the Technical Committee, the members and alternates named in Annex II to the present Resolution;
7. Request each Contracting Party to appoint before 1 January 2003 a suitable qualified technical expert in that country to act as a focal point for the Technical Committee matters, and, as appropriate, to provide input into work of the Technical Committee either directly or through liaison with other suitably qualified technical experts and to disseminate the work of the Committee in their country.

DRAFT RESOLUTION 2.7

INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS: STANDING COMMITTEE

Recalling that pursuant Article VI paragraph 9 e the Meeting of the Parties may establish such subsidiary bodies as it deems necessary to assist in the implementation of this Agreement, in particular for coordination with bodies established under other international treaties, conventions and agreements with overlapping geographic and taxonomic coverage;

Recalling further that at its first Session the Meeting of the Parties established a Technical Committee to provide scientific and technical advice and information to Meeting of the Parties and, through the Agreement Secretariat, to Parties;

Recognizing that the Executive Director of the United Nations Environmental Programme is responsible for the administration of the Secretariat;

Noting that no provisions have been made to provide guidance and advice to the Secretariat on policy, financial and, which the Secretariat may raise between sessions of the Meeting of the Parties;

Considering the usefulness of a small permanent committee for matters relating to the organization of meetings and for the continuous implementation of the Agreement

The Meeting of the Parties:

1. *Decides* to establish a Standing Committee, which, within the policy agreed by the Meeting of the Parties shall;

- a) carry out between sessions of the Meeting of the Parties, such interim activity on behalf of the Meeting as may be necessary;
- b) make recommendations for consideration at the next session of the Meeting of the Parties;
- c) oversee, on behalf of the Parties, the development and execution of the Secretariat's budget as derived from the Trust Fund and other sources, and also all aspects of fund-raising undertaken by the Secretariat in order to carry out specific functions authorized by the Meeting of the Parties;
- d) oversee, as representative of the Meeting of the Parties, the implementation of policy by the Secretariat and conduct of the Secretariat's programmes;
- e) provide guidance and advice to the Secretariat on implementation of the Agreement, on the preparation of meetings, and on any other matters relating to the exercise of its functions brought to it by the Secretariat;
- f) represent the Meeting of the Parties, vis-à-vis the Government of the host country of the Secretariat's headquarters, UNEP and other international organisations for consideration of matters relating to the Agreement and its Secretariat;
- g) act as bureau at the sessions of the Meeting of the Parties, in accordance with the rules of procedure of the Meeting of the Parties;
- h) report to the Meeting of the Parties on the activities that have been carried out between ordinary sessions of the Meeting of the Parties;
- i) perform any other functions that may be entrusted to it by the Meeting of the Parties;

2. *Determines* the following principles for the composition of and the procedures to be followed by the Standing Committee:

- a) The Committee shall consist of not more than 7 Contracting Parties, who shall be appointed by the Meeting of the Parties. For at least five of these members, the appointing shall be based upon the

principle of balanced geographical distribution¹. The remaining two members shall be comprised of the host country for the next session of the Meeting of the Parties and a representative from the Depositary.

- b) The Meeting of the Parties shall appoint an alternate member for a member described in paragraph (a). Any such alternate shall be represented at meetings as a regional member only in the absence of a representative of the member for which it is the alternate;
- c) If an extraordinary session of the Meeting of the Parties is held between two ordinary sessions, the host Party of that extra ordinary session shall participate as an observer in the work of the Committee on matters related to the organisation of the extraordinary session;
- d) Contracting Parties, which are not members of the Standing Committee shall be entitled to be represented at meetings of the Committee by an observer who will have the right to participate at their own expenses but not to vote;
- e) The Chairman may invite any person or representative of any other country, organisation and the Chairman of the Technical Committee to participate in meetings of the Committee as an observer without the right to vote;
- f) The membership of the Committee shall be reviewed at each ordinary session of the Meeting of the Parties, in accordance with the rules of procedure of the meeting. The term of office of the members nominated on a geographical basis shall expire at the close of the second ordinary session of the Meeting of the Parties following that at which they have been nominated;
- g) The Committee should at a minimum meet on an annual basis, normally at the Seat of the Secretariat;
- h) The Secretary for the Committee shall be provided by the Secretariat of the Agreement;
- i) The Secretariat shall inform all Parties of the date and venue of the Standing Committee meetings;
- j) The Committee shall draw up and adopt its own Rules of Procedure.

3. *Requests* the Secretariat to make provision in future budgets for the payment, upon request, of reasonable and justifiable travel expenses of appointed Standing Committee members from developing countries and countries with economies in transition, within the policy agreed by the Meeting of the Parties.

