



SIXTH MEETING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE
16 – 17 June 2010, The Hague, the Netherlands

DRAFT REPORT OF THE FIFTH MEETING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE
24 -25 June 2008, Bonn, Germany

Agenda item 1. Opening

1. Mr. Bert Lenten introduced and welcomed the new Chairman of the Standing Committee (StC), Mr. Erasmus Tarimo, Director of Wildlife, Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, United Republic of Tanzania. Since the establishment of the AEWA Standing Committee at MOP2, Tanzania had taken over the Chair and had been represented by Mr. Emmanuel Severre, who had meanwhile taken up a new position in the Government. Mr. Tarimo, as his successor, had taken over Mr. Severre's former responsibilities, including the chairing of this Committee.

2. The Chairman expressed his pleasure at taking up the position of Chairman of the AEWA Standing Committee. He introduced the members of the Standing Committee and went on to thank Germany for hosting the AEWA StC meetings over the years and wished delegates a productive meeting, resulting in decisions to be presented to the fourth session of the Meeting of the Parties (MOP4) in Madagascar in September 2008 for adoption. He referred to the ensuing heavy schedule and went on to declare the meeting open.

3. On behalf of the Host Government and the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU), Ms. Paulus welcomed the meeting. Ms. Paulus recalled the past weeks, which had been very exciting for Bonn, as well as for Germany as a whole, due to the 9th COP of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), which had taken place in Bonn in May 2008. At this important meeting, countries had worked together and although genuine progress had been made, this represented small steps in a global context. Ms. Paulus stressed her pleasure at being able to contribute to the work of AEWA, which was, in comparison, a more focussed and tangible Agreement. She referred to the ambitious agenda ahead and wished delegates a fruitful meeting, during which she was certain that sound decisions would be made, well in time for MOP4.

4. On behalf of the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS), the Executive Secretary, Mr. Robert Hepworth welcomed the delegates. He also recalled the CBD COP and the resulting fresh impetus to all stakeholders. At a side event to the conference, the theme of the forthcoming CMS COP, '*2010 and beyond: Wildlife Renaissance*' was introduced. Mr. Hepworth noted that the CMS COP would cover a range of flyway topics including a policy paper and status report on all flyways. He went on to describe the current meeting as a precursor to the forthcoming Meeting of the Parties (MOP4) and expressed his appreciation with regard to the work involved in producing such comprehensive documents. He also expressed his concern at the funds still lacking for the full implementation of the Wings over Wetlands (WOW) UNEP-GEF African-Eurasian Flyways Project, and appealed to donor countries to support this promising initiative. Mr. Hepworth wished all those present a successful meeting.

Agenda item 2. Adoption of Rules of Procedure

5. Mr. Lenten introduced document StC 5.2 *Rules of Procedure of the AEWA Standing Committee*. He briefly outlined the major amendments resulting from comments at StC4. These were:

Rule 5: in order to create a link to the Rules of Procedure (RoP) of the Technical Committee (TC), the following sentence was added at the end of Rule 5: "*The Standing Committee works closely with the Technical Committee to ensure consistence in the work of the Agreement*".

Rule 11: The reference to the regions was amended for clarity to read: “*representative from the Eastern and Southern African region*”.

6. Following minor amendments were proposed for adoption:

Rule 5, last line: “...in the work of the Agreement”.

Rule 11: to be amended to read “...*one* representative from the Middle East and Northern Africa region, one representative from the Western and Central Africa region, and one from the Eastern and Southern Africa region.”

Rule 12, first and last sentences: to be amended to read “Each member of the Standing Committee shall be entitled to be represented at meetings of the Committee by a representative or *his or her* Alternate Representative”, “In *his or her* absence, the Representative of the member shall act in his or her place”.

Rule 14, last sentence: “Regional members are eligible *for re-appointment* but may not serve more than two consecutive terms of office”.

Rule 24: to be amended to reflect document StC 5.7 to read “The Committee shall normally meet *at least once every 2 years*”.

Rule 31: to be amended to read “...to all Parties, and to the participants”.

7. The Meeting adopted these amendments by consensus.

Agenda item 3. Adoption of the Agenda

8. Mr. Lenten introduced document StC 5.3 *Provisional Annotated Agenda and Work Programme*, which was adopted.

Agenda item 4. Admission of Observers

9. Mr. Lenten welcomed Mr. John O’Sullivan and Ms. Nicola Crockford as representatives of BirdLife International as well as Mr. Angus Middleton representing the Federation of Associations for Hunting and Conservation of the EU (FACE). The Meeting agreed to admit the Observers.

Agenda item 5. Adoption of the draft Report of the fourth Meeting of the Standing Committee

10. Mr. Lenten introduced document StC 5.4 *Draft Report of the Fourth Meeting of the Standing Committee* and invited delegates to make comments on a page by page basis.

11. Ms. Paulus requested amendment of the name of the Unit of which she is Head in para 2; she is Head of the International Nature Conservation Unit. She went on to point out a mistake in para 20; the name of the Ministry is “Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety”.

12. Mr. Schall requested a change in the word order in para 27 to read “...the accession of the Russian Federation to CMS and AEWA” rather than “AEWA and CMS”; Mr. Schall referred to the fact that AEWA is an Agreement under CMS.

13. Referring to para 48, Mr. Van Dijk reported that although efforts had been made to secure funding for a workshop to promote AEWA in the Russian Federation, no progress had been made so far. As this initiative did not represent a commitment as such, it was agreed to change the wording to “Referring to the considered workshop on promoting AEWA in Moscow”.

14. Mr. Mungroo requested clearance with regard to the use of the word “dedicating” in para 49 as “designating” seemed more appropriate in that context; Mr. Van Dijk suggested changing “...dedicating 10 marine areas” to “...designating a number of marine areas” because there were certainly more than 10 within the entire EU.

15. Mr. Mungroo suggested amending the last sentence in para 50 to read “This had been rejected for procedural reasons”.

16. Mr. Mungroo further pointed out that the statement made by Ms. Kanza in para 119 relating to the problems of establishing the Second Trust Fund and when they will be solved repeats what is mentioned in para 102, thus he suggested the following amendment to para 119: “Ms. Kanza reiterated that the problems related to...”.

17. Referring to para 163, Mr. Van Dijk was puzzled to read that plans were already underway to draft an Action Plan for the Bewick’s Swan and requested information on this point. Mr. Sergey Dereliev explained that this is actually a mistake and the species referred to is the Icelandic breeding population of the Whooper Swan; however this will not be finalised in time for MOP4.

18. The report of the Fourth Meeting of the Standing Committee was adopted subject to inclusion of these amendments.

Agenda item 6. Report on preparations for the 4th Meeting of the Parties (MOP4)

19. Mr. Lenten introduced Ms. Catherine Lehmann, the Officer in charge of organising the MOP, in close cooperation with the AEWA Focal Point for Madagascar, Ms. Zarasoa. Ms. Lehmann went on to give an overview of the arrangements for MOP4, which is scheduled to take place on 15-19 September 2008 in Antananarivo, Madagascar. She reported that 107 registrations had been submitted so far and that up to 150 were expected in total. Logistical arrangements were well underway. The costs of the Meeting amount to 400.000 Euros, of which of 181.400 Euros are available in the regular budget and a further 200.000 Euros were raised in the form of voluntary contributions, kindly donated by the Governments of France, Finland, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland and World Association of Zoos and Aquariums (WAZA); the remaining 50.000 Euros still urgently needed to be covered.

20. In response to this, the Chairman made the spontaneous offer, on behalf of the Government of Tanzania, to donate 5.000 Euros towards the costs. This gesture was gratefully accepted by the Secretariat.

21. Regarding the substantial preparation; international reviews, as required by the AEWA Action Plan and resolutions have been prepared and approved by the Technical Committee and would be tabled at the present Standing Committee Meeting.

22. Ms. Zarasoa took over and expressed her thanks for being able to take part in this Standing Committee Meeting. She reported that for the Government of Madagascar, it had not been an easy decision to host MOP4 and saw this as a step towards overcoming the challenges faced with regard to the millennium goals. She thanked the Secretariat, particularly the Executive Secretary, Mr. Lenten and Ms. Lehmann for all their support in helping to organise the meeting. She assured delegates that the Madagascan Ministries of Foreign Affairs, Environment and Public Safety and Security would all do their utmost to make the MOP a success. She went on to report that 4,600,000 hectares of land in Madagascar were already protected and that Madagascar wanted to step up its efforts towards the conservation of migratory species. She reiterated her thanks to the Secretariat for excellent preparations and also to the *Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit* (GTZ) for additional support in Madagascar.

23. Mr. Schall thanked the Government of Madagascar and was happy to hear that preparations were going so well and went on to say that he was looking forward to the MOP in Madagascar.

24. Mr. Ragusch also thanked Ms. Lehmann and Mr. Lenten for all their work in preparing the meeting. He announced that the German Government was able to provide financial support towards the meeting amounting to 15.000 Euros.

25. The Chairman thanked the Government of Germany for this pledge and reiterated Tanzania's offer of contributing 5.000 Euros towards the costs of MOP4.

Agenda item 7. Draft Strategic Plan and enhanced National Report for online reporting.

26. Mr. Lenten introduced documents StC 5.5 *Draft Strategic Plan 2009-2017* and StC 5.6 *Draft National Report Format for online reporting*.

i. Strategic Plan

27. Mr. Lenten informed that the drafting of a strategic plan for AEWA had been agreed upon at MOP3 and because of the obvious link to reporting; the Secretariat had been under pressure to make headway with both issues, which had involved consultations with members of the Technical and Standing Committees as well as with Contracting Parties. Mr. Lenten asked Mr. Dereliev, who had taken the lead in both projects to report on their progress.

28. Mr. Dereliev reported that the Strategic Plan compiled by a contractor in very close cooperation with the Secretariat was based on that of CMS, which had been approved by the CMS COP. On the basis of consultations with the different bodies of the Agreement and aided by the fact that the contractor had a thorough knowledge of the Agreement; the first draft had been produced and had been circulated to the AEWA bodies for subsequent submission to MOP4 for approval.

29. Mr. Van Dijk commented on Objective 1.2 of the Strategic Plan: "*Establish and maintain a comprehensive flyway network of protected and managed sites of international and national importance for waterbirds*", he suggested following the dual approach of the Ramsar Convention and including those managed areas outside protected areas by changing the wording to "*Establish and maintain a comprehensive flyway network of protected and managed sites and other sustainably managed sites...*".

30. The Chairman took the opportunity to stress the commitment and resources necessary to be able to implement this plan.

31. Mr. Schall referred to objective 5.4 relating to the funding and financial situation and agreed that this is a good goal; however it depended very much on the overall financial situation, which was difficult to foresee during the coming years.

32. The Chairman agreed that the financial situation was indeed a critical one and pointed out that this would be taken up again further on into the agenda.

33. Mr. Lenten stressed the heavy workload for the current Secretariat and maintained that human resources should be strengthened in the long term otherwise expectations would have to be downraised.

34. Ms. Paulus confirmed the position of Germany that regarding resources, the Strategic Plan represented a goal and that the targets were in no way binding.

35. Bert Lenten stressed that the Strategic Plan was a guiding document, not only for the Secretariat but also for the Contracting Parties, whose input is of vital importance. The budget was also very closely linked to the Strategic Plan. The costs for the activities of the Secretariat could be assessed; however it was difficult to assess the financial issues outside the responsibility and sphere of influence of the Secretariat.

ii Online National Report Format

36. The Secretariat had been instructed to develop an Online National Report Format by MOP3 for submission to MOP4. This had been consulted with the Technical Committee and subsequently revised and aligned to the Strategic Plan. The online reporting system had been developed by the World Conservation Monitoring Center (UNEP/WCMC) within the framework of a larger UNEP-funded project, which, in turn, was possible because of a major grant from Norway. The long-term goal was to harmonise reporting between CMS and AEWA. The on-going maintenance of the AEWA format is the responsibility of the Secretariat in

consultation with the governing bodies. Since March 2008 further templates had been optimized and re-designed.

37. Mr. Dereliev demonstrated the functions of the online reporting format, which would be active for the next triennium. Each Contracting Party Focal Point would have a password in order to log into the system. All the AEWA species are available in a drop-down list as well as the alien and non-native species within the Agreement area. Relevant information from former reports will be pre-filled for each Contracting Party, enabling them to log into the system and start reporting/revising at an earlier stage. The Resolution 4.1 is linked to the Strategic Plan and the National Reporting Format. The MOP gives the StC the opportunity to adjust the online reporting format to reflect the Resolutions of the last MOP. The Secretariat suggested doing this soon after the MOP so the Parties could begin with reporting as soon as possible. The reports could be exported as a PDF. An analytical tool would be developed in cooperation with the other MEAs using the information contained in the database. The Secretariat was grateful to Norway, which had provided a grant for knowledge management to UNEP, thus enabling UNEP/WCMC to develop this highly professional online reporting system.

38. Mr. Dereliev briefly introduced Resolution 4.1, which requests MOP4 to adopt the Strategic Plan and National Online Reporting Format. He stressed the importance of the Small Grants Fund, which is envisaged in the Strategic Plan itself and that this should become operational to enable Contracting Parties to implement the Strategic Plan.

39. Mr. Mungroo suggested also referring to developing countries in the operative para 4, whereby Contracting Parties are urged to contribute financial resources towards the implementation of the Strategic Plan.

40. The Chairman felt that developing countries should be called upon to become more committed towards the implementation of the Strategic plan and was seconded by those represented at the Meeting. Mr. Lenten warmly welcomed this new initiative by developing countries to be more active and was pleased to amend the resolution accordingly.

41. The Meeting agreed to the following amendment of Resolution 4.1, operational para 4:
“*Urges Contracting Parties, including developing countries and countries with economies in transition proportionate to their capacity, as well as donor organisations, to make available financial resources for the full implementation of the Strategic Plan*”.

42. The Standing Committee approved the following for submission to MOP4 for adoption:

- The Strategic Plan, subject to the inclusion of the above amendments.
- The draft enhanced National Report Format for online application.
- Draft Resolution 4.1, subject to the inclusion of the above amendments.