- a) Members should make every effort to pay their own travel expenses;
- b) The Secretariat may refund to the Chairman of the Standing Committee all reasonable and justifiable travel expenses for travel undertaken on behalf of the Meeting of the Parties or on behalf of the Secretariat;
- c) Travel arrangements for sponsored Standing Committee members will be made by the Secretariat in accordance with the Rules and Regulations of the United Nations and, where applicable, claims for refund must be supported by receipts, and submitted to the Secretariat within 30 days from the completion of the travel.

4. *Requests* Contracting Parties to provide financial assistance to developing countries and countries with economies in transition being Parties to the Agreement to be represented at meetings of the Standing Committee by an observer.

¹ “Geographical distribution” reflects the following five regions: Europe, Central Asia, Middle East and Northern Africa, Western and Central Africa, Eastern and Southern Africa.

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE REGIONS

NORTH AND SOUTH WESTERN EUROPE

Dr. Olivier Biber (provisional member)
Chef questions internationalES nature et paysage
Office fédéral de l' environnement, des forêts, et du
paysage
CH-3003 Berne
SWITZERLAND
Tel: (+41 31) 3230663
Fax: (+41 31) 3247579
E-mail: Olivier.biber@buwal.admin.ch

CENTRAL EUROPE

Dr. Dan Munteanu
President
Commission for the Protection of Nature
Monuments
Str. Gh. Dima 49/2
3400 Cluj-Napoca
ROMANIA
Tel: (+40) 64 438086
Fax: (+40) 64 438086
E-mail: sorcj@codec.ro

EASTERN EUROPE

Dr. Valentin Serebryakov
Associate Professor
Shevchenko National University in Kiev
Kiev 01033
UKRAINE
Tel: (+38 044) 2520120
Fax: (+38 044) 2520120
E-mail: zoology@biocc.univ.kiev.ua

CENTRAL AFRICA

Mr. Ikonga Jérôme Mokoko
Coordonnateur Programme
WCS.Congo/ Aires Protégées
B.P. 14537
Brazzaville
CONGO
Tel: (+242) 810346
Fax:
E-mail: wcscongo@yahoo.fr

EASTERN AFRICA

Dr. Charles Mlingwa
Director General
Tanzania Wildlife Research Institute
P.O. Box 661
Arusha
TANZANIA
Tel: (+255) 27 2548240/ 2509871
Fax: (+255) 27 2548240
E-mail: tawiri@africaonline.co.tz

SOUTHERN AFRICA

Mr. Yousoof Mungroo
Director
National Parks and Conservation Service
Ministry of Agriculture F.T.N.R.
Reduit, Mauritius
Tel: (+230) 4642993
Fax: (+230) 4651184
E-mail: npcsagr@intnet.mu

SOUTHWESTERN ASIA

Dr. Elena Kreuzberg
Senior Researcher, Nature Conservation
Institute of Zoology, Uzbek A.S.
Niazov, 1 Str
700095, Tashkent
UZBEKISTAN
Tel: (+998 71) 121 61 85
Fax: (+998 71) 1206791
E-mail: kreuz@comuz.uz

REPRESENTATIVES OF ORGANISATIONS

IUCN

Dr. Mariano Gimenez-Dixon
Programme Officer - Species
IUCN - The World Conservation Union
28, rue Mauverney
1196 Gland
SWITZERLAND
Tel: (+41) 22 9990155
Fax: (+41) 229990015
E-mail: mgd@hq.iucn.org

WETLANDS INTERNATIONAL

Mr. Ward Hagemeijer
Senior Biodiversity Conservation Officer
Wetlands International
P.O. Box 471
6700 AL Wageningen
The NETHERLANDS
Tel: (+31) 317 478867
Fax: (+31) 317 478850
E-mail: hagemeijer@wetlands.agro.nl

CIC

Prof. Dr. Herby Kalchreuter
CIC - Migratory Bird Commission
c/o European Wildlife Research Institute (EWI)
79848 Bonndorf-Glashütte
GERMANY
Tel: (+49) 7653 1891
Fax: (+49) 7653 9269
E-mail: wildlife.ewi@t-online.de

UNEP/CMS

Ms. Jasmin Kanza
Administration and Fund Management
Officer
UNEP/CMS
Martin Luther King Str. 8
53175 Bonn
GERMANY
Tel: (+49) 228 815 2404
Fax: (+49) 228 815 2449
E-mail: jkanza@cms.unep.de

UNEP

Dr. Paul Chabeda
Chief, Biodiversity and Biosafety Unit
UNEP Nairobi
P.O. Box 30552
Nairobi
KENYA
Tel: (+254) 2 623877
Fax: (+254) 2 623926/ 624255
E-mail: paul.chabeda@unep.org