Agenda item 8. Draft Budget Proposal 2009-2012

43. Mr. Lenten introduced document StC 5.7 *Draft Budget Proposal 2009-2012*.

44. Mr. Lenten mentioned the challenge involved in developing a budget proposal due to the increasing demands. He noted that the Secretariat was lucky in receiving its premises free-of-charge from the German Government. The Secretariat must, however, ensure sufficient human resources if progress is to be made; for this purpose, 8 budget scenarios had been developed. Apart from himself, the Secretariat was currently staffed with a Technical Officer, Information Officer, Programme Officer, Administrative Assistant, and two part-time Assistants. In order to be able to cope with the increasing workload, the positions of the Information and Team Assistants would have to be increased to full-time. The post of Information Officer had been previously fully financed by the German Government, however as from October 2008, this position would be covered by the AEWA budget. Other additional costs include those for IT-services, which the Secretariat had previously been fortunate enough to receive free-of-charge from the United Nations Volunteers (UNV) during the past 7 years. The translation of all meeting documents is costly so that if Parties insist on having all documents translated, the budget would have to be increased accordingly. Mr. Lenten went on to indicate that savings could be made in reducing the frequency of Standing Committee

meetings by replacing them with email communication and telephone conference calls, wherever possible; in the same way the next MOP could take place in 2012 instead of 2011. Also the frequency of reviews could be reduced.

45. Mr. Lenten presented the 8 different budget scenarios, ranging from a 0 – 35% increase. The costs of IT-services, amounting to 25,000 p.a. were included in all scenarios, although it had recently become clear that these would amount to 35,000 p.a. so this adjustment would still have to be made. In order to keep the present staff, a minimum increase of 15 % would be necessary; anything below that would mean a decrease in the staff capacity of the Secretariat. A 15% increase would also cover the obligatory contribution of 80.000 Euros towards the GEF project (Wings over Wetlands). A 20% increase would be necessary, if, in addition, the travel costs of eligible members of the Technical and Standing Committees were to be covered and the posts of the Team and Information Assistants increased to full-time. He noted that the Strategic Plan foresaw an increase in staff capacity, which would entail a minimum increase of 20%.

46. Mr. Lenten went on to explain that the annual contributions shown in the different scenarios were based on the average contribution paid by each Contracting Party for the past 3 years and increased accordingly.

47. Mr. Van Dijk confirmed that it was useful to provide different options; however the decision would ultimately be taken by MOP and not by the StC. He remarked that in the past, it had been usual to adhere to the inflation correction.

48. Mr. Lenten responded that this would not suffice to maintain the current level of activities; therefore it was necessary to table more options.

49. Mr. Hepworth pointed out that the ensuing IT costs would affect the whole CMS family of Agreements and ways were being examined to reduce the cost to the Parties. Economies could be made, e.g. in terms of storage capacity, which was being paid by the gigabyte. Another option could be under the Headquarters Agreement, which would be discussed with the BMU and other Ministries concerned. UNEP would also be approached, as parent organisation to cover these costs out of the 13% charged by UNEP on all expenditure. Thus with a combination of economies, it should be possible to make an impact on these charges.

50. Mr. Schall expressed his thanks for the very good and detailed document and explained that in the case of Germany, negotiations within the relevant Ministries were still on-going on this issue and that the inflation factor does of course have to be taken into consideration. He was however able to indicate Germany's position, i.e. that an increase of more than 15% could be excluded.

51. Mr. O'Sullivan reflected on the tasks assigned to the Secretariat by the last MOP and the respective budget and congratulated the Secretariat particularly on the excellent job done and the fantastic results achieved with limited resources. He added that the current staff, however efficient, could not cope with an ever-increasing workload, so that the 15% option is the very minimum required to be able to move on.

52. Mr. Mungroo commented that only 3 components could be achieved with a 15% increase. Recently a scheduled Standing Committee meeting had to be cancelled due to lack of funds and the lack of translated documents is always being criticised. In order to provide this service and for the Agreement to operate effectively, a minimum increase of 20% increase was required.

53. Ms. Antofie took the opportunity to introduce herself as the new representative for Romania. She thanked the Secretariat for all the work done. She had taken note of what had been said and supported Germany's position. She would, however, need some time for consultations with her Government before coming back with a statement.

54. Mr. Lenten confirmed that the budget would not be adopted at this meeting but would be proposed to MOP4; thereby leaving enough time for discussion. The StC was asked to comment on this document and to confirm that it would provide a good decision basis for the MOP.

55. Mr. Schall requested clarification on the amounts of annual budgetary contributions in table 3. He asked if this represented the amount to be expected from member states each year.

56. Mr. Lenten replied that the figures stated were based on the average contributions made by Contracting Parties over the last 3 years, which had been adjusted according to the respective scenarios. The amounts remained constant each year; the costs relating to the next MOP were spread out over the quadrennium; thus there was no increase in the fourth year due to the next MOP.

57. Mr. Schall remarked that, as a result of interest gained by leftover funds during the first three years, the financial situation in the fourth year may actually be better than depicted.

58. Mr. Lenten explained that any interest gained from savings made in the years 1-3 would flow back into the Trust Fund.

59. Mr. Van Dijk pointed out that savings made due to the change of cycle from 3 to 4 years as well as additional activities as a result of the Strategic Plan should be reflected in the budget.

60. Mr. Lenten reiterated that in order to be able to do more towards implementing the Agreement, capacity had to be increased; thus an increase between 15 – 35 % was necessary.

61. Mr. Hepworth pointed out that there had been some quite substantial changes made to the UN scale, with regard to contributions. This was due to the fact that some countries had rapidly growing economies and would be paying more in future as a result. He noted that the figures stated in Table 3 of the budget overview may therefore not be final.

62. The Chairman added that there should be more balance in the relation between the higher and lower paying countries and that the commitment of all parties should be reflected in the contributions paid.

63. Mr. Lenten recalled discussions between AEWA and CMS with regard to a minimum contribution for Parties. The current minimum contribution amounted to 100 Euros, it could however be raised to 500 Euros. He pointed out, that a raise could also lead to higher losses in the case of countries in arrears with their payments.

64. Mr. O’Sullivan asked for guidance regarding this issue and the function of the Standing Committee in the decision-making process.

65. Mr. Lenten explained that the StC can make a recommendation to MOP regarding a minimum contribution of 500 euros. Many countries were currently paying between 100 and 300 Euros; a contribution of 500 Euros could cover travel costs, for example. Mr. Lenten reminded delegates that the focus of the discussion must remain the increase in the budget, which was the major issue. An increase in the minimum contribution would be welcome but would not have a huge impact. He also mentioned that he would like to stay in line with CMS on this issue.

66. Mr. Kane reported that Senegal was already a Party to a number of Agreements and that the Ministry of Finance may not accept the higher contribution.

67. On behalf of Madagascar, Ms. Zaraso agreed with Senegal and was concerned that if all the Agreements were to establish a minimum contribution, this could lead to a situation, which could no longer be accommodated by the Ministry of Finance. Madagascar would like to make tangible contributions but this would have to be reconsidered.

68. Following a short discussion reflecting a positive attitude towards this issue, Mr. Kane summed up that the Standing Committee should propose a minimum contribution that could be discussed by the countries involved and decided at the MOP.

69. Mr. Lenten referred to Resolution 4.2, which was linked to the budget. One item was left open regarding the up-grading of posts as this was dependent upon the ultimate decision made regarding the scenarios. He also raised the issue of the eligibility for funding with regard to new accession countries to the EU. According to the rules, these countries were not eligible for funding; however CMS has made exceptions in some cases. Mr. Lenten requested the approval of the Standing Committee to deviate from the rule and to

allow for exceptions to be made, on a case-by-case basis, to provide these countries (e.g. Poland, Bulgaria, Estonia, Romania) with funding as long as is necessary.

70. Mr. Ragusch confirmed that Germany particularly welcomed the fact that Poland was seriously considering becoming a Party to AEWA and that the relevant resolution (3.14) may be handled flexibly, so that funding for participation at MOP for the countries in question could be provided, as is common practice with CMS. However he stressed that this was only an interim solution and must not become standard procedure.

71. The draft resolution was approved by the Meeting.

72. The Standing Committee approved the draft Budget proposal and draft Resolution 4.2 for submission to MOP4 for adoption.

73. *Mr. Lenten introduced an organisational proposal by CMS, just provided for distribution to the delegates, which would be discussed later on during the meeting. The proposal, which is part of a larger paper focuses on a mutual capacity-building, public relations and fund-raising unit. Mr. Lenten asked delegates to read the proposal in preparation for the discussion on the next day.*

Agenda item 9. Draft International Implementation Priorities 2009-2012

74. Mr. Dereliev introduced document StC 5.8 *Draft International Implementation Priorities*. The International Implementation Priorities (IIP) listed, are based on those for the previous triennium 2006-2008 and up-dated for the coming 4 years, reflecting the date of the next MOP. Projects, which had been finalised had been removed from the list and 5 new projects had been added: three on issues relating to threats to habitats and waterbirds resulting from extractive industries, windfarms and other renewable energy sources, one relating to the distribution of birds following changes in the climate and one regarding training for national agencies in AEWA member countries to enhance the implementation of the Agreement at national level.

75. Mr. Dereliev explained that Resolution 4.3 was linked to this document. He noted that most of the projects which had not been implemented due to lack of funding were connected to the GEF project. He strongly urged those Parties willing to make voluntary contributions to focus these on the IIP connected to the GEF projects.

76. The Standing Committee approved the draft IIP 2009-2012 and draft Resolution 4.4 for submission to MOP4 for adoption.

Agenda item 10. Proposals for amendments of the Agreement and/ or its Annexes

77. Mr. Dereliev introduced document 5.9 *Proposals for amendments to the Agreement and/ or its Annexes* and the draft Resolution 4.4 linked to this. This document included all proposals for amendments for submission to MOP4 by Contracting Parties to AEWA; these amendments were the result of the work of the Technical Committee and had all been submitted by the required deadline, i.e. 150 days before the opening of the MOP and circulated to all the Contracting Parties for comments. Mr. Dereliev briefly introduced the following proposals:

- (a) Proposals for amendments to Annexes 2 (Waterbird species to which the Agreement applies) and 3 (Table 1) submitted by Mauritius, which concerned the addition of 20 species of waterbirds traditionally considered as seabirds and the conservation status of their populations, based on the paper produced by the Technical Committee on the potential role of the Agreement in the conservation of seabirds;
- (b) Proposal for amendment to Table 1 of Annex 3 submitted by Italy. This was a self-initiated proposal concerning the population status of the Little Tern and Eurasian Oystercatcher;

- (c) Proposals for amendments to Annex 3 (Table 1) submitted by Italy, which concerned the conservation status and definition of several populations, and associated conservation status revision derived from the most recent IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, and revised definition of geographical terms used in range descriptions;
- (d) Proposals for amendments to paragraphs 2.1.2(d) and 7.5 of the Agreement's Action Plan (Annex 3) submitted by Croatia, which concerned possession, utilization and trade in parts and derivatives of birds and eggs of Column B populations and the frequency of update of the international reviews;
- (e) Proposals for amendments to paragraph 4.1.4 and section 4.3 of the Agreement's Action Plan (Annex 3) submitted by Libya, which concerned the deadline for phasing out the use of lead shot for hunting in wetlands and measures dealing with management of human activities;

78. Mr. Van Dijk recalled that at the last MOP, the delegation from the Netherlands had been against the addition of seabirds; however this proposal would be tabled in Brussels in the near future so comments from the EU as a whole could still be expected.

79. Mr. Schall added that Germany's standpoint was a more optimistic one: the Federal Ministry of Hunting had no objections to this amendment and the German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN) was definitely in favour of it. Germany would therefore promote the inclusion of these seabirds in AEWA in Brussels because of the lack of responsibility in the open seas and AEWA could be the instrument to cover these issues. He went on to thank those involved in compiling the TC paper on seabirds and suggested including the International Maritime Organization (IMO), which played an important role particularly in the current discussion regarding shipping regulations and in the designation of particularly sensitive sea areas.

80. Mr. Dereliev briefly introduced the draft Resolution 4.4, which reflected the proposals and included all appendices with the relevant information.

81. The Standing Committee approved draft Resolution 4.4 for submission to MOP4 for adoption.

Agenda item 11. Draft International Single Species Action Plans

82. Mr. Dereliev outlined the 5 documents linked to this Agenda item, four Single Species Action Plans (SSAP) and the revised SSAP format. He went on to explain that two further SSAPs were still in the process of being drafted; for the Madagascar Pond-heron and the White-winged Flufftail. These had been developed in cooperation with CMS and co-funding had been kindly provided by the Government of Italy. By producing these SSAPs, the Secretariat had followed the strong plea made by the last MOP to concentrate on inter-African migrants. The drafts were expected to be finalised in time for submission to MOP4 for approval. The final drafts would include all the comments submitted by the Range States. The other four action plans were available as final drafts.

83. The Standing Committee agreed to the submission of the draft SSAPs for the Madagascar Pond-heron and the White-winged Flufftail to MOP4 subject to the inclusion of the comments received from the Range States.

a) Action Plan for the Lesser Flamingo

84. Mr. Dereliev introduced document StC 5.10 *Draft International Single Species Action Plan for the Lesser Flamingo*.

85. This final draft was a very comprehensive action plan including many contributions from stakeholders. This plan had been initiated together with CMS two years ago. The plan was commissioned to two organisations, the IUCN/Wetlands International Flamingo Specialist Group and the Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust (WWT) in cooperation with Wetlands International, who worked very closely together on this.

86. Mr. O'Sullivan expressed the grave concern of many stakeholders with regard to the proposal for a soda-mining plant at Lake Natron, which is an extremely important breeding site for the East African population of this species, representing 75% of the entire species. The potential impact on this ecologically and

economically important species could be far-reaching. This development was unknown at the time the SSAP was compiled and should be acknowledged in some way.

87. On behalf of Tanzania, Mr. Kaita responded that the Ramsar Advisory Mission to Lake Natron in February 2008 provoked wide consultation on the issue. The proposal to develop the construction facility at Lake Natron Ramsar Site had been withdrawn and subject to approval by the Government on the basis of an integrated management plan, currently being developed by the Wildlife Division of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism. Mr. Kaita was certain that the management plan would not allow a development of this kind.

88. Mr. Barbieri expressed his thanks for this helpful information and referred to the involvement of both the CMS and the AEWA Secretariats in the Advisory Mission. He requested information about the timeframe regarding the production of the integrated management plan and when a decision would be taken.

89. Mr. Kaita reported that work had begun in May and the plan should be finalised by the end of 2008.

90. The Chairman confirmed that the interest on the side of the Tanzanian Government had lessened. He reported that Kenya was also against this development and urged all stakeholders to remain firm.

91. The Standing Committee approved the Draft International Single Species Action Plan for the Lesser Flamingo for submission to MOP4 for adoption.

b) Action Plan for the Eurasian Spoonbill

92. Mr. Dereliev introduced document StC 5.11 *Draft International Single Species Action Plan for the Eurasian Spoonbill*. This SSAP had been commissioned to EUROSITE, which had very good links to Africa and Eurasia and was funded by the BirdLife partner in the Netherlands, Vogelbescherming Nederland. The team had been led by Patrick Triplet from France. The ring recovery analysis carried out had contributed towards understanding the migration of the different populations and sub-populations of this species.

93. Mr. Schall remarked that the comments submitted by Germany had not yet been incorporated into the draft.

94. Mr. Dereliev assured that all the comments submitted within the recent deadline would be incorporated before the MOP.

95. Mr. Kane pointed out that in the French version the species was referred to as being the *Spatule blanche* and he was not sure if this referred to the Eurasian or the African Spoonbill. He had not been able to submit his comments but had worked closely with Patrick Triplet and would continue to do so.

96. Mr. Dereliev confirmed that the plan was for the Eurasian Spoonbill.

97. The Standing Committee approved the Draft International Single Species Action Plan for the Eurasian Spoonbill for submission to MOP4 for adoption.

c) Action Plan for the Black-tailed Godwit

98. Mr. Dereliev introduced document 5.12 *Draft International Single Species Action Plan for the Black-tailed Godwit*. This Action Plan superseded the EU Action Plan for the species and represented an extension of the EU Plan regarding the flyway as a whole. It was commissioned to the same consultancy. Hunting was the major issue of confrontation in this Action Plan involving extensive bilateral consultations with hunting organisations.

99. Mr. Van Dijk welcomed the fact that the EU Action Plan would be superseded by that of AEWA, adding that the Netherlands invested a lot of money in the conservation of this species and was keen to see conservation action taken along the rest of the flyway. He reported that the Netherlands would provide comments on a number of issues, including the Icelandic sub-population.

100. Ms. Crockford also underlined the importance of paying attention to the Icelandic population, whose breeding habitat in Iceland was under threat due to the forestation of lowlands. This should be reflected in the Action Plan.

101. The Standing Committee approved the Draft International Single Species Action Plan for the Black-tailed Godwit for submission to MOP4 for adoption subject to the inclusion of the comments received from the Range States.

d) Action Plan for the Lesser White-fronted Goose

102. Mr. Dereliev introduced document StC 5.13 Draft *International Single Species Action Plan for the Lesser White-fronted Goose*. This Action Plan for the Western Palaearctic population of the Lesser White-fronted Goose, initiated in 2005, was also an issue of the CMS Scientific Council and there had been a growing dispute on the re-introduction of this species in the Nordic countries. A major problem was accidental shooting due to the similarity to the Greater White-fronted Goose. Re-introduction measures in the 1980's used birds without proper genetic analysis resulting in hybrids. This, in turn, led to serious problems between the countries involved. After the CMS Scientific Council issued a recommendation at its 13th Meeting, which had not been accepted by Sweden, a dead-end was reached. In January 2007 the Secretariat, represented by Bert Lenten and Sergey Dereliev initiated a negotiatory mission to Sweden, Norway and Finland to meet government officials and to try to resolve the issue. The resulting negotiation report, approved by the Nordic countries and Germany in November 2007, represented a breakthrough and the Secretariat would like to thank Germany and the Governments of all the stakeholders for their cooperation. Following the agreed recommendations, the Action Plan was revised by the consultant Mr. Tim Jones, sub-contracted by BirdLife International, whose high level work on this Action Plan had been acknowledged by all those involved.

103. Following the agreed recommendations in the report, the Secretariat convened the inception meeting of the Committee for the re-introduction and supplementation of the Lesser White-fronted Goose in Fennoscandia (RECAP) in May. Following the approval of the Action Plan in September, another body would be established representing all the range states. The initial grant for the development of this Action Plan came from Sweden; however Germany had offered strong support, financial and otherwise and Norway and Finland were also among the main donors towards the development of this Action Plan. Thanks to the generous funding by the Norwegian Government, a consultant, Ms. Kirsten Martin had been recruited as coordinator for the Action Plan to the species. The 2nd draft of this Action Plan had been sent to the Range States and the deadline for comments was 4 July 2008. The Secretariat hoped that this plan would be acceptable to Sweden and the other Nordic countries.

104. The Standing Committee approved the Draft International Single Species Action Plan for the Lesser White-fronted Goose for submission to MOP4 for adoption subject to the inclusion of the comments received from the Range States.

105. Mr. Schall reported that Germany would submit comments within the deadline, as requested. He went on to enquire if the Nordic Parties had agreed to the minutes of the above-mentioned meeting in May being sent to Aktion Zwerggans e.V., the initiator of the private re-introduction project.

106. The Secretariat replied that the deadline for feedback on this issue was the same as the deadline for comments on the draft SSAP.

107. Mr. Dereliev briefly introduced draft Resolution 4.5, which requests the MOP to approve the four SSAPs presented here and the already-mentioned SSAPs for the Madagascar Pond-heron and the White-winged Flufftail, which are still in the final drafting stages. The resolution also included the SSAP for the Maccoa Duck, which had already been approved by the StC at its last Meeting in November 2006.

e) Revised Format for AEWA Single Species Action Plans

108. Mr. Dereliev introduced document StC 5.14 Revised Format for AEWA Single Species Action Plans, which was a revised version of the format currently used, drafted by BirdLife International and approved by MOP2. Since then the MOP had approved eight SSAPs using this widely accepted format and another 7

would be submitted for approval in September. It became clear however that this format would benefit from some re-structuring in order to produce more comprehensible Action Plans. This revised version was compiled by BirdLife International in close cooperation with WWT, Wetlands International and the Rubicon Foundation. It should result in a more user-friendly format for the Action Plans, thus helping all those involved in the implementation. It was sent to the Technical Committee for comments; the deadline was 27 June 2008.

109. Mr. Schall acknowledged the improvements made in this revised format and pointed out that the issue of climate change was not included; he suggested adding a sub-chapter on the potential impact of climate change to the respective species.

110. The Standing Committee approved the Revised Format for SSAPs for submission to MOP4 for adoption, subject to revisions resulting from the comments of the Technical Committee and other stakeholders.

Agenda item 12. International Reviews

111. Mr. Lenten introduced this Agenda item recalling that according to paragraph 7.4 of the Action Plan, which is part of the Agreement, it is laid down that the Secretariat, in close cooperation with the Technical Committee and the parties should prepare 7 different reviews, 2 of which were linked to the WOW project; this had been the highest priority of the Secretariat during the last triennium. Funds had been accrued for 5 of these reviews, which were ready for submission to MOP4. He went on to apologise for the heavy burden to the Parties with regard to the lengthy questionnaires, necessary for the compilation of these reviews.

a) Report on the status and trend of populations (*document StC 5.15 and draft Resolution 4.6*)

112. Mr. Lenten gave a short introduction to this important review, which is often seen as being a measure of success of the Agreement.

113. Mr. Dereliev reported that this review had required a large investment in terms of finance and man-hours. Major features of the 4th edition of this review, which had not been included in previous versions included the trend analysis for certain species within Europe and the Red List Index for the AEWA species, which was a sound indicator for the success of the implementation of the Agreement. The conclusions of this report served as a basis for draft Resolution 4.6. This report determined that there were twice as many populations with decreasing trends as there were with increasing trends. It was suggested that Range States are encouraged to increase their monitoring schemes; various measures were being looked into including high-tech methodologies. Further funds needed to be accrued in order to produce an assessment of population boundaries (approx 700.000 Euros); this knowledge was essential in order to be able to manage populations. The Critical Site Network Tool (CSN Tool) being developed within the framework of the WOW project would have a huge impact on this.

114. Ms. Crockford suggested that Iceland could be added to the list of countries with high proportions of waterbird populations in para 7 of the preamble to Resolution 4.6 because it was an important breeding area within Europe.

b) Pertinent hunting and trade legislation (*document StC 5.16 and draft Resolution 4.7*)

115. Ms. Lehmann introduced this review and the respective resolution on behalf of the Secretariat. She reported that comprehensive questionnaires had been sent out to all Range States and that 81% of responses had been received from Contracting Parties and 32% from non-Contracting Parties. A great deal of time had been invested in contacting Focal Points to deal with the many open questions and to ask for more details. Other international organisations had also been reviewed in the light of AEWA requirements. The main findings were that implementation outside the EU was lacking and that the level of compliance in the case of Contracting Parties was higher than in that of non-Contracting Parties. Countries must be provided with more guidance on hunting and trade; this is a task of the Technical Committee. The Action Plan should also be revised in this respect and wording should be more explicit. Workshops should be carried out for

Contracting Parties in order to train Focal Points and help them to implement the Agreement (included in the IIP).

116. In answer to a question on the focus of the training courses, Ms. Lehmann explained that this depended very much on the country; generally all the countries outside the EU had problems with enforcement and Workshops should provide the Focal Points from the relevant Ministries with guidance on how to implement the Action Plan.

117. The Standing Committee approved the Review on pertinent hunting and trade legislation for submission to MOP4.

c) The stage of preparation and implementation of single species action plans (*document StC 5.17*)

118. Mr. Dereliev reported that this new Review had been commissioned to the Dutch-based Foundation, Rubicon. A total of 15 SSAPs dealing with waterbirds exclusively confined to the Agreement area had been assessed, some of which were approved under AEWA and some under other bodies. The work involved was extensive as some species had 30 – 70 Range States. Although the response to the questionnaires circulated had not been very encouraging, a good overview was achieved including useful recommendations, forming a good basis for synergising with other organisations working in the same field. A list of Action Plans had been compiled, which should be up-dated and another long list of new Actions Plans would be developed, funds permitting. This was a very useful review, which would be repeated in 6 years time if the new timeplan is adhered to.

119. Mr. Dereliev reported that the conclusions of this and the Review on re-establishment projects were combined in draft Resolution 4.8.

120. The Standing Committee approved the Review and the corresponding draft Resolution for submission to MOP4.

d) Re-establishment projects (*document StC 5.18 and draft Resolution 4.8*)

121. Mr. Dereliev reported that this Review had been commissioned to the Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust (WWT), which had sound experience in re-establishments. WWT had developed a database for re-establishment projects within the AEWA area, which could serve as a reference source for this type of information. The Review showed that projects following the guidelines had been successful, whereas those which deviated from the guidelines had failed. Thus one of the first recommendations resulting from this Review was that future plans for re-establishments should concentrate on following the guidance of the IUCN. The draft Resolution included the suggestion that supplementary guidelines should be developed for the re-introduction of waterbirds, under AEWA.

122. The draft Resolution 4.8 combined the recommendations of the Reviews c) and d) and also included a strong plea for funding, without which the recommendations could not be implemented.

123. Ms. Crockford enquired about the possible inclusion of the Eurasian Curlew in the list of Near Threatened species so that the currently available Action Plan could be expanded into a flyway one.

124. Mr. Dereliev replied that the re-assessment of this species had occurred only very recently so that it had not been taken account of in this Review, however this could be adjusted at a later stage.

125. The Standing Committee approved the Review and the corresponding draft Resolution 4.8 for submission to MOP4.

e) The status of introduced non-native waterbird species (*document StC 5.19 and draft Resolution 4.9*)

126. Mr. Dereliev reported that this Review had been carried out by the British Trust for Ornithology (BTO), which had also been responsible for compiling the first edition. BTO provided a highly professional service in compiling this 2nd edition of the Review, which was extremely comprehensive and well-visualised. The recommendations were also well-argued. The feedback from the Range States had been higher in this

case. Draft Resolution 4.9 relied on the recommendations of this Review. The most outstanding non-native species in the region was the Ruddy Duck, where extensive eradication measures have been carried out in a number of countries. The draft Resolution particularly calls upon the Netherlands and France to take action.

127. In line with the wording of a Resolution already approved by the Bern Convention, Ms. Crockford proposed an addition to para 9 of draft Resolution 4.9 to read: “Requests Contracting Parties and other Range States to prohibit or have more stringent regulations for keeping *and trade of* certain species that pose a particular risk to native biodiversity such as hybridization or competition”.

128. Mr. Schall remarked that the work involved with the extensive and time-consuming questionnaires had definitely been worthwhile considering the resulting excellent overview of non-native species.

129. On behalf of the Netherlands, Mr. van Dijk confirmed that collaboration with the UK already existed as far as eradication measures for the Ruddy Duck were concerned. He added that he would check the situation in the Netherlands and assess whether sufficient measures were being taken. He felt that as a result of the information given to him on this issue so far, the wording in this draft Resolution may not be entirely appropriate.

130. Mr. Dereliev confirmed that an adjustment could be made if necessary; however this was based on information from the compiler and that even if action was being taken, the results were not entirely positive.

131. Mr. van Dijk reiterated that he would look into the necessity of complimentary measures or the continuation of existing measures.

132. Taking into account the comments made, the Standing Committee approved the Review and the corresponding draft Resolution for submission to MOP4.

f) Progress in phasing out the use of lead shot for hunting in wetlands (*document StC 5.20 and draft Resolution 4.10*)

133. Ms. Lehmann reported that this review was based on a former version compiled by Wetlands International in 2000. In this case, 78% of responses received were from Contracting Parties and 31% from non-Contracting Parties. A large number of publications had been reviewed. Only 13 out of the 118 Range States had fully phased out the use of lead shot for hunting in wetlands; in addition 4 countries had legal restrictions in place but had not fully phased out the use of lead shot in wetlands. There was an obvious lack of awareness and also acceptance despite the efforts of the the Secretariat and hunting organisations in the past.

134. Replying to a question by Mr. Schall, who referring to the Libyan proposal, pointed out that there were 2 different proposals on the issue of lead shot, Mr. Lenten responded that the aspect proposed by the Government of Libya referred to the deadline for phasing out of lead short, which is a proposal for amendment to the Action Plan of AEWA, whereas the recommendations from the Review form the basis for the Resolution.

135. The Chairman reported that hunters coming to Tanzania brought lead shot with them from Europe and the USA. He suggested imposing a ban.

136. Mr. Lenten agreed that it would be a matter of time – awareness-raising was still an important measure. Many hunters were not aware of the obligations under AEWA.

137. On behalf of FACE, Mr. Middleton confirmed that the organisation supports the phasing out of lead shot for hunting in wetlands and referred to para 4, third line of the draft Resolution 4.10, which he felt could be misleading. He suggested the following wording: “...additional four Range States had introduced restrictions on the use of lead shot for hunting in wetlands *or* in some wetlands, and that several countries...”