EXPERTS

RURAL ECONOMICS

Mr Elijah Yaw Danso
Social Development Advisor
Forest Sector Development Project
P. O. Box 1457
Kumasi
GHANA
Tel: (+233) 51 35659
Fax: (+233) 51 35659
Mobile : (+233) 27 534761
E-mail: elijah@forestry-ksi.org

ENVIRONMENTAL LAW

Mrs. Rachelle Adam
Deputy Legal Advisor
Ministry of the Environment
5 Canfei Neshirim St., P.O.Box 34033
Jerusalem
ISRAEL 95464
Tel: (+972) 2 6553735
Fax: (+972) 2 6553744
E-mail: rachela@environment.gov.il

OBSERVERS FROM CONTRACTING PARTIES

DENMARK

Dr. Sten Asbirk
Head of Section
Danish Forest and Nature Agency
Haraldsgade 53
2100 Copenhagen
DENMARK
Tel: (+45) 39472000
Fax: (+45) 39279899
E-mail: sta@sns.dk

GERMANY

Dr. Klaus Riede
ZEF Bonn (Zentrum für Entwicklungsforschung)
Walter-Flex-Str. 3
D-53113 Bonn
GERMANY
Tel: +49 228 731872
Fax: +49 228/731869
E-mail: k.riede.zfmk@uni-bonn.de

UNITED KINGDOM

Mr. David Stroud
Senior Ornithologist
JNCC - Joint Nature Conservation Committee
Monkstone House
City Road, Peterborough PE1 1JY
UNITED KINGDOM
Tel: (+44) 1733 562626
Fax: (+44) 1733 555948
E-mail: David.Stroud@JNCC.GOV.UK

GERMANY

Mr. Gerhard Adams
Federal Ministry for the Environment
Postfach 120629
53048 Bonn
GERMANY
Tel: (+49) 228 3052631
Fax: (+49) 2283052684
E-mail: adams.gerhard@bmu.de

NETHERLANDS (Depositary)

Dr. Jan-Willem Sneep
Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management
and Fisheries
Directorate for Nature Management
Division of Policy Instruments
P.O. Box 20401
2500 EK The Hague
NETHERLANDS
Tel: (+31) 70 378 5255
Fax: (+31) 70 378 6146
E-mail: j.w.sneep@n.agro.nl

UNITED KINGDOM

Mr. Robert Vagg
International Conservation Policy Adviser
Department for Environment,
DEFRA (Global Wildlife Division)
Temple Quay House, 2 The Square
Bristol BS1 6 EB
UNITED KINGDOM
Tel: (+44) 117 372 8110
Fax: (+44) 117 372 8317
E-mail: robert.vagg@defra.gsi.gov.uk

OBSERVERS FROM INTERNATIONAL NGO'S

BIRDLIFE INTERNATIONAL

Mr. David Pritchard
International Treaties Adviser
BirdLife International
c/o RSPB The Lodge
Sandy, Bedfordshire SG19 2DL
UNITED KINGDOM
Tel: (+44) 1767 680551
Fax: (+44) 1767 683211
E-mail: dave.pritchard@rspb.org.uk

UNEP/WCMC

Dr. Christoph Zöckler
UNEP - World Conservation Monitoring
Centre
219 Huntingdon Road
Cambridge CB3 0DL
UNITED KINGDOM
Tel: (+44 1223) 277314
Fax: (+44 1223) 277136
E-mail: christoph.zockler@unep-wcmc.org

FACE

Mr. John Swift
Representative of the Fédération des Associations
des Chasseurs de l'Union Européenne (F.A.C.E.)
The British Association for Shooting and
Conservation
Marford Mill, Rosselt, Wrexham LL12 OHL
UNITED KINGDOM
Tel: (+012) 44 573003
Fax: (+012) 44 579138
E-mail: johns@basc.org.uk

O.M.P.O.

Mr. Olivier Guy-Nöel
Secretary General
5 Avenue des Chasseurs
75017 Paris
FRANCE
Tel: (+33) 01 44010510
Fax: (+33) 01 44010511
E-mail: ompo@ompo.org

GUESTS

Mr. Neil Baker

Ms. Liz Baker
P.O. Box 9661
Moshi
TANZANIA
Tel: 0744-318987
E-mail: kifuju@kilionline.com

Mr. Lars Denisen

P.O. Box 9171
Dar-es-Salaam
TANZANIA
Tel: 0744-376010
E-mail: denisen@twiga.com

SECRETARIAT

UNEP/ AEWA SECRETARIAT

Mr. Bert Lenten
Executive Secretary
Ms. Mirna Maya, Assistant
Ms. Heike Grelka, Consultant
Secretariat for the Agreement on the Conservation of
African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds
Martin-Luther-King-Str. 8
53175 Bonn
GERMANY
Tel: (+49) 228 815 2414
Fax: (+49) 228 815 2450
E-mail: aewa@unep.de