138. Ms. Lehman explained that this was not only about “all” wetlands or “some” wetlands but also about regions; thus it might be better to find a more general term for this.

139. Taking into account the comments made, the Standing Committee approved the Review and the corresponding draft Resolution for submission to MOP4.

Agenda item 13. Effects of climate change on migratory waterbirds

140. Mr. Dereliev introduced document StC 5.21 *Report on effects of climate change on migratory waterbirds* and draft Resolution 4.11.

141. He reported that the previous MOP had instructed the Technical Committee to assess the long-term implications of climate change on migratory waterbirds. The Secretariat contracted out a desk study to BTO to facilitate the implementation of Resolution 3.17; this had been possible thanks to a grant kindly provided by the Government of the UK. Respective Guidelines had also been produced. The corresponding Resolution draws on the recommendations of this report, whereby all the AEWA species and populations were assessed. The Technical Committee was requested to identify new research priorities. However immediate adaptation measures were required, particularly with regard to the maintenance of a broader network of sites to accommodate future shifts in distributions of populations. This Resolution also suggested that the Technical Committee developed a process for the designation of an international network of sites for the protection of migratory birds for submission to MOP5. In the meantime, Parties should be urged to maintain the ecological character of all types of habitats.

142. Referring to the discussion on SSAPs and the decision to include recommendations as to the effects of climate change, Mr. Schall suggested an addition to draft Resolution 4.11, operative paragraph 1 to include a cross-reference to the SSAPs; he suggested the following wording: "...other species to climate change. The potential respective recommendations given in the SSAP should be taken into account".

143. Referring to operative paragraph 5, Mr van Dijk felt that "designation" should be replaced by "dedication". He also suggested adding a paragraph referring to protection and/ or sustainable management in this context.

144. The Secretariat explained that the Technical Committee was requested to devise a process, to define gaps in the identification of existing designations and where more needed to be done. This process, when adopted, should be carried out by the Contracting Parties. He referred to the Ramsar network and that a similar process could evolve for all the habitats used by migratory birds, not only wetlands. This process need not be limited to the impact of climate change but could also include other factors.

145. The appropriate paragraphs were revised. Mr. Dereliev reported that the draft Resolution 4.11 had been substantially re-drafted and agreed upon by the Dutch and the German delegation to read:

Operative paragraph 4:

'Urges Contracting Parties to designate, establish and manage adequate networks of protected and managed sites, and other adequately managed sites, to accommodate range-shifts and facilitate waterbirds' dispersal;'

Operative paragraph 5:

'Requests the Technical Committee to assess whether the existing international networks of sites are sufficient for the protection of migratory waterbirds, including the projected climate change effects, and if necessary to propose to the next session of the Meeting of the Parties, which complementary approaches should be additionally taken;'

146. The Standing Committee approved draft Resolution 4.11 Rev. 1.

Agenda item 14. Latest information on Avian Influenza

147. Mr. Dereliev reported that a comprehensive overview of this issue was not possible because this would outscale the capacity of the Secretariat, which follows developments as closely as possible. The Secretariat regularly participates in the meetings of the expert group, the Scientific Avian Influenza Taskforce founded by CMS and AEWA in 2005. During a recent teleconference, several issues had been discussed, including the coordination of resolutions among the respective MEA's later on this year (AEWA, Ramsar and CMS); with the aim of aligning them to complement each other. Mr. David Stroud, an Observer to the Technical Committee and a very active contributor to the work of the TC, had compiled the AEWA draft Resolution on behalf of the Technical Committee together with Ruth Cromie and Rebecca Lee from WWT. The draft Resolution draws on the conclusions of several meetings, as well as material taken from other sources. There may be some up-dates to the information presented before MOP4.

148. Another issue raised at this last teleconference was the issue of the spread of HPAI through hunting activities. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) felt that there was a strong need for guidance in this respect and would prepare a first draft together with Niels Kanstrup from CIC. The information leaflet of the Taskforce is available in several languages, both on the website and from the AEWA and CMS Secretariats. The Proceedings of the meetings in Nairobi and Aviemore were also available. The Task Force aimed to put together a chart to give an overview for all the activities planned by all the organisations. The dedicated website containing all the most recent information is regularly up-dated by WWT (<http://www.aiweb.info/link>).

149. Mr. Francisco Rilla, CMS Information Officer thanked Mr. Dereliev for the thorough overview of the work of the Task Force. He also mentioned the recent meeting at the Museum König in Bonn; the proceedings for this meeting had already been prepared. He reported that the scope of the Task Force may be extended in future to include more animal diseases. One of the most important activities continues to be capacity building in all regions, which depended strongly on funding and contributions.

150. The Standing Committee adopted draft Resolution 4.12 for submission to MOP4.

Agenda item 15. Draft Conservation Guidelines

151. Mr. Dereliev introduced documents StC 5.22 *Draft Conservation Guidelines on how to avoid, minimise or mitigate the impact of infrastructure developments and related disturbance affecting waterbirds* and StC 5.23 *Draft Conservation Guidelines on measures needed to help waterbirds adapt to climate change* and the corresponding draft Resolution 4.13.

152. The finalisation of the draft conservation guidelines on infrastructural developments had been delayed because of necessary adjustments. The guidelines were the result of an IIP project, which had been funded by the Government of Belgium. The paper had been well elaborated and subsequently approved by the Technical Committee.

153. The other guidelines, compiled by BTO, regarding the impact of climate change on migratory waterbirds, were a good basis for a succinct paper, which could be developed further in future. Feedback from the Technical Committee was still pending and would be forwarded to the compilers so that the final draft may be slightly amended.

154. The Secretariat would like to submit both these guidelines for approval as official AEWA Conservation Guidelines.

155. Mr. Schall made one small recommendation, i.e. that we this issue should be clustered with climate change because there is a systematical link and these points should be dealt with together at MOP4 with Avian Influenza as a separate issue.

156. Mr. Lenten agreed that the Agenda could be changed respectively.

Agenda item 16. Other draft Resolutions

a) Procedure for submission of proposals to amend the annexes to the Agreement (draft Resolution 4.14).

157. Mr. Lenten reported that the procedure would be much easier if proposals, resulting from the work of the Technical Committee could be submitted by the Standing Committee as well as by the Contacting Parties. The issue had been discussed at TC8 and approved by the legal expert.

158. Mr. Schall referred to the 150 day deadline for the submission of proposals to the annexes of the Agreement before the next MOP and noted that this would still apply. He went on to confirm that he saw the advantages of this procedure and that he endorsed this proposal.

159. Mr. Van Dijk pointed out that the definition of a Party was held down in Article I as being 'Parties to this Agreement'.

160. Bert Lenten reiterated that according to the legal advisor to the Agreement, under Article X, para 2, the Standing Committee could also be seen to be a party; however he confirmed that he would seek further advice as to the significance of Article I in this case, as this was a legal question.

161. Mr. Schall mentioned one practical point concerning the dates for the Standing Committee Meetings; these should be convened more than 150 days before the MOP in order to keep to the deadline for proposals for amendments to the Annexes of the Agreement.

162. The Standing Committee adopted Draft Resolution 4.14.

b) Establishment of an International Review Panel (draft Resolution 4.15).

163. Mr. Lenten reported that the international reviews clearly indicated that the Agreement was not being well implemented; according to the International Conservation Status Review, 41% of populations show a decrease in trends and the Review on the phasing out of lead shot reports that only 17 Parties had phased out the use of lead shot in wetlands. The question came up at the Technical Committee meeting that more had to be done and the legal expert proposed the establishment of a Review Panel, which could react to urgent issues by assessing the situation and sending a mission for that purpose. The Standing Committee could be given this mandate to address adverse effects on migratory waterbirds or their sites and habitats and respond by requesting a mission to assess the situation and make appropriate recommendations to the Party concerned to ensure that obligations under the Agreement were fulfilled. At a later stage, a subsidiary body could be established in accordance with the Agreement. This was a new concept, initiated because more had to be done to implement the Agreement and work towards the CBD 2010 Biodiversity Target.

164. Mr. Schall reported on his experience while in charge of another MEA, the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution, whereby an implementation committee had been established in the early 90's. This had indeed been a great help with regard to enforcement. Mr. Schall very much supported this proposal and had endorsed the suggestion to incorporate this function in the mandate of the Standing Committee.

165. Mr. Van Dijk requested clarification with regard to provision for this activity in the proposed budget. He went on to remark that savings could almost certainly be made and that synergies should be optimised, particularly with regard to the mission to Lake Natron. He went on to point out that other habitats are also relevant for migratory waterbirds – not only wetlands.

166. Mr. Lenten confirmed that the Lake Natron Mission was a Ramsar Advisory Mission and that AEWA and CMS had been represented by Sergey Dereliev. He confirmed that every effort would be made to combine efforts and that the overall impact would be much greater if MEAs joined forces.

167. Mr. Dereliev commented that synergies were being looked at with the Ramsar Convention and also the Bern Convention, where a similar type of instrument already existed, through which the AEWA Secretariat had recently participated in a mission to Bulgaria with regard to wind farm developments. He stressed that

every effort was being made to work across the MEAs however there were issues, which were only relevant to AEWA, underlining the importance of a separate instrument.

168. Mr. Lenten responded to the question regarding budget and confirmed that there was no extra provision for activities of this type; however he did not envisage this type of mission taking place more than once or twice a year, the costs of which could be covered by the regular travel budget.

169. The Standing Committee approved draft Resolution 4.15.

c) Adoption of Guidelines for interpretation of criteria used in Table 1 of the AEWA Action Plan (Doc. StC 5.24 and draft Resolution 4.16)

170. In Resolution 3.3, the MOP adopted guidance on the term 'long-term decline' and the Technical Committee had been requested to provide guidance on the remaining 3 criteria used in table one, being '*the degree of concentration onto a small number of sites at any stage of the annual cycle*', '*dependence on a habitat type, which is under severe threat*', and '*the extent of extreme fluctuations in size or trend*'.

171. The TC started work on this guidance after MOP3 and at TC7 in 2006 first drafts were compiled. The TC subsequently met in ad-hoc meetings to continue work on these drafts and the signed off proposals for guidance on 1 & 2 as presented in document StC 5.24. The TC experienced some difficulties with the last criterion regarding the magnitude of the fluctuation – under the IUCN red list there is a clear guidance for extreme fluctuation – those which are 10-fold; however this does not apply to bird populations. The TC decided that there is a need of a more precise look at population studies with the support of a statistician. Thus it is proposed to postpone that task for the next triennium so that the Secretariat can contract out a desk study for this purpose. Dr. Clausen drafted additional guidance on the application of these definitions.

172. Mr. Van Dijk referred to the concentration in a particular cycle and questioned if this should not be defined further with regard to the time scale involved?

173. Mr. Dereliev explained that the time scale was not set as a requirement for this definition. This final draft referred to populations of which 90% or more regularly concentrate on 10 or fewer sites in a particular annual cycle stage.

174. The Standing Committee approved draft Resolution 4.16.

d) Institutional arrangements: Standing Committee (StC) (draft Resolution 4.17)

175. Mr. Lenten introduced this standard Resolution, which reflected the new Regional Representatives to be agreed upon at MOP4. The StC was established by MOP2 so all the StC Regional Representatives have to step down at the end of their Term of Office; the only fixed post being that of the Depositary. The Resolution also included a proposal to change the frequency of StC meetings from annual to biennial in order to save money. The additional mandate in form of the International Review Panel (draft Resolution 4.15) was also mentioned. The MOP was requested to approve funding for the travel costs of eligible delegates; however this could only be realised in the frame of the 20% budget scenario. As decided by MOP2, all Contracting Parties had the possibility of attending the meeting as Observers, although it was difficult for developing countries to find the funds for this.

176. Mr. Schall questioned operational paragraph 7 of draft Resolution 4.17 underlining that those Parties being financially able should support other Parties as Observers and if it would not be better to specify those delegates with a definite function, such as the Representatives, their Alternates and the Chair of the Technical Committee etc. rather than to invite all Parties as Observers.

177. Mr. Lenten clarified that MOP2 decided to open the StC meetings to Observers from other Contracting Parties, however this was unrealistic due to the fact that there were no funds currently available for the regular Members of the StC so it was even less likely that the attendance of Observers could be supported.

178. The Standing Committee approved draft Resolution 4.17.

e) Institutional arrangements: Technical Committee (draft resolution 4.18)

179. Mr. Dereliev introduced draft Resolution 4.18. This draft Resolution was for the purpose of approving candidates for the 6 positions, which would become vacant, i.e. the Regional Representatives for North and Southwestern Europe, Central Africa and Southern Africa and the Thematic Experts for Rural Economics, Environmental Law and Game Management. The terms of office of these six delegates would end in September 2008. Because the process of nominations at MOP4 did not always result in efficient selection due to the lack of time, an alternative nomination procedure had been approved by the Technical Committee. Thus nominations could be submitted to the Secretariat under this procedure and assessed by the advisory group consisting of the Chairs and Vice-Chairs of the StC and TC as well as the Executive Secretary and the Technical Officer. The Advisory Group had met the previous evening and the following recommendations had been made:

Members:

- North and Southwest Europe (1 nominee): recommendation: David Stroud – no Alternate
- Central Africa (1 nominee) Jerome Mokoko from Congo has already been on the committee for 9 years, the Advisory Group suggested and agreed that the TC would benefit from further recruitment so this was left open for the time being.
- Southern Africa – no nominations to date

These 2 positions were open to further nominations after MOP4.

Experts:

- Rural Economics (1 nominee): recommendation: Hussein Sosovele
- Environmental Law (1 nominee): recommendation: Melissa Lewis
- Game Management: (7 nominees): recommendation: Jean-Yves Mondain-Monval

180. The current TC Rules of Procedure had been supplemented to cover more aspects of the work of the Technical Committee such as the procedure for nomination and election of members and renamed *Modus operandi*.

181. The Standing Committee approved draft Resolution 4.18

f) Date, venue and funding of the 5th Session of the MOP (draft Resolution 4.19)

182. Mr. Lenten introduced this standard Resolution regarding the next Session of the Meeting of the Parties. He noted that since MOP4 was taking place in Madagascar, three out of the four MOPs would have taken place in Africa so it would be preferable to hold the next MOP in Eurasia; discussions were underway with a number of countries. He hoped to get a concrete offer within the next few months. This draft Resolution also reflected the proposition for the next MOP to take place in four years time instead of three in order to align this meeting with that of the next Ramsar COP to optimise synergies between the 2 MEAs. He went on to mention that the standard fall-back option would be to hold the Meeting at a UN venue, however the total costs would be higher without the practical and financial support of a host country.

183. The Standing Committee adopted draft Resolution 4.19

g) Tribute to the organisers (draft Resolution 4.20)

184. Mr. Lenten introduced this last draft Resolution, through which tribute is paid to the host country as well as to those countries providing funds towards the organisation of the meeting. This would be up-dated just before the MOP to include all donor countries.

Agenda item 17. Reports from Standing Committee Members and Observers

185. Mr. Lenten introduced this agenda item, which he stressed was an important up-date by the representatives of the regions as well as those of the NGOs, who reported on activities of interest for AEWA and progress made in their regions.

186. On behalf of Eastern and Southern Africa, Mr. Kaita reported on the workshop held in Nairobi in April 2007 in connection with the development of a SSAP for the Madagascar Pond-heron, in which eight countries from the region had participated. Another workshop on the legal taking of the Grey- and Black-crowned Cranes as well as other wetland species in Naivasha, took place in Kenya from 8 – 11 October 2007. Countries represented at this workshop were Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, South Africa, Nigeria and Mali. He reported that the workshop report was ready and that a motion would be proposed to the CITES meeting to up-grade the Grey-crowned and Black-crowned Cranes from Appendix 2 to Appendix 1.

187. Mr. Lenten thanked Mr. Kaita for this information. He regretted not having been aware of this workshop and requested to be informed about this and also about future workshops.

188. On behalf of Europe and Central Asia, the representatives from Germany and Romania gave their report.

189. Mr. Schall reported on efforts to encourage the accession of new member states. In this context, a meeting was organised between a Russian delegation under the leadership of the Director in charge of Nature Conservation and the CMS, AEWA, ASCOBANS and EUROBATS Secretariats at the UN Campus in Bonn. He reported that the Russian situation is, at present, difficult due to the recent change in Government and the distribution of responsibilities within the respective Ministries. The issue of hunting remained the responsibility of the Ministry of Agriculture and the former Ministry of Natural Resources was now a Ministry of Environment, which was promising with regard to accession to CMS and the Agreements. Efforts to encourage and support Russia to accede would continue.

190. In the case of Poland, a meeting had taken place on ministerial level and the German Environment Minister, Mr. Gabriel directly addressed the issue of accession to AEWA. Minister Lowitzski confirmed interest and requested information on the benefits of Poland's succession. The Secretariat had provided this information and a letter would be sent on ministerial level including this input. Poland had also expressed interest in attending MOP4.

191. With regard to Turkey, preparations for accession to CMS were underway; however Mr. Schall was not informed about steps being taken towards accession to AEWA.

192. Another issue involving waterbirds was the new Red List for Germany which was under preparation and included raptors and other vertebrae.

193. Germany had hosted the CBD COP9 in May 2008 and Mr. Schall highlighted the the issue of the designation of marine areas, which is of interest to AEWA since seabirds are now proposed to be included in the AEWA species. This would be the first step towards designating sites beyond national boundaries in the international seas. The German Chancellor, Ms. Angela Merkel had signed an Agreement on an important contribution for nature protection in the 3rd world involving a sum of 500 million Euro annually until 2013 to support the LifeWeb Initiative for the creation of protected sites all over the world.

194. Lastly Mr. Schall reported on the application to UNESCO for the designation of the most important wetland site in Germany, the Wadden Sea as a World Heritage Site. This designation would hopefully take place within the next two years.

195. Mr. Lenten thanked Mr. Schall and the German Government for the efforts made in encouraging Russia, Poland and Turkey to accede to the Agreement. He took the opportunity to urge the other members to encourage the Comores, Mozambique, Liberia and Sierra Leone to join. It was part of the role of the Regional Representatives to raise awareness on AEWA and Mr. Lenten expressed his gratitude for all the efforts being made in this respect.

196. The Chairman sought further information on the exact scope of the LifeWeb Initiative, established by Germany.

197. Mr. Schall answered that the BMU English website provided all the details of this initiative, in the frame of which economically powerful countries should support those less economically powerful to be able to protect more sites.

198. On behalf of Romania, Ms. Antofie underlined the importance of EU membership for Romania and Bulgaria and reported that both countries are very much involved with the EU regulations to improve management of protected areas, also for birds. Romania participated actively in the Ramsar actions and had recently been represented at an important meeting in Kiev on the Danube Delta, which was a paradise for birds. It is also worth mentioning the success of the LIFE project for the protection of the Dalmatian Pelican in the Danube Delta. The Romanian Ornithological Society is very active as well as being a good source of information and initiating many activities at civil society level. Ms. Antofie expected to be able to give a more detailed overview of activities of interest to AEWA in her Region to the next Meeting.

199. On behalf of Western and Central Africa, Mr Kane reported that good progress had been made with regard to AEWA species in Western and Central Africa. The Spoonbill Workshop had taken place in Africa after MOP3 in Dakar, where important experience and knowledge had been gained. In cooperation with Wetlands International, Senegal was active in improving the habitats of the Grey-crowned Crane and implementing the Action Plan for the species in all of Western and Central Africa. In cooperation with a number of partners, efforts were being made to identify which birds need protection. A workshop on capacity building was organised with Wetlands International and involving partners from Western and Central Africa. Activities were being carried out with a view to better intertwining AEWA and Ramsar. A training course for trainers on agricultural planning had taken place; the aim was to establish a pool of trainers for Central and Western Africa and to improve implementation of the Agreement. Mr. Kane mentioned that the WOW project was also of significance in Senegal.

200. On behalf of Madagascar, Ms. Zarasoa reported that preparations for MOP4 were well underway and that Madagascar was making every effort towards implementing the Agreement and was very committed to the protection of migratory species. She went on to mention a number of activities currently taking place. A census of waterbirds was being carried out every year in close cooperation with Wetlands International. Prior to the ratification, a major workshop had been carried out with the support of the AEWA Secretariat involving high-ranking representatives in order to raise awareness for migratory waterbirds. In addition, twenty organisations and local authorities in Madagascar were being approached in order to raise awareness for the Agreement. A major target in Madagascar was to expand the protected areas by 1 million hectares per year. However, one of the problems in Madagascar was that several organisations were participating in nature conservation and currently collecting data separately. Within the next few years, efforts would be made to develop a webpage making this data available. Ms. Zarasoa went on to explain that the final National Report for Madagascar had not yet been finalised.

201. On behalf of the Middle East and Northern Africa, Mr. Issa reported on the use of lead shot in Egypt and that hunting was currently based on the use of lead cartridges. The Ministry of Environment was looking into the use of steel shot with manufacturers. There were no studies about the impact of lead-shot-remains in Egyptian wetlands. Unfortunately decision-makers and stakeholders did not consider this to be a serious problem. There were 2 laws in place for the protection of endangered species; one law was established to ensure the sustainable exploitation of birds, particularly where livelihoods were at stake; the other law was for the protection of birds in protected areas only. Special programmes were in place for the protection of, *inter alia*, falcons and the Egyptian tortoise. Hunting of birds had been prohibited since 2006 because of the spread of avian flu. Since avian flu had been discovered in poultry, biosecurity had been improved at all levels with tighter controls on the movements of birds as well as fertilisers and feed. Efforts had been made in raising awareness on the importance of accession of countries along the migratory route. Meetings had taken place in Tunisia and Jordan. Information should be exchanged between the Mediterranean countries and the rest of Africa as well as Europe.

202. Mr. Lenten reminded Mr. Issa that information and resources on the issue of lead shot were available on the AEWA website as well as in the special newsletter on the subject. The Secretariat would be happy to provide Egypt with information to help with awareness raising among Egyptian hunters.

203. On behalf of The Netherlands, Mr. van Dijk reported on the bilateral activities of the Netherlands with regard to the recruitment of member states and that the main activities so far had been in connection with the

Russian Federation. The ecological link between the Netherlands and Russia was very strong as most flyways have their origin in Russia. An MoU had been established with Russia and many projects had been funded in the last year with a strong focus on wetlands. He reported on the launch of a new Biodiversity Programme, which had been established in March 2007 for the promotion of ecological networks with the emphasis on wetlands and flyways as well as the change to sustainable trade regarding products such as biofuel, root, soya and peat and the protection of the marine environment. On a national scale, three pillars had been established for the management of migratory birds; the National Ecological Network and Natura 2000, which cover almost all wetlands, thus representing the main effort towards the protection of 1.5 million wintering geese, as well as swans, ducks and waders using grasslands not designated as protected areas.

204. Cooperation measures with farmers and the establishment of compensation programmes were important measures to ensure that wintering geese were tolerated on farmland. On an international scale, he reported on an expedition to Taymir to study the breeding ecology of waders later migrating to the Wadden Sea and Africa. This was a long-established project (15 years), which was particularly interesting in the light of climate change. The project would only be able to continue if further funding could be secured. Efforts were being made to establish a centre for the population dynamics of geese as there are ongoing conflicts with other land-users and the populations of geese were growing; addressing agricultural problems in this context remained a priority. With regard to capacity building, an annual course in the form of training of trainers was being carried out in Moldova this year for people all over the world by the International University of Wageningen. Mr. Van Dijk pointed out that looking at Europe as a whole; in West European countries the intensification of agriculture posed problems whereas in Eastern Europe the abandonment of agriculture was leading to rough vegetation, unsuitable for breeding waders and for migrating geese. Agro-environmental schemes had been introduced in the EU countries however in Eastern Europe; few appropriate instruments were available which could be addressed with regard to these issues.

205. Referring to his current membership of the Presidency of the trilateral Wadden Sea project, Mr. Schall stressed Germany's interest in the Arctic effort and confirmed Germany's support.

206. Mr. Van Dijk went on to refer to other initiatives currently being carried out in the Arctic with regard to the Greater White-fronted Goose breeding grounds and research on the breeding success of waders. There may be some way of combining efforts. He thanked Mr. Schall for indicating Germany's interest.

207. On behalf of BirdLife International, Mr. O'Sullivan reported that Birdlife International remained fully supportive to all the aims of AEWA and continues to value the close cooperation established. He reported on a new project called 'Born to Travel' which will be launched in the near future. This campaign is meant to raise awareness on migratory birds and their flyway throughout the AEWA Area. Of course all the treaties dealing with this issue, i.e. AEWA, CMS and Wetlands International as well as WOW and other projects such as the Soaring Birds project would be involved in this campaign. The lead would be taken by the BirdLife Partner in the Netherlands, Vogelbescherming Nederland. A more detailed report on this initiative would be given at MOP4.

208. On behalf of FACE, Mr. Middleton reported that a series of workshops for raising awareness on NATURA 2000 had taken place in the new member states and the opportunity was being used for taking up the subject of phasing out lead shot. Following on that, BirdLife International and FACE were working together on drafting a letter to all BirdLife Partners and FACE members to send to their Ministries urging them to phase out the use of lead shot in wetlands. Manufacturers were also being approached as lead shot is still cheaper than steel shot so that it was important to promote the alternatives and work more closely with manufacturers in future. Regarding hunting and trade, the new ecosystems evaluation approved at CBD COP9 should lead to a greater emphasis on the value of ecosystems and the social economics of bird harvesting. He went on to point out that the new biodiversity governance structure in the Commission included a special group for invasive and alien species; this could provide an opportunity for AEWA to become involved.

209. Referring to the social economics of bird harvesting, Mr. Lenten pointed out that this was an issue to be dealt with under one of the IIP projects for which funding is being sought. He welcomed a collaborative approach with the EC on this in the near future.

Agenda item 18. Report of the Depositary

210. Mr. Van Dijk introduced document StC5.25 *Report of the Depositary*. He listed the seven countries, where AEWA had come into force since MOP3, i.e. Algeria, Belgium, the Czech Republic, Guinea Bissau, Italy, Latvia and Madagascar, Norway and Cyprus had also recently ratified so that the number of Contracting Parties amounted to 61.

211. Mr. Lenten added that in some countries (such as Estonia) the accession procedure was already fairly advanced and would be finalised very soon in the run-up to the MOP.

212. In answer to Mr. Schall's question regarding the status of Libya, Mr. Lenten answered that all the Northern African Countries apart from Morocco had ratified the Agreement; the Secretariat was working to help Morocco with the procedure in close cooperation with Oiseaux Migrateurs du Paléarctique Occidental (OMPO). Another priority is Mauritania, where, again, the Secretariat is making every effort to support the Mauritanian Government.

Agenda item 19. Report of the Technical Committee

213. The Chairman of the Technical Committee, Mr. Mungroo reported that many of the items relating to the work of the Technical Committee had already been discussed. Regarding the venue for TC8, Ghana had shown interest but had not taken the matter further; Kenya had kindly agreed to host the Meeting in Naivasha, and the preparation had already been made when it had to be cancelled at short notice because of the political unrest in the country. The Secretariat had then organised the Meeting to take place at the UN Campus in Bonn from 3-5 March and 22 Participants had taken part. There had been three absentees; the Regional Representatives from South-Western Asia and Western Africa and the Expert in Rural Economics.

214. TC8 was a particularly significant meeting as it was the last to be held before MOP4; it was an innovative meeting in that it was the first time that evening workshops had been introduced, which proved to be very productive for the drafting of all the necessary documents. There were 27 items on the agenda based on issues held down in the MOP3 resolutions, including international reviews in accordance with paragraph 7.4 of the action plan. The main work assignments for the TC were drafted in the workplan 2006 – 2008, which started after MOP3 and has been an ongoing process. According to the workplan, 11 major issues were to be dealt with, each of which was assigned to a Working Group made up of members, experts, observers and the Secretariat. The TC worked intersessionally by email and on the basis of ad-hoc workshops convened by the Secretariat in Bonn. All 11 tasks have been completed but one, which had to be postponed due to lack of funds. All the results had been endorsed by the Technical Committee at its 8th Meeting for discussion at MOP4. Mr. Mungroo noted that there had been no contention at the present StC meeting regarding the issues approved by the TC so that he was pleased that all the resulting resolutions could be submitted to MOP4.

215. Mr. Schall acknowledged the workload of the Technical Committee and thanked all those involved for the good work.

Agenda item 20. Report of the Secretariat

216. Mr. Lenten introduced document StC 5.26 *Report of the Secretariat*.

217. One of the major activities of the Secretariat had been to develop the AEWA Strategic Plan, which had been approved earlier that day for submission to MOP4. New developments included the Central Asian Flyway Action Plan, launched by CMS in January 2008 and the CMS MoU for African-Eurasian migratory raptors and owls.

218. Fundraising had, as always been challenging as activities were not covered by the core budget, only the running costs of the Secretariat. Since MOP3, 808,000 Euros had been raised, 21,000 of which went towards the CMS-led Avian Influenza Task Force. When the WOW project was designed, 250,000 USD per year were received on average for the implementation of the IIP. Based on this, an amount of 150,000 USD was allocated to activities listed within the IIP and linked to WOW project. However, in reality, much less had been received resulting in a serious shortfall. Fundraising was ongoing with a focus on MOP4.

219. Regarding the recruitment of staff, MOP3 had approved the recruitment of a part-time secretary and a part-time information assistant. Two very qualified applicants were able to be recruited to fill these positions. Regarding temporary staff, the Programme Officer, Ms. Lehmann, had carried out substantial work on international reviews. Although the Information Officer, Florian Keil was in charge of information management as such, the whole team was involved in different ways, e.g. website maintenance, scientific advice, drafting, proofreading and research. Participation in the CMS internship programme made it possible to integrate the skills of a number of interns of various nationalities in the work of the Secretariat.

220. On the subject of Information Management, Mr. Lenten reminded all the delegates of the regularly distributed e-newsletter and urged them to subscribe if they had not done so already. As well as overseeing this, the Information Officer, Florian Keil maintained the WMBD website, the WOW website and had also developed a new website for the African Bird Ringing Scheme (AFRING). There were many more activities in the pipeline, such as the production of posters and the accession pros and cons brochure.

221. In order to highlight the 15th Anniversary of the Agreement in 2010, the Secretariat was planning to publish a book on the Black-tailed Godwit featuring watercolours by the Belgian artist, Yves Fagniard. Other publications include the MOP3 proceedings and special newsletter, Conservation Guidelines, the Avian Influenza brochures and a special newsletter on the phasing out of lead shot. A resource CD is planned as well as a special newsletter after MOP4.

222. Mr. Lenten went on to report on the participation of the AEWAS Secretariat, also on behalf of CMS, in the Advisory Missions to Lake Natron in Tanzania and on windfarm developments along the Black Sea coast in Bulgaria. The planned sugar cane production in the Tana Delta in Kenya for the purpose of producing biofuel was also of particular concern currently and was being closely monitored by the Secretariat.

223. Mr. Schall took the opportunity to thank the Secretariat team for the good work and substantial achievements.

224. Mr. O'Sullivan reiterated the serious concerns regarding the Tana Delta issue and reported that the news had just broken that the Kenyan Government had given permission for the sugar cane plantations to go ahead in these pristine wetlands. This was an issue, which concerned large populations of migratory waterbirds as well as the inhabitants of the areas, such as fishermen and farmers, whose livelihoods depended on the wetlands. It was a complex and alarming situation, which could be a case for the proposed Implementation Review Panel. Mr. O'Sullivan invited the Meeting to come up with suggestions for approaches to dealing with this issue.

225. Mr. Van Dijk reported that the EU was currently preparing a Directive on biofuels, which could cover all wetlands; however this would not come into effect in the foreseeable future. He went on to thank the Secretariat for its exceptional work and welcomed the book on the Black-tailed Godwit, hoping that it would help raise awareness for the bird in the Netherlands.

226. Mr. Lenten informed that the book on the Black-tailed Godwit had already been discussed with the BirdLife Partner in the Netherlands. The Secretariat would welcome support on the part of the Netherlands, particularly as the Netherlands was the main breeding ground for this species.

227. Mr. Van Dijk went on to point out that care should be taken with the name of the *WetCap* project as an organisation under the name of *WETCAP* already existed in the Netherlands. He also pointed out that the Avian Flu brochure had also been published in Chinese.

228. Mr. Schall urged the Secretariat to involve the UNEP Secretariat in Nairobi when considering the most useful approach to take with regard to the Tana Delta issue. He assumed that the colleagues in Nairobi would have the necessary contacts.

229. Mr. Lenten reported that he had already approached the CMS Secretariat with regard to a mutual letter to the Executive Director of UNEP, Mr. Achim Steiner with regard to the Tana Delta. A mission may also be necessary; the Secretariat would continue to monitor the situation closely.

230. Ms. Antofie joined Germany and the Netherlands in congratulating the Secretariat on the excellent job done on behalf of the Romanian Government.

231. Mr. Kane also congratulated the Secretariat and expressed his hope that the information circulated here today would also be sent to the developing countries.

Agenda item 21. International Implementation Priorities 2006 - 2008

232. Mr. Lenten introduced document StC5.27 *Report on the implementation of the International Implementation Priorities 2006-2008*.

233. Mr. Lenten reported that the implementation of International Implementation Priorities (IIP), set out by MOP3, was fully dependent on voluntary contributions and that due to a significant shortfall, not all of them could be implemented. Those not implemented, many of which are linked to the WOW project, would be taken on to the next triennium. The shortfall of funds for implementation of the WOW project amounted to approx. 1 million Euros. Mr. Lenten called on all countries to consider supporting this project to ensure its full implementation. The serious problems regarding the lack of funds for this project had led to early closure.

234. Document StC5.27 listed the projects and reports on the implementation and funding status. Funding was accrued for many Special Species Action Plans and for the coordination of other Action Plans. The Birdlife Partner in the Netherlands and other partners had provided funding. He stressed again that the first priority for funding were the projects linked to the WOW project for many of which investments had already been made; funding gaps would lead to inevitable losses.

Agenda item 22. Implementation of the Communication Strategy

235. Mr. Lenten reported that the Communication Strategy had been adopted at MOP3 through Resolution 3.10. Since then every effort had been made by the Information Officer, Florian Keil to implement this; however progress had been slow due to the fact that only 20% of his time was allocated for AEWA (the rest was allocated to the WOW project and the CMS family as a whole). Since 2003 Florian Keil's position had been funded by the German Government and as from 1 October 2008, his post would become fixed-term. A number of activities were foreseen, such as internal communication to increase the active exchange of information within the governing bodies of the Agreement. The Information Officer and the Technical Officer had been working closely on the development of a designated web page (workspace) for the Technical Committee, which would eventually be followed up by a similar one for the StC. The first draft had been presented at the last TC meeting.

236. With regard to external communication, it had not been possible to carry out the planned regional meeting for East and West Africa. With the help of a grant from Sweden and of the Division of Environmental Law and Conventions (DELCO), a training session would be organised to take place before the MOP in Madagascar, which would be the first regional meeting for anglophone African countries to train their representatives on how to negotiate new agreements and also how to negotiate during meetings. With the help of UNEP, a further training session for francophone countries is planned as soon as funds can be accrued

237. Efforts had been made to engage more ambassadors to promote accession to AEWA and an MoU had been concluded with OMPO which is very active in the Baltic States and Morocco. The ongoing efforts of

Wetlands International, BirdLife International and the hunting organisations, FACE and CIC in promoting accession to AEWA among the non-Contracting Parties were also very much appreciated. Capacity building measures included the above-mentioned workshop and also the many activities taking place as part of the WOW project. With regard to awareness raising, the AEWA website had been greatly improved, with the news section being up-dated every week. Mr. Lenten asked all those present to provide the Secretariat with feedback regarding the user-friendliness of the website. The 11th Newsletter was available and the regular e-newsletter was distributed to all subscribers every second month, which was the result of the work of the whole team. Accession guidelines had been developed as well as a DVD and work on these was ongoing, funds permitting; the AEWA Reader would hopefully be published in early 2009. More capacity was needed in the Secretariat to enable more resources to be produced.

238. A new exhibition stand had been produced for the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) COP9, which took place in Bonn in May 2009. AEWA was represented in the exhibition linked to this meeting and the Secretariat organised a special side-event on the WOW project, which attracted many visitors. A large number of meeting participants had been able to receive information about the Agreement and important contacts had been established. Other events where the Agreement had been represented were the Bird Fair in the Netherlands, the 100 year Nature Conservation Day in Bonn as well as the UN day in Bonn. Participation in the Bird Fair in the UK was also planned for summer 2009. Last but not least, a further publication, the Climate Change brochure would be published in time for MOP4.

239. Mr. Keil went on to report on the procedure for the production of materials within the Secretariat. He started with the AEWA website, which is maintained by Ms. Kaemper under the guidance of Mr. Keil with input from all the team. The news and events page is a highlight and gives an overview of news connected to AEWA and flyway conservation. He stressed that stories from the regions were always very welcome so that they could be presented to a large audience. The regular E-newsletter was sent electronically to approx. 2.500 contacts, representing the entire AEWA network.

240. Mr. Keil went on to report about the TC-Forum, which was a new development of a password-protected Workspace for the TC members, enabling all TC Members and Observers to work interactively, while archiving all the work. This exciting tool, which had been developed entirely in-house, could help to replace ad-hoc meetings in future.

241. Responding to a comment by Mr. Kane on difficulties often encountered by developing countries with regard to internet access, Mr. Keil responded that the Secretariat was aware of this problem. He referred to the WOW project, which included a system of regional hubs making information more accessible to all the AEWA regions. This was an ongoing initiative being boosted by the WOW project.

Agenda item 23. Report on World Migratory Bird Day (WMBD)

242. Mr. Keil gave a brief presentation on this activity, which was a collective effort between AEWA and CMS; it was the largest awareness-raising campaign organised by the Secretariat. The CMS Information Officer, Mr. Rilla had contributed considerably in reaching out to Latin America, making this a truly global event. The idea was basically simple – initiated in connection with the outbreak of Avian Influenza in 2006 and launched with the help of a major event in Kenya. The themes reflected relevant topics, which changed from year to year. The idea was to provide information with the help of a poster distributed to all the organisations, communities, clubs and individuals organising events. The Secretariat was the central hub, where all the information about events came together (157 this year). All events were registered and featured on the WMBD website. The network was growing and awareness was thus being raised for migratory birds. Topics covered in the last three years had been Avian Influenza, Climate Change and Biodiversity in 2008, which was linked to the CBD COP held in Bonn that year. Mr. Keil showed a selection of events including the painting competition linked to WMBD 2007. BirdLife International, Wetlands International and UNEP had played a major role in spreading the information to their networks. The dedicated website showed a trailer and included a short questionnaire including some questions on key aspects of the respective theme. Statistics showed that many people had visited the website – including many visitors from Africa.

243. Mr. Keil hoped that all those present would visit the website and make use of the information on it to spread the word. The Secretariat could provide any further information upon request.

244. Mr. Lenten responded to a question by M. Schall regarding the theme for the next WMBD, and suggested that this could be based on man-made barriers faced by migratory birds such as windfarms and power lines.

245. Mr. Hepworth praised this good idea, noting that WMBD was proving to be very effective in raising awareness for migratory birds and congratulated the AEWA Secretariat on the results achieved. He recalled that the idea had been born as a result of the adverse publicity migratory birds received in 2005 as a result of the outbreak of avian influenza. This was a major promotional and educational opportunity. He suggested aligning the dates and perhaps combining it with the already established American IMBD. He added that the potential of commercial sponsorship should also be looked into.

246. Mr. Lenten replied that efforts had been made to look for sponsors and binoculars had been donated by an optical producer but it had not gone beyond that. He went on to explain his vision for the future and that this was not something that the AEWA Secretariat could handle on a long-term basis. Now that WMBD had become established as an annual event, it could be taken up and managed more officially by a consortium made up of e.g. BirdLife International, Wetlands International, WWF, AEWA and CMS, whereby a Secretariat could be established for that purpose and activities including the sale of products could be managed.

247. Mr. Middleton suggested contacting the mining group Rio Tinto, which organised a World Bird Day, where all local companies are encouraged to become involved.

Agenda item 24. Update on the Wings Over Wetlands (WOW) UNEP-GEF African-Eurasian Flyways Project

248. Mr. Lenten explained that Mr. Hagemeyer had unfortunately been unable to attend so that he would present this up-date in his position as a member of the WOW Steering Committee. He reported that this 12 million USD project was one of the largest Global Environmental Facility (GEF) projects. As the Coordination Unit was based in Wageningen, the Netherlands, all the payments were made in Euros, thus 25 – 30 % of the value of the funds had been lost so the Project Coordination Unit (PCU) would have to close after 3 years and the Steering Committee was faced with the challenge of finding another way of providing coordination for this project, if it was to continue. The German Government had provided 1 million Euros towards the project and the AEWA Secretariat pledged 1.3 million USD partly in the form of in-kind services offered by Mr. Keil and Mr. Lenten as well as a cash amount and a part of funds received for the implementation of the IIP. Many countries had serious problems in providing funding, so that finding the 1 million Euro to fully implement this project was posing a serious problem. Companies and governmental donors would also be approached to accrue the necessary funds.

249. Despite the challenging financial situation, this project was well underway. Most of the training modules have been produced for the different regions and the next step would be to find the money to implement them. Another important aspect of the project was the Critical Sites Network (CSN) Tool, which would combine four databases, the data of which could then be used by governments and other stakeholders to receive information on critical sites for each particular species. A presentation was being prepared for MOP4 and there would also be a side-event on the WOW project. Another important part of the project were the demonstration sites, which provided guidance to others managing sites; the publication containing the information provided by the demonstration sites would hopefully be published soon.

250. Mr. Lenten went on to report on a change in the Steering Committee, the current Vice-Chair Mr. Gerard Boere had taken over from Mr. Steven de Bie, who is a Professor at Wageningen University and a senior expert at SHELL and had to step down for personal reasons. A very positive development, which is a direct result of this project, was the very good and close cooperation between the 4 key partners, Ramsar, AEWA, BirdLife International and Wetlands International. He concluded by saying that he very much hoped to be able to accrue the missing 1 million Euro in the year to come.

251. Mr. O'Sullivan thanked Mr. Lenten for the thorough report and thanked the Secretariat for all its fundraising efforts. He stressed the positive developments as a result of the project, particularly with regard

to the demonstration sites some of which have not had the benefit of conservation measures in the past and others, which were being reinvigorated by the WOW project. Despite the challenges still to be faced, he underlined the success of the project so far and reiterated that BirdLife International would continue its support.

252. Mr. Keil added that the network was growing as specified in the AEWA Communication Strategy. The main sponsors had already been mentioned, all the other sponsors were mentioned on the website. He added that the CSN Tool would link and enhance the knowledge on migratory sites and was being eagerly awaited by the potential users. Activities at the 11 demonstration sites were already underway, each of which had a different focus. The results of the demonstration sites would be made available to other site managers. More information on the project is available under: <http://www.wingsoverwetlands.org>.

Extraordinary Agenda item: Presentation by the CMS Secretariat on CMS organisation proposals

253. Mr. Hepworth referred to the supplementary document distributed to the meeting: *Note on CMS Organisation Proposals*, which gave an overview of the proposals currently under discussion. The discussion included the concept of clustering functions shared between CMS and the three daughter Agreements in the areas of Capacity Building, Information & Media, Websites, Publications, Reporting, and Fundraising. He acknowledged that a great deal of informal cooperation was already ongoing; ASCOBANS and CMS were already a joint Secretariat and examples of close cooperation with AEWA were the World Migratory Bird Day and the Avian Influenza Task Force. The proposal for a common Capacity Building, Information and Fundraising Unit resulted from the initiative to make the best use of available resources. The majority of costs would be met by CMS and otherwise resourced jointly in kind and in cash by the smaller Agreements proportionate to the size of each body. This could be a fairly flexible arrangement and reporting lines could continue as they are now. Referring to the Synergies Agenda in the wider UN and UNEP context, Mr. Hepworth mentioned that he had just received an update and that the General Assembly had drawn up a draft Resolution, which was likely to be passed this year, on international environmental governance, and which recognised the importance of enhancing cooperation and coordination among the MEAs, promoting working in clusters, and rationalising Secretariat activities while maintaining the autonomy of those Agreements. It also urged the COPs and MOPs of the MEAs to continue to explore the potential for cluster-wide cooperation among the Agreements by setting up and intensifying collaboration in various areas. The current proposal was an example of how that might be achieved, however he stressed that the COPs and MOPs would make the final decision on this issue as they had the legal independence.

254. Mr. Van Dijk responded that the Netherlands would continue to play an important role in the discussions on the future of CMS; however after COP10 as it was premature to take any decisions at this time.

255. Ms. Paulus went on to say that as this document had only been tabled on the previous day, Germany would require more time to study it; however she reported that the first reaction on the ideas presented was that Germany was not convinced that the development of common information units would be of added value as cooperation already takes place within the CMS family, and that particularly the level of Information Management delivered by the AEWA Secretariat was very satisfactory from the German point of view. She went on to say that Germany seconded the opinion of the Depositary that it was premature to discuss or make any decisions on this issue before the overall discussion on the structure and strategy of CMS and the Agreements had been carried out in the next triennium after COP10. Ms. Paulus also referred to the creation of regional nodes, mentioned in the document and reiterated Germany's position stated at the last CMS StC Meeting, that the creation of regional nodes was not considered to be a convincing and sustainable solution to support the implementation of CMS.

256. In his position as German representative on the EUROBATS Standing Committee, Mr. Schall reported that he had expressed the need for a joint Working Group involving all the Agreements with the purpose of negotiating the best way forward between the next two COPs.

257. The Chairman commented on the discussion and noted that time would be needed for those concerned to deliberate on these proposals in order to make a sound decision, which would have serious implications, should they not work out as expected. The AEWA Strategic Plan had just been adopted for submission to

MOP4 and in the light of the targets set, and the current level of staff, no decisions could be taken at any level at the moment.

258. Mr. Hepworth stressed that this was an opportunity taken solely to be able to elaborate on the content of the paper within the Standing Committee and to consult and collect the views and include them in the process already begun by the Chairman of the CMS Standing Committee. There was no proposal for a decision at this stage. The views of those involved were however important to be able to continue the debate.

259. Ms. Paulus clarified that the intention of Germany was not to participate in discussions on this issue isolated from the overall discussion related to all aspects of the future strategy and structure of CMS and its Agreements, which would be discussed at the CMS COP together with the Contracting Parties; thus any decisions would be deferred to a later date.

260. Mr. Mungroo expressed his concern that much more information was required in a paper of this nature, which should encompass the responsibilities of the officers joining a common unit and the implications to the Agreements concerned, should those officers be removed creating a vacuum in their respective Secretariats.

261. The Chairman summarised the opinions expressed that more information and time were required and that the discussion would be referred to a later date involving all the Agreement Secretariats concerned.

Agenda item 25. Report on the development of new projects

262. Mr. Lenten reported on two projects currently under development. The first was the project on Strengthening Waterbird and Wetland Conservation Capacities in North Africa (WetCap). The project proposal had been developed by the Programme Officer, Ms. Catherine Lehmann. Development agencies had been approached with a view to finding appropriate sponsors for the implementation of the Agreement. After receiving a positive response from the Spanish agency for international development cooperation (AECID), the Spanish BirdLife partner SEO had been consulted and a concept for this project had been outlined. He was happy to announce that the confirmation for a grant amounting to 400.000 Euros as a contribution towards AEWA to support the WetCap project had just been received. This contribution was for the first year of the project and potentially a total of 1.2 million Euros would be contributed by AECID for the 3-year duration of the project. Validation was still outstanding at governmental level; however the inter-ministerial commission had already approved, the next step would be the signing of an MoU. The Project would focus on Egypt, Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco and Mauretania. Implementation should start after MOP4. Mr. Lenten went on to acknowledge the hard work of the Programme Officer leading to this successful outcome.

263. Other aspects of this project were small grants aimed at community projects in each country that focussed on waterbird and wetland conservation as well as the translation of key AEWA and Ramsar Convention documents into Arabic and French, which was linked to the WOW project and thus constituted a matching fund. A transferable framework for training and awareness raising programmes was being produced under WOW. Surveys would also be carried out in areas, where there had not been any to date; the data collected would be incorporated in the WOW CSN Tool. This was a very exciting development, which would be sealed by an official signing ceremony in due course and would hopefully be kicked off at the end of the year

264. Mr. Lenten went on to describe the Great Rift Valley (GRV) initiative and efforts being made to have it acknowledged as a Serial Nomination World Heritage Site; it was one of the most important flyways in Africa for a large number of species, including raptors. The Great Rift Valley starts in Turkey and stretches all the way down to Mozambique, spanning 7,000 kilometres. Mr. Lenten had attended a UNESCO World Heritage Convention Workshop in Kenya, where he had been asked to be an advisor on the Steering Committee together with BirdLife International and the Ramsar Convention. A respective Resolution had already been drafted (*draft Res. 4.21*), which would also be brought forward to the Ramsar and CMS COPs. This initiative could also have a significant impact for CMS and be a step towards an ecological network for Africa. After discussing the issue with colleagues at UNEP/GEF it had become clear that there was a definite possibility of funds being allocated towards this initiative in the near future.

265. In answer to Mr. Schall's question regarding the natural heritage and the cultural heritage categories and whether both would be applied for, Mr. Lenten replied that political backing was being sought so that the MEAs could continue to be involved and try to gain as many benefits as possible with regard to the conservation of the species under them, however UNESCO would have to take the lead in this process

264. Mr. Mungroo clarified that a World Heritage Site could either be a cultural or a natural site or both in a so-called mixed site.

266. Ms. Paulus confirmed Germany's support towards this initiative and reported that the German Government had been able to acquire expertise due to recent evaluations by the IUCN with regard to the designation of larger areas for World Heritage Sites and would be happy to share this in connection with the GRV initiative.

267. Mr. Van Dijk raised the point on terrestrial animals in Africa and that the Netherlands had been promoting the idea of ecological networks worldwide especially on Pan-European level and in the CBD; however he would welcome the view of the CMS Secretariat on a recommendation for ecological networks in general.

268. Mr. Hepworth noted that this was not on the Agenda for CMS. He did, however, confirm that CMS was not averse to this proposal and that the CMS Ambassador, Ms. Kuki Gallmann has been promoting this idea for sometime. If there was a strong commitment on the part of UNEP/GEF then this should be followed up as resources remained a crucial factor.

269. Mr. O'Sullivan added that it would be beneficial to involve IUCN, which was also represented on the AEWa Technical Committee, and had a significant influence on the listing of sites. It would be important to keep IUCN aware of what was under consideration.

270. Mr. Lenten clarified that he had participated in a scientific Workshop in Nairobi last year, organised by the UNESCO World Heritage Commission together with the Netherlands and other partners and worked on the idea of attaining political endorsement through resolutions by the different MEAs. Another way to raise awareness was through a small brochure, which had already been developed. A meeting had just been requested by UNEP/GEF in order to discuss this issue further and it seemed that there was a definite interest in providing funds. The role of the AEWa Secretariat was that of an initiator, to be active on the Steering Committee and to give guidance; it was for UNESCO and IUCN to decide on the designation.

271. The meeting approved draft Resolution 4.21.

Agenda item 26. Implementation of the Agreement and the Action Plan

272. Mr. Dereliev introduced document StC5.29 *Overview of National Reports and Reports on phasing out lead shot received so far.*

273. Mr. Dereliev explained that in accordance with Article V.I(c), the Contracting Parties shall submit to the Secretariat a National Report on the implementation of the Agreement not later than 120 days before the opening of the MOP and in its Resolution 2.2, the Meeting of the Parties called upon the Contracting Parties to report to each ordinary session of the Meeting of the Parties on progress made to phase out lead shot.

274. This document summarised the information received from the AEWa Contracting Parties and the reports submitted by 19 June 2008. Although all efforts had been made to incorporate as many reports as possible, 4 had been submitted after that date (Algeria, France, Hungary and the Netherlands) and could therefore not be included.

275. Countries represented at this Committee, which have not yet submitted their National Reports were Egypt, Madagascar, Tanzania and Romania and Mr. Dereliev reminded the respective representatives that the deadline had been 10 May 2008; he explained that there was very little time to summarize the information from National Reports for submission to the MOP and therefore strongly requested the members

of the StC to urge the Parties in their regions to do so. The Secretariat's efforts in this respect were time-consuming and not always successful as messages were often overlooked.

276. The submission of reports on the phasing out of lead shot was quite high, due to a review carried out by the Secretariat last year, whereby most countries had submitted detailed questionnaires; thus no further reports were required. Only 11 reports were still outstanding. The feedback required did not necessarily have to be very detailed. Mr. Dereliev again appealed to the StC members to contact countries in their regions and urge them to submit their reports and thus enable the Secretariat to provide the MOP with a complete overview.

277. Almost 70% of all reports had been submitted after the last triennium. Mr. Dereliev hoped that with the support of the Regional Representatives, a better rate of submission could be achieved.

278. Mr. Van Dijk commented that the issue in the case of the Netherlands was simple because the use of lead shot has been completely banned; however the questionnaires were too long and he suggested providing a simpler, more user-friendly version of the questionnaire.

279. Mr. Schall shared the view of the Netherlands and urged the Secretariat to consider combining and condensing questionnaires; he noted that the questionnaire on the phasing out of lead shot had been closely followed by the one on experiences made after phasing out lead shot.

280. With regard to the submission of the National Report for Madagascar and the questionnaire on the phasing out of lead shot, Ms. Zarasoa regretted that these had not yet been submitted. She explained that the procedures involved proved to be difficult in Madagascar. In the case of phasing out of lead shot, legislation could easily be passed; however monitoring and enforcement were the problem and the fact that the Ministry of Defence was responsible in this case. Legislation was, for example, easier to apply to Ramsar sites than for other wetlands. Some data had been received and despite the difficulties involved, all efforts were being made to contact the responsible bodies.

281. Mr. Dereliev reported that the information collected from countries on the experiences made with phasing out of lead shot, such as the Netherlands and Germany, would be compiled in form of a brochure, which would be a useful guidance tool for Madagascar to design a national process, which, as countries reported, could take from 1 to 22 years.

Agenda item 27. Administrative and financial matters

282. Mr. Lenten introduced document StC5.30 *Allocation of funds accrued through contributions of new Parties*.

He reported that at MOP2, it had been decided that the Secretariat could set aside the annual contributions of new Parties acceding to the Agreement after MOP2 for special projects. At the previous StC Meeting it had been decided that leftover funds from 2006 could be allocated for projects in 2007. As the present meeting had not been able to take place in 2007 as scheduled, due to lack of funds and a decision on the allocation of leftover funds had to be made by the end of that year, Mr. Lenten had contacted the Chair of the StC, Mr. Severre who agreed with the allocation of leftover funds from 2007 and a part from 2008 for the following measures: the Servicing of the Meeting of the Parties, Implementation of the African-Eurasian Flyways GEF Project, Implementation of the Agreement (SSAP), Implementation of the Communication Strategy, and implementation of the International Implementation Priorities.

283. Replying to Ms. Zarasoa's question on Madagascar's contributions for 2007 and 2008 mentioned in Table 1: Contributions of new Parties, Mr. Lenten explained that this table represented an overview of income and not deficits.

284. Referring to document StC5.31 *Financial and administrative matters – Report on income and expenditures for 2007 and 2008*, Mr. Lenten explained that MOP3 had decided to establish a core budget (AWL) based on the annual contributions from Contracting Parties and a second budget (AVL) based on voluntary contributions. The annexes to this document reflected the overview of expenditures from the core budget as well as the income from voluntary contributions and annual contributions. The money in form of

voluntary contributions was often earmarked for specific activities. Leftover funds in any particular year were transferred to the same budget lines in the subsequent year according to the UN regulations.

285. Although Parties with bigger annual contributions such as France payed in advance, some countries were in arrears despite regular reminders on the part of the Secretariat. Mr. Lenten explained his intention not to fund Parties more than 3 years in arrears for participation to MOP4, in order to encourage them to pay their dues, particularly as many of them had very small amounts to pay.

286. Mr. Lenten expressed his thanks to Mr. Ricardas Patiejunas from the Administration Unit for his hard work and continuous support with regard to the financial work and compiling the reports for this meeting.

287. In summary, Mr. Lenten reported that the financial situation was a healthy one and that he did not expect any deficits at the end of 2008.

Agenda item 28. Institutional matters

288. Mr. Lenten reported on the MoC concluded with Oiseaux Migrateurs du Paléarctique Occidental (OMPO) in Paris (Stc.Inf. 5.1) and the development of a similar MoC with Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF), which covered many of the AEWA species. This was one of the tasks of the Programme Officer and he hoped that this MoC could be concluded in the near future.

Agenda item 29. Developments of interest to AEWA

289. Mr. Lenten reported on ongoing activities under CMS, namely the launch of the Central Asian Flyway (CAF) Action Plan and the MoU on African-Eurasian Raptors, both of which overlap with the AEWA area.

i) Central Asian Flyway Action Plan for the Conservation of Migratory Waterbirds and their Habitats

290. Mr. El Kabiri, Deputy Executive Secretary of CMS introduced the CAF Action Plan, which had been launched in January 2008 after consultations with the 30 range states. The development of an MoU with India, which was a major Range State, had been delayed due to budgetary issues and aspects of the work involved. This was being developed in cooperation with Wetlands International, which would also provide details on budgetary proposals soon.

291. Mr. Schall expressed some concerns and observations on behalf of Germany concerning this issue. During the AEWA StC Meeting in 2005 it had been agreed that the CAF Range States should be formerly consulted on whether they want to join a common Agreement. The discussion was about a stand-alone Agreement however the issue of a possible enlargement of AEWA to cover the CAF area was still open. Mr. Schall suggested keeping the file open and that the participation of the AEWA Secretariat should be maintained and the views of the Range States reported to the AEWA Contracting Parties at the AEWA MOP and CMS COP.

292. Mr. El Kabiri replied that all the facts necessary for making a decision were available. Some countries were not in favour of a merger with AEWA e.g. China. He went on to say that the Standing Committee was welcome to make a proposal on this issue; however CMS as a global Convention will introduce a policy paper on all the flyways to be discussed at COP9. He reiterated that the opinion of the Range States involved was important and necessary.

293. Mr. Schall concurred with the point made by Mr. El Kabiri that the views of the Parties should be considered. He recalled that at MOP3 in Dakar, the former Russian States had been in favour of a merger of CAF with AEWA. Mr. Schall stressed the need for AEWA to be kept in the process because of the strong affinities involved.

294. Mr. Lenten expressed his concern about the progress of the CAF issue and the direction it was taking, which was a different one to that decided upon at the first meeting in Uzbekistan in 2002 together with CMS; also during the Meeting in New Delhi in 2005 a large number of Range States had expressed their preference

to a link with AEWA. AEWA's involvement was inevitable because 16 of the 30 Range States to CAF were Range States to AEWA. Mr. Lenten underlined the resulting unnecessary duplication of efforts and costs and reiterated that the ultimate decision would be made by the Parties.

295. The Chair concluded that the AEWA StC endorsed the AEWA Secretariat's involvement in the process until a decision was made by the COP.

ii) Action Plan for the Conservation of Migratory Birds of Prey in Africa and Eurasia

296. Mr. El Kabiri went on to report on the development of the Raptors MoU. The text of the MoU had been agreed upon after extensive discussion at the Meeting in Loch Lomand in October 2007. The draft had been circulated for consultation and comments were received from 18 countries, many of which had indicated that they were willing to sign the MoU. The final draft would be distributed as soon as it had been finalised. The United Arab Emirates had generously offered to host the interim Secretariat of the MoU. Mr. El Kabiri welcomed this important conservation measure for migratory raptors, which had been developed within a short space of time.

297. Ms. Paulus thanked Mr. El Kabiri for the information and expressed Germany's willingness to actively contribute to the Working Group as there were some questions, which were still open and could be clarified at the EU coordination meeting taking place at the end of that week; however Germany could not sign before some organisational and financial points had been finalised. She went on to stress the importance of the AEWA Secretariat's involvement, as in the case of CAF, whereby many issues raised in the Raptors MoU were also relevant to AEWA species and it was important to avoid overlap and take all actions and decisions in close cooperation with AEWA.

298. Mr. Van Dijk concurred with the German position and congratulated CMS on the good results achieved. The positions of all the Agreements should be seen in the wider context and that AEWA should definitely be involved in the process.

299. Mr. Lenten requested clarification on the issue of annual contributions and whether this would be the first MoU under which annual contributions would be required from the Parties.

300. Mr. El Kabiri responded that all options were currently being examined by the Working Group. He added that it was not easy to design a model for this purpose and that the CMS priority was to be efficient and be able to implement the MoU; this should be seen as an opportunity to make synergies with the CMS family in the frame of the new structure for CMS, currently under discussion.

301. The Chair concluded that, in this case, AEWA should also remain in the process until a decision was made by the COP on how to proceed with this issue.

Agenda item 30. Selection of the AEWA Award winners

302. The Secretariat orally informed the Meeting about the outcome of the call for nominations for the AEWA Award. The Meeting subsequently selected the winning candidates in both categories:

1. Individual Category: Dr. Mark D. Anderson
2. Institutional Category: Oiseaux Migrateurs du Paléarctique Occidental (OMPO)

Agenda item 31. Report of the Chair of the Standing Committee to MOP4

303. Mr. Lenten's proposal for the Secretariat to draft the report and send it to the members of the Standing Committee for comments before presenting the final version to the MOP, was accepted by the meeting.

Agenda item 32. Date and venue of last meeting

304. Mr. Lenten noted that if the MOP agreed with the proposal to hold the Meetings of the Standing Committee every two years instead of every year then the next meeting would take place in 2010, leaving enough time to deal with the issue of the date and venue.

Agenda item 33. Any Other Business

305. Noting the presence of the Chairman of the Technical Committee, Mr. Mungroo, Mr. El Kabiri took this opportunity to thank Mauritius for the grant given to CMS in 2005 as a contribution to the marine turtles initiative, which had been highly appreciated.

Agenda item 34. Closure of the Meeting

306. Mr. El Kabiri was invited to give a vote of thanks and reported that it had been a pleasure to attend this meeting and thanked Mr. Lenten and his team for the impressive amount of high quality documents produced. He was pleased to have been able to hear about the issues tabled, particularly the administrative and financial ones, as he was currently the Officer in charge of the Administration Unit. He reported that the new Officer would be starting duty shortly, in time for the COP in December 2008, which would also be attended by the Executive Secretary of AEWA, Mr. Lenten. He went on to thank all the delegates for their time and their commitment to the AEWA Standing Committee, which was obviously going from strength to strength.



LIST OF PARTICIPANTS / LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS

5th STANDING COMMITTEE MEETING / 5^{ème} RÉUNION DU COMITÉ PERMANENT

24 – 25 June 2008, Bonn, Germany

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE REGIONS / LES REPRESENTANTS DES REGIONS

EUROPE AND CENTRAL ASIA

Dr. Christiane Paulus
Head of the International Nature Conservation
Division
Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature
Conservation and Nuclear Safety
Robert-Schuman-Platz 3
53175 Bonn
GERMANY / ALLEMAGNE

Tel.: (+49) (1888) -305-2630

Fax : (+49) (1888) -305-2864

E-mail: Christiane.Paulus@bmu.bund.de

Dr. Maria Mihaela Antofie
Head of the Biodiversity Unit and
Biosafety Compartment
Ministry of Environment and Sustainable
Development
12 Libertatii Str, District 5,040129
BucharestROMANIA / ROUMANIETel.: 40 21 31
633 82Fax: 40 21 31 602 82
E-Mail: mihaela.antofie@mmediu.ro

EASTERN AND SOUTHERN AFRICA

Mr. Erasmus Tarimo (Chairman)
Director of Wildlife
Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism
Nyerere Road/Ivory Room
P.O. Box 1994
Dar es Salaam
TANZANIA / TANZANIE

Tel.: (+255 22) 28 66 408

Fax: (+255 22) 28 65 836

E-Mail: director@wildlife.org.tz

WESTERN AND CENTRAL AFRICA

Mr. Ousmane Kane
Chef Division Zones Humides et Aires Marines
Protégés
Direction Parcs Nationaux
B.P. 5135
Dakar-Fann
SENEGAL / SÉNÉGAL

Tel.: (+221) 33 832 2309

Fax: (+221) 33 832 2311

E-mail: dpn@sentoo.sn

DEPOSITARY

Mr. Gerard van Dijk
Senior Executive Officer International Affairs
Department of Nature
Ministry of Agriculture, Nature & Food Quality
P.O. Box 20401
2500 EK Den Haag
The NETHERLANDS / PAYS-BAS

Tel. : (+31) 70 378 5009

Fax: (+31 70) 3786146

E-Mail : g.van.dijk@minlnv.nl

MIDDLE EAST AND NORTHERN AFRICA

Mr. Taher A. Mohamed Issa
General Director of National Biodiversity
Department
Ministry of State for Environmental Affairs
30 Taree Hewan El-Zerae, Maadi
Cairo
EGYPT / EGYPTE

Tel.: (+2) 02 252 71391

Fax:

E-Mail: tahernbu@gmail.com

OFFICIAL DELEGATES / DELEGATIONS OFFICIELLES

GERMANY/ ALLEMAGNE

Mr. Oliver Schall
Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature
Conservation and Nuclear Safety
Referat / Division N I 4
Internationaler Naturschutz / International Nature
Conservation
Robert-Schuman-Platz 3
53175 Bonn
GERMANY / ALLEMAGNE

Tel.: (+49 228) 305-2632
Fax: (+49 228) 305-2684
E-mail: oliver.schall@bmu.bund.de

Mr. Edward Ragusch
Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature
Conservation and Nuclear Safety
Referat / Division N I 4
Internationaler Naturschutz / International Nature
Conservation
Robert-Schuman-Platz 3
53175 Bonn
GERMANY / ALLEMAGNE

Tel.: (+49 228) 99 305-2663
Fax: (+49 228) 305-2684
E-mail: edward.ragusch@bmu.bund.de

Ms. Melanie Klußmann
Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature
Conservation and Nuclear Safety
Referat / Division N I 4
Internationaler Naturschutz / International Nature
Conservation
Robert-Schuman-Platz 3
53175 Bonn
GERMANY / ALLEMAGNE

Tel.: (+49 228) 305-4465
Fax: (+49 228) 305-2684
E-Mail: melanie.klussmann@bmu.

REPRESENTATIVE OF HOST COUNTRY FOR MOP4

Mme. Zarasoa
Ministère de l'environnement, des Eaux et Forêts
Chef de Service de protection de l'environnement
marin et côtier
B.P. 571, Ampandrianomby
Antananarivo
MADAGASCAR / MADAGASCAR

Tel.: (+261) 20 331139226/ 61359
Fax: (+261) 20 2241919
E-Mail: rogeranaivo@moov.mg

TANZANIA/ TANZANIE

Mr. Mzamilu Kaita
Principal Game Officer
Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism
Nyerere Road/Ivory Room
P.O. Box 1994
Dar es Salaam
TANZANIA / TANZANIE

Tel.: (+255 22) 28 66 408
Fax: (+255 22) 28 65 836
E-Mail: director@wildlife.go.tz

**CHAIRMAN OF THE TECHNICAL
COMMITTEE**

Mr. Yousoof Mungroo
4A, Impasse Barthelemy Ohsan
Beau-Bassin
MAURITIUS/ MAURICE
Tel.: (+230) 4671252 2993
Fax:
E-mail: ymungroo@gmail.com

**INTERNATIONAL NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS /
ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES NON GOUVERNEMENTALES**

BirdLife International

Mr. John O'Sullivan
International Treaties Adviser
Birdlife International
RSPB, The Lodge, Sandy
SG 19 2DL Bedfordshire
UNITED KINGDOM / ROYAUME-UNI

Tel.: (+44) 1767 680 551
Fax: (+44) 1767 683 211
E-mail: john.osullivan@rspb.org.uk

Ms. Nicola Crockford
International Species Policy Officer
Birdlife International, RSPB, The Lodge, Sandy
SG 19 2DL Bedfordshire
UNITED KINGDOM / ROYAUME-UNI

Tel.: (+44) 1767 680 551
Fax: (+44) 1767 683 211
E-mail: nicola.crockford@rspb.org.uk

**Federation of Associations for Hunting and
Conservation of the EU - FACE**

Mr. Angus Middleton
Director of Conservation
Federation of Associations for Hunting and
Conservation of the EU - FACE
Rue F. Pelletier 82
B- 1030 Brussels
BELGIUM / BELGIQUE

Tel: +32(0) 2 732 69 00
Fax: +32 (0) 2732 70 72
E-mail: conservation@face.eu

INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS / ORGANISATIONS
INTERGOUVERNEMENTALES

UNEP/CMS Secretariat

Mr. Robert Hepworth
Executive Secretary
Secretariat of the Convention on the Conservation of
Migratory Species of Wild Animals
Hermann-Ehlers-Str. 10
53113 Bonn
GERMANY/ ALLEMAGNE

Tel: (+49 228) 815-2410
Fax: (+49 228) 815-2449
E-mail: secretariat@cms.int

Mr. Lahcen El Kabiri
Deputy Executive Secretary
Secretariat of the Convention on the Conservation of
Migratory Species of Wild Animals
Hermann-Ehlers-Str. 10
53113 Bonn
GERMANY/ ALLEMAGNE

Tel: (+49 228) 815 2407
Fax: (+49 228) 815 2449
E-mail: lelkabiri@cms.int

Mr. Marco Barbieri
Scientific & Technical Officer
Secretariat of the Convention on the Conservation of
Migratory Species of Wild Animals
United Nations Premises in Bonn
Hermann-Ehlers-Str. 10
53113 Bonn, Germany
GERMANY/ ALLEMAGNE

Tel: (+49 228) 815 2424
Fax: (+49 228) 815 2449
E-mail: mbarbieri@cms.int

Mr. Francisco Rilla
Information Officer
Secretariat of the Convention on the Conservation of
Migratory Species of Wild Animals
Hermann-Ehlers-Str. 10
53113 Bonn
GERMANY/ ALLEMAGNE

Tel: (+49 228) 815 2460
Fax: (+49 228) 815 2449
E-mail: frilla@cms.int

AEWA Secretariat / Secrétariat de l'AEWA

UNEP / AEWA Secretariat

Mr. Bert Lenten,
Executive Secretary
Ms. Marie-Therese Kämper
Administrative Assistant
Mr. Sergey Dereliev
Technical Officer
Mr. Florian Keil,
Information Officer (JPO)
Ms. Jolanta Kremer
Team Assistant
Ms. Catherine Lehman,
Associate Programme Officer

Secretariat of the Agreement on the Conservation of
African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds (AEWA)
Hermann-Ehlers-Str. 10
53113 Bonn
GERMANY / ALLEMAGNE

Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2414
Fax: (+49 228) 815 2450
E-mail: aewa@unep.de

INTERPRETERS

Ms. Katharina Suntrup
Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature
Conservation and Nuclear Safety
Robert-Schuman-Platz 3
53175 Bonn
GERMANY / ALLEMAGNE

E-mail: katharina.suntrup@bmu.bund.de

Ms. Caroline Bechtold
Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature
Conservation and Nuclear Safety
Robert-Schuman-Platz 3
53175 Bonn
GERMANY / ALLEMAGNE

E-mail: caroline.bechtold@bmu.bund.de

Ms. Enken Tadsen-Duch
Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature
Conservation and Nuclear Safety
Robert-Schuman-Platz 3
53175 Bonn
GERMANY / ALLEMAGNE

E-Mail: Enken.Tadsen-Duch@bmu.bund.de

Ms. Andrea Lenhart
E-mail: AndreaLenhart@bmvgl.bund.